

みんなくりポジトリ

国立民族学博物館 学術情報リポジトリ National Museum of Ethnology

Introduction : Updating the San, Image and Reality of an African People in the Twenty First Century

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 国立民族学博物館 公開日: 2017-10-31 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): 作成者: 池谷, 和信, Hitchcock, Robert K., Biesele, Megan, Lee, Richard B. メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/10502/00008553

Introduction: Updating the San, Image and Reality of an African People in the Twenty First Century

Robert K. Hitchcock

Michigan State University, USA

Kazunobu Ikeya

National Museum of Ethnology, Japan

Megan Biesele

Kalahari Peoples Fund, USA

Richard B. Lee

University of Toronto, Canada

INTRODUCTION

Long an icon of popular culture, and a fixture in anthropological text books and films, and, more recently, a subject of anthropological and political controversy, the contemporary San (Bushmen, Basarwa) peoples are framed in contradictory ways. To some they represent the image of ‘pristine’ hunter-gatherers, a way of life like that of humanity’s ancestors, a picture of authenticity in a world of false values. To others, they stand for the opposite, in many ways apartheid’s most oppressed victims, marginalized minorities called into being by centuries of subordination and more recently by the forces of global capitalism.

Neither of these polarities begins to capture the realities of today’s San people. Numbering close to 100,000 people in southern Africa (Angola, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) (Figure 1), the San present a wide spectrum of social, economic, and political conditions. Some continue to hunt and gather part time, while most others work for low wages on the farms of blacks or whites. There are some self-sufficient San communities engaged in a combination of agriculture, livestock production, small-scale rural industries, and wage employment, as seen, for example, in the Okavango Delta region of Botswana. The San in some parts of southern Africa have embarked on a variety of different kinds of community-based development activities

While many San still experience injustice and cultural loss, this is tempered by success stories, examples of political mobilization, and a new spirit of community resistance. It is a tribute to the San resilience and cultural strength that they have overcome many obstacles in an effort to retain their languages, cultures, and



Figure 1 Map of Namibia, Botswana and Adjacent Nations

religious beliefs, even if circumstances have forced them to give up their mobility and foraging systems.

The work of scholars, development workers, and activists chronicles the ongoing struggles for San human rights and well-being as well as some of the progress, defeats, and victories that are writing new chapters in the history of the San. This volume addresses changes that are on-going among the San, including rising HIV/AIDS rates, shifts in health, fertility and mortality patterns with sedentarization, and transformations in education, social organization, and local-level development.

But as described in the important comprehensive five-volume study, *Regional Assessment of the Status of the San in Southern Africa*, edited by anthropologist James Suzman, in some of the countries where San survived, they were the subject

of special statuses (Suzman 2001a, b). Their nomadic ways, essential to their survival, were treated as vagrancy and suppressed. In certain areas, repression and violence continues to the present, and women, children, and men are suffering from poor treatment (Sylvain 1999; Felton and Becker 2001).

The San exhibit marked cultural flexibility and creativity. Coming to political consciousness, some San have recreated themselves as First Peoples, identifying themselves in a number of instances as members of the world's indigenous populations (Saugestad 2001; Hitchcock 2002; Sylvain 2002). They have sought, sometimes successfully, for land and civil rights in the countries in which they live (Hitchcock and Vinding 2004). While discrimination remains, governments in the southern African region have begun to recognize the uniqueness and potential of the San and to implement at least some policies in support of San development aspirations. This volume attempts to point out areas where serious injustices and problems persist, but also provides examples of communities where small victories have been won in the struggle for cultural survival.

BACKGROUND: THE SAN IN PREHISTORY AND HISTORY

Ancestral San peoples have lived in southern Africa since ancient times. The oldest examples of unequivocal human remains have been excavated at Klasies River Mouth east of Cape Town, dated to 120,000 B.P. For thousands of generations, San populations lived by hunting and gathering as the sole occupants of southern Africa. Archaeological evidence indicates that the San lived in small mobile groups with complex microlithic stone tool technology (Mitchell 2002). Around the time of Christ some of the San foragers began to herd goats and sheep and later cattle, some of them becoming in time the Khoi peoples, sometimes referred to in the past as Hottentots (Schapera 1930; Elphick 1977; Barnard 1992).

At one time, the San occupied an area stretching from the Congo-Zambezi watershed in central Africa south to the Cape. The San were relatively widely dispersed in the region, and they numbered up to 300,000 people (Lee 1976: 5). Today, San peoples reside in six countries (see Table 1), with scattered individuals and small communities who identify themselves as San in other countries such as Lesotho and Swaziland. The majority of the San are to be found in the Kalahari Desert region of Namibia and Botswana, though there are also populations of San in Angola, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa.

Contemporary San exhibit a wide variety of adaptations and types of interactions with other societies, governments, and international institutions (Lee 1979a, b, 2003; Hitchcock 1996; Gordon and Douglas 2000; Cassidy, Good, Mazonde, and Rivers 2001; Robins, Madzudzo, and Brenzinger 2001). Over the past several decades, often with the assistance of anthropologists and interested development workers, the San communities have formed their own non-government organizations, and they have established a variety of development projects (Saugestad 2001; Lee, Hitchcock, and Biesele 2002). Anthropologists also have formed support organizations for the San,

Table 1 Numbers of San in Southern Africa

Country	Population Estimate by Regional Assessment of San in Southern Africa	Population Estimate by WIMSA
Angola	1,200	3,400
Botswana	47,675	49,000
Namibia	32,000	38,000
South Africa	4,350	7,500
Zambia	300	1,300
Zimbabwe	2,500	'a few hundred'
TOTAL	80,025	Ca. 100,000

Note: Data for the first column were obtained from James Suzman. *An Introduction to the Regional Assessment of the Status of San in Southern Africa*. Windhoek, Namibia: Legal Assistance Center, 2001; for the second column, the data were obtained from the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa, Windhoek, Namibia except for the estimate on South African San, which was provided by Roger Chennels (personal communication).

one example being the Kalahari Peoples Fund, founded in 1973 by members of the Harvard Kalahari Research Group and other individuals interested in the well being of the San peoples (Lee 1979b: 317–318; Biesele 2003; see www.kalaharipeoples.org). International indigenous peoples support organizations, including the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), Survival International, and Cultural Survival have all worked with the San or have provided overviews of the San situations (see, for example, the websites of each of these organizations, www.iwgia.org, www.cs.org, www.survival.org).

Efforts have been made by anthropologists and linguists to help reclaim San languages and identities and to train San in mother tongue San languages (Batibo and Smeija 2000). An important area of current concern among San relates to education (WIMSA 2004, 2005). The San, like other indigenous and minority peoples, want to enhance their socioeconomic statuses, and they see education as one important means of bringing that about.

This volume addresses in part the ways in which education has been approached among the San (see, for example, the chapter by Megan Biesele). The San see the ability to learn mother tongue languages as a basic right, something that not all governments in southern Africa agree with. Progress is, however, being made, with the passage of legislation in South Africa concerning the teaching of San and other languages (as stipulated in Section 6[5] of the South African Constitution).

WHO ARE THE SAN?

The terms “San,” “Bushmen,” “Basarwa,” and “Khwe” have all been used to refer to peoples of hunting and gathering origin in southern Africa. It should be noted, however, that each of these terms has a complex and problematic history. The state of debate about “San,” “Bushmen,” or “Basarwa” as possible appellations for

the general group of small, click-speaking, yellow-skinned peoples in southern Africa can be illustrated by the case of two Ju|'hoan brothers, both active in national and local politics in Namibia. At a large community meeting in the Nyae Nyae region of northeastern Namibia in 1991, each of them argued differently about the word "Bushman." One said that he never wanted to hear the term used again in post-apartheid Namibia. The other argued that the term could be ennobled by the way in which they themselves now chose to use it. Thus, he argued, the term "Bushman" could be used in a positive way for all the people in southern Africa who shared similar ethnic backgrounds and customs.

As for the term "San," many people at the meeting had heard of it, but they knew it has a pejorative connotation in Nama, the language from which it comes. In the 1960s "San" was used by the Harvard Kalahari Research Group as a replacement for "Bushmen," which was believed by researchers to have negative social connotations and to be sexist (Lee 1976). None of the people at the 1991 Namibia meeting advocated use of the term San, but they noted that they were familiar with no other over-arching term besides Bushmen.

Some linguists have suggested using "Khoesaan" an overarching term for both Khoekhoe and Nama peoples, and the term "Khoisan" has been used to refer to the groups of hunters and herders in southern Africa who speak click languages (Schapera 1926, 1930; Barnard 1992). Representatives of the various San language groups met in Namibia in late 1996 and agreed to allow the general term "San" to designate them externally. As "pan-San" consciousness grows in southern Africa, one can assume that a general term will emerge to cover all of the groups in southern Africa who claim this identity.

The various countries in southern Africa use different names to refer to those populations known popularly as Bushmen. Namibia used the term Bushmen to refer collectively to the various former foraging and agropastoral groups in the country until 1996, when San began to be used. For several years South Africa used the term Bushmen, but recently San been favored, as seen, for example, in the establishment in July, 1996 of the South African San Institute (SASI). Angola does not yet have an official term for Bushmen and other non-Bantu peoples, but they are sometimes referred to as Kwankhala, Bushmen, or Bosquimanos (the Portuguese term for Bushmen). Neither Zambia nor Zimbabwe has official terms for indigenous peoples, although in the latter case the term Amasili is used on occasion (Hitchcock 1996; Robins, Madzudzo, and Brenzinger 2001).

In the 1960s, the term "San" was used by the Harvard Kalahari Research Group as a replacement for "Bushmen," which was believed by researchers to have negative social connotations (Lee 1976: 5). This term was used primarily by researchers for a number of years, but within Botswana the term employed most often was "Basarwa" (singular, "Mosarwa"). This term is said to be derived from a word signifying "people of the south". In the past, the term "Masarwa" was employed, but this word was seen as pejorative because it did not signify the status of being a person (Alice Mogwe, personal communication, 1996). The San groups

in Botswana generally referred to themselves by their own specific group names (e.g. |Gui for the people of the central Kalahari, !Xo for the people of the southwestern Kalahari or Kua for those people of the east-central and southeastern Kalahari regions; see Barnard 1992).

The government of Botswana has made efforts to avoid the problem of ethnic identification in its programs, since, in its eyes, this is reminiscent of the kinds of terminology used by those espousing apartheid. Instead, the Botswana government since 1978 has used the term “Remote Area Dwellers,” which covers all of those people living outside of villages in rural areas. A Setswana term for this appellation is *tengyanateng*, which, according to some, means “people from deep within the deep,” a description that is not necessarily always appreciated by the people to whom it is applied (Hitchcock 1996; Saugestad 2001; chapter 10 in this volume).

Some spokespersons for San non-government organizations in Botswana have argued for the use of the term N|oakhwe (“Red People”) to refer to the San. Some of them have also suggested that the term “First People” be applied to the San, building on the idea of these groups being the “first comers” or aboriginal peoples who first occupied the Kalahari Desert. The designation “First People” was used by the San non-government organization First People of the Kalahari which has sought to draw attention to the plight of the San.

The government of Botswana, on the other hand, has taken the position that *all* residents of the country are indigenous and so does not accept the designation of “First People.” The Botswana government chose specifically not to target assistance on ethnic groups. The Botswana government’s Remote Area Development Program has instead concentrated its development efforts on a target group defined on the basis of its (1) spatial location (remote areas outside villages), (2) sociopolitical status (marginalized), and (3) socioeconomic status (impoverished and subject to discrimination). The numbers of people defined as Remote Area Dwellers in Botswana vary, depending on the source of the information, but an estimate of the number of people who reside in remote areas range from 60,000–100,000. Of these people, some 47,675 were San at the beginning of the new millennium (Suzman 2001a: 5, Table 1).

In late 1996 representatives of various San groups met in Namibia, where they agreed to allow the general term “San” to designate them externally. This decision was reaffirmed at a meeting on “Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage” held in Cape Town, South Africa in July, 1997. It was also agreed in Cape Town that specific group names should be employed for the various named social units. Adopting terms of self-appellation acknowledges the new sense of empowerment of indigenous southern Africans. In 2001 the Khoisan Consultative Conference sought to bring together all of the Khoe and San groupings under a single organizational structure (Chennels and du Toit 2004: 99). Since that time, it was agreed that the term Khoisan be dropped in favor of two separate names, Khoe and San.

THE SAN AND DEVELOPMENT

The approaches to the development of San in general are mirrored, in many ways in what transpired over the past century in Ghanzi District in western Botswana and the Gobabis and Omaheke Districts in eastern Namibia (Sylvain 1999, 2002, chapter 6 in this volume; Suzman 2000, 2001b). After 1898, when European settlers were allocated freehold farms on the Ghanzi Ridge by the Administration of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, the relationships among San, Bakgalagadi, Tswana, and Europeans underwent significant transformations (Wily 1979; Guenther 1986). The relationships between local people and the Afrikaaner farmers were essentially symbiotic ones in which each side benefitted from the presence of the other. Later on, however, the San were largely dispossessed as a result of the changes in the farm tenure situation and the fencing of the farms (Childers 1976; Wily 1979). Many of the pans that contained water and which were focal points of San residence were within the boundaries of the farms.

A substantial portion of the San population in the region became what in effect were landless laborers on land that was in the hands of other people. San men worked as cattle herders and did other livestock-related labor such as fence-building, and women did domestic labor and odd jobs around the farmstead. At first, the San were paid in kind, usually in the form of food, clothing, and tobacco, but later on they began to be paid cash. With changes in the livestock economy of southern Africa, stock farmers began to replace San herders with workers who had more skills (for example, in fixing borehole equipment). Fewer San were needed for herding and other work, and the farm owners pressured the unemployed San to leave the farms. The result of these processes was impoverishment and marginalization for a sizable number of San (Childers 1976; Wily 1979).

Similar trends were seen in the tribal grazing areas of Botswana, where San who were in some ways indentured servants on the cattle posts of wealthy cattle owners were treated paternalistically and were sometimes beaten or even killed if the cattle owners believed them to be guilty of livestock theft or insubordination (Miers and Crowder 1988; Tagart 1933; see also Botswana National Archives files [BNA] S.194/9, S.204/8).

The strategies that were recommended as ways to assist Kalahari San ranged from *laissez faire* and assimilation to ones that advocated overt intervention (Silberbauer 1965: 7, 132–138, 1981: 12–17). The primary methods for dealing with mistreatment of San on the part of the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration were (1) to make public proclamations and (2) to undertake investigations. In one of the first official reports to the colonial government on the status of the San, John Smith Moffatt, a Resident Magistrate, said that cases of mistreatment should not be handled “by taking aggressive steps” (Botswana National Archives – BNA – file HC 3/2/71, April 16, 1887). He went on to say that efforts to change San status would “disturb the whole country” and that they “would embarrass the slaves” (BNA file HC 3/2/71). One of the reasons that they took this position is that they did not want

to disturb the status quo.

Although the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration would have preferred to ignore the San, events overtook them. In the early 1920s, attention was drawn to the status of San and other minority groups in Botswana when the League of Nations conducted investigations of slavery (see BNA file S.34/8). In 1926, a member of the Bamangwato elite, Simon Ratshosa, wrote a report on "How the Masarwa Became Slaves," something which brought official attention to the issue of San social, political and economic rights (BNA files DCS 5/2 and DCS 8/6). The Secretary of State called for an inquiry into "hereditary service" in the Protectorate (BNA file S.43/7). On August 3, 1926 the High Commissioner made a statement in the Bamangwato tribal capital, Serowe, concerning the status of San:

It has been said that the Masarwa are slaves of the Mangwato. The Government does not regard them as slaves, but realizes that they are a backward people who serve the Mangwato in return for the food and shelter they receive. I understand that for the most part they are contented and that they do not wish to change. But the Government will not allow any tribe to demand compulsory service from another and wants to encourage the Masarwa to support themselves. Any Masarwa who wish to leave their masters and live independently of them should understand that they are at liberty to do so and that if the Mangwato attempt to retain them against their will, the Government will not allow it. It is the duty of the chiefs and headmen to help these people to stand on their feet (statement by High Commissioner, BNA file S.43/7).

This statement reiterated British attitudes about the ways in which San were treated, thus responding to public concerns about colonial passivity with respect to the slavery issue. At the same time, it was a not-so-subtle attempt to transfer the responsibility for taking care of what came to be called "the Bushman problem" to the Tswana.

The International Labor Organization examined forced labor at its annual meeting in 1928. An outgrowth of this discussion was the decision of British Government officials to write to the High Commissioner to find out if there would be any problems with Great Britain becoming party to an international agreement concerning labor relations. The reply was that Botswana enforced the *Masters and Servants Act* of the Cape Colony (BNA files S.6/1 and S.47/3). There is little evidence, however, that much effort was expended in enforcing labor regulations or requiring people to pay their workers fair wages.

Tswana leaders in Botswana, including Tshekedi Khama of the Bamangwato, requested that an inquiry be done on the status of San in 1930, something that was done in the Ngwato District in 1931. The inquiry, which came to be known as the "Masarwa Commission," was conducted by Edward S. B. Tagart, a former Secretary for Native Affairs in what is now Zambia. The focus of the inquiry was on the conditions under which San were employed by the Bamangwato and their rights to payment and property. Corporal punishment was also a major focus of the inquiry

(*High Commissioner's Proclamation*, 11 July, 1931; BNA file S.204/8). One of the issues that had been raised in Ghanzi and in Gobabis in what is now Namibia was the mistreatment of San laborers, some of whom allegedly were beaten or chained in order to keep them from running away from the farms.

A result of these hearings and investigations was the decision to establish settlement schemes for San. The first of these was implemented at Olifantskloof in western Ghanzi District. This scheme was run by the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration and was overseen by a Protectorate policeman, Sergeant de Lorme. At Olifantskloof several hundred people did a combination of road work, trapping, and preparation of hides and skins for sale. The scheme was abandoned after two years when the District Commissioner who supported it, W.H. Cairns, was transferred out of Ghanzi District (Silberbauer 1981: 13–14). It should be noted that there was opposition to the idea of establishing settlement schemes for San among some of the Ghanzi farmers, who were afraid that these places would serve to attract San from their farms, thus reducing their access to cheap labor.

A second settlement scheme for San was a result of the recommendations of J.W. Joyce, who had done a survey of San in the Ngwato District in 1936–37. Joyce recommended that some land be set aside for those San who wished to raise crops. In 1938 the Protectorate government initiated a settlement scheme at Letlhakane in the eastern Kalahari which J.W. Joyce was associated with. An Agricultural Demonstrator, Gilbert Molaba, was posted there, and he helped train people in agriculture (BNA S.360/2; S.263/9). A school was also started for San children. This scheme, too, lasted only two years before it was abandoned and the infrastructure taken over by other groups. This settlement was an outgrowth of some of the discussions about what to do about San peoples that were held in Bechuanaland, Namibia, and South Africa in the 1920s and 1930s.

Interest in San increased exponentially in 1936 when a group of southern Kalahari San was exhibited at the Empire Exhibition in Johannesburg, South Africa. The Minister of Native Affairs of South Africa was so impressed by these people that he said that they should be allowed to continue hunting freely in the Gemsbok National Park; as he put it, “We must treat these Bushmen as fauna” (*The Cape Argus*, August 25, 1936). In 1936, an entrepreneur, A.C. Bain, took a deputation of 55 San to the Houses of Parliament in Cape Town in order to protest their mistreatment by Parks officials. The cause of the San was taken up by social scientists in late 1936, when a group of anthropologists from the University of the Witwatersrand in Johannesburg put forward a proposal to the High Commissioner that a substantial portion of the Kalahari be ceded over to San (BNA file S.469/1/1). This suggestion brought a quick reaction from the British Protectorate Administration. The Resident Commissioner, C.F. Rey, said,

In the first place I saw no reason whatsoever for preserving Bushmen. I can conceive no useful object to the world in spending money and energy in preserving a decadent and dying race, which is perfectly useless from any point of view, merely to

enable a few theorists to carry out anthropological investigations and make money by writing misleading books which lead nowhere (C.F. Rey, November 6, 1936, BNA file S.469/1/1).

Rey expressed the opinion that the main objective of anthropologists was to preserve the San as “living fossils” for their own scientific and pecuniary purposes. He also suggested that development efforts among San would have little effect (BNA file S.469/1/1).

In contrast to these views, anthropologists have in fact had substantial impacts on the San. They have helped San get lands set aside, as was the case with the area that became known as Bushmanland in Namibia, which the Marshall family had advocated, and which was made a separate administrative district in the 1950s. Anthropologists have initiated development projects and settlement schemes (see, for example, Heinz 1975). They have served as intermediaries, culture brokers, and translators. They have obtained substantial amounts of cultural and linguistic material that is useful not only in cultural preservation but also in curriculum development and training in education. In addition, anthropologists have helped improve health and nutritional conditions through their own work and through recommendations to medical personnel, public health agencies, and medical research institutions.

Anthropologists, archaeologists, non-government organization members, and development workers have engaged in various kinds of efforts to assist San. These efforts have ranged from mapping their land use patterns to analyzing San rock art for purposes of developing tourist brochures and interpretive programs for museums. Such impacts can be seen, for example, in the Tsodilo Hills of northwestern Botswana, now a World Heritage site, which contains thousands of rock paintings and engravings and several hundred Stone Age, Iron Age, and recent archaeological sites and a small museum that describes the Hills and the work that has been done there. Over the past several years, the Trust for Okavango Cultural and Development Initiatives has undertaken land use planning and integrated conservation and development work in the Tsodilo Hills. Similar efforts have been carried out by the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa in Namibia and the South African San Institute, the !Xun and Khwe Communal Property Association, and the ≠Khomani Communal Property Association in South Africa.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF APPLIED ANTHROPOLOGICAL WORK AMONG SAN

Unlike the Aborigines of Australia, which had a number of significant anthropological studies based upon detailed ethnographic fieldwork, most of the work on the San in the 19th century was done by non-anthropologists. In the early part of the 20th century, the majority of work on San by anthropologists was not

based so much on fieldwork as it was upon an analysis of archival records and secondary sources. This is true, for example, of the important study of the Khoisan peoples by Isaac Schapera. Schapera brought together an enormous amount of material on the Khoi and San (Schapera 1930). He was a gifted researcher whose work on issues ranging from customary law and social organization to land tenure and labor migration was extremely influential on policies of the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration (see, for example, Schapera 1938, 1943, 1953). Schapera's work touched repeatedly on San issues, and he pointed out some of the problematic relationships between the San and other groups, noting that the San had little, if any, voice in decision-making, that they could not speak on their own behalf in customary court proceedings, they could not own property, and they often had no say about terms of employment on cattle posts or in the homes of influential Tswana (Schapera 1938: 250–252, 1943: 260–261, 1953: 28, 37).

In 1937, a group of academics at the University of Cape Town in South Africa formed a committee that was aimed at “protection of the Bushmen through the provision of reserves” and at ensuring “the preservation of the Bushmen as a separate race” (Schapera 1939: 68). A committee with similar goals was formed by the South African Association for the Advancement of Science in 1937 (Schapera 1939: 68). Isaac Schapera was on an inter-university committee that adopted a resolution on November 27, 1937 that called for an investigation into the conditions affecting the San in South Africa, South West Africa, and the Bechuanaland Protectorate. An important contribution of Schapera to San studies and San development was his compilation of data on the contemporary status of San in southern Africa. This study, which again was based on second-hand material and on statements made by District Commissioners, was published in *Race Relations* in 1939. This study helped spark greater interest among San not only among academics but also administrators, and it fueled arguments for the setting aside of blocks of land for San as a means of helping meet their needs for areas sufficient in size for them to be able to continue hunting and gathering and to allow them to maintain their cultural traditions and lifeways.

Some of the first fieldwork done on San by an anthropologist was that by Dorothea Bleek, who worked among the Nharo San on the Botswana-Namibia border in the 1920s (Bleek 1928a) and among the !Kung (!Xun) of central Angola (Bleek 1928b). Some short-term field studies were also done among ≠Khomani and !Xam San in the northern Cape region of South Africa in the area in and around what is now the Kalahari Gemsbok Park in the 1930s (Rheinalt Jones and Doke 1937). Relatively little work was done among San during the Second World War, although there were administrative reports from District Commissioners in the Bechuanaland Protectorate that indicated that the numbers of San going to the mines in South Africa increased significantly during the early to mid-1940s; according to San informants this was done as a means of generating income and “to help the war effort.”

Public interest in San populations and their situations increased in the 1950s as

a result of a series of investigations by researchers from South Africa, Great Britain, and the United States (Silberbauer 1965: 1–2; Tobias 1975; Marshall 1976: 1–11). For its part, the Protectorate government, realizing that the country was going to receive its independence before too long, decided that further efforts should be made to assess the socioeconomic status of San. In 1958, a Protectorate administrative officer, George Silberbauer, was appointed to carry out surveys and come up with recommendations for dealing with San issues, including what to do about the landless people on the farms. From 1958 to 1966, Silberbauer carried out ethnographic studies in Ghanzi and the central Kalahari region. Detailed ethnographic work was done among the |Gui of the Xade region of the Central Kalahari (see Silberbauer 1965, 1981).

One important result of this work was the establishment of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, which was promulgated in 1961 and was included in Section 5(1) of the *Fauna Conservation Proclamation* (Bechuanaland Government 1961). Subsequent legislation relating to the Central Kalahari was drawn up in part by Silberbauer and was passed in 1963 (Bechuanaland Government 1963). This proclamation outlined who could come in to the reserve, restricted the keeping of dogs and other domestic animals in the reserve, and forbade the use of guns. The provision of boreholes was also recommended in the Central Kalahari. The Central Kalahari Game Reserve, which was over 52,000 sq km in size, was one of the largest conserved areas on the African continent, and it was one of the few, if not the only, game reserves that allowed local people not only to have residential rights but also rights to engage in subsistence hunting and gathering.

At the time of the 1964 census, on which Silberbauer collaborated with Alec Campbell and other Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration officials, there were approximately 4,000 San who were estimated to be on the Ghanzi Farms, which were close to the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. The 1964 census broke the population down into three categories: (1) those who lived in the bush and had little or no contact with non-San groups, (2) those who spent most or all of the year on water points belonging to non-San, and (3) those who lived on the Ghanzi freehold farms. It is important to note that it was not only San who were classified as nomads, but also some Bakgalagadi, people who were ethnically distinct from the San and who spoke a language akin to Setswana, but who lived side by side with the San in remote parts of Botswana.

The anthropological and census work had a number of impacts. It focused additional attention on the plight of the San in western and central Botswana, some of whom were facing difficulties because of prolonged drought and cutbacks on the numbers of laborers on freehold farms and cattle posts. Silberbauer argued vociferously for the improvement of the socioeconomic well-being of the San. One way to do this, he noted, would be to enhance education and training. In addition, he argued for the diversification of the economy of the San, calling for the establishment of an experimental farm where people could be trained not only in livestock-related labor but also as agriculturalists (Silberbauer 1965). He even went

so far as to recommend the provision of boreholes and livestock to San, something that concerned both administrators and non-San, who were worried that the San would build up their livestock numbers, thus having an impact on local environments and causing changes in the rural economy, thus reducing the numbers of people willing to work for low wages on cattle posts, ranches, and freehold farms (for a discussion of these issues in the Western Sandveld region of Central District, Botswana's largest commercial ranching area under the Tribal Grazing Land Policy, a major land and livestock development initiative, see Campbell, Main, and Hitchcock this volume). Anthropological and development work on San living on cattle posts and ranches was carried out in Ghanzi District (Childers 1976; Russell 1976; Guenther 1986; Barnard 1992), Kweneng District (Vierich 1981; Vierich and Hitchcock 1996), Central District (Hitchcock 1979, Campbell, Main, and Hitchcock, this volume), and Kgalagadi District (Thoma and Lawry 1978) and, in Namibia, anthropological research was done on the Gobabis Farms and the Omaheke region (Sylvain 1999, 2002, chapter 6 in this volume; Suzman 1995, 2000, 2001b). Some of the conclusions of these studies included the following: the statuses of many cattle post and ranch workers were extremely low, wages were poor and sometimes were not paid, violence was all too common on the farms and cattle posts, farm workers lacked security of tenure and thus potentially could be removed at the behest of the cattle post or farm owner, schools and health services were generally hard to come by on the farms and cattle posts, so education and health statuses were relatively low, and people in these areas often felt that they were treated paternalistically. These are some of the reasons that some of the people living on farms and cattle posts have called for better treatment and for greater attention to human rights of farm workers.

THE CENTRAL KALAHARI GAME RESERVE LEGAL CASE

One of the strategies recommended for assisting San that came out of the work of George Silberbauer in the 1950s and 1960s was the establishment of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, which was proclaimed in 1961. The Central Kalahari Game Reserve, one of Africa's premier protected areas, and the second largest game reserve on the continent, contained substantial numbers of people, many of them San but also Bakgalagadi (Silberbauer 1965, 1981; Tanaka 1980). In 1986, the government of Botswana announced that the people residing in the reserve would be encouraged, but not forced, to leave the reserve. In 1997, several hundred people were trucked out of the reserve along with their belongings. In February, 2002, several hundred more people were removed from the reserve and relocated in settlements on the peripheries of the reserve, notably New !Xade in Ghanzi District, Kauduane in Kweneng District, and |Xeri in Central District.

There was much discussion among San and Bakgalagadi about what to do about the issue of relocation out of the game reserve (for some of the background on this discussion, see Ikeya 2001; Hitchcock 2002). Various non-government organiza-

tions, including Survival International, made plaintive pleas to the government of Botswana to reverse their decision. Local non-government organizations, including Ditshwanelo, the Botswana Center for Human Rights, the Botswana Christian Council, First People of the Kalahari, and the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa sought to negotiate with the government, hoping that the Botswana authorities would allow people to stay in the reserve. However, in February, 2002, the government went ahead with its intended relocation of additional people from the reserve.

In February-March, 2002, a legal action was filed in the in Botswana High Court to obtain reversal of the decision to cut off of services to the people in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. In April, 2002, the legal case was dismissed on a technicality by a High Court Judge, Mr. Dibotelo. The dismissal of the Central Kalahari legal case was appealed successfully. In July, 2004, the Central Kalahari legal case No. MISCA 52/2002 in the Matter Between Roy Sesana, First Applicant, Keiwa Setlhobogwa and 241 others, Second and Further Applicants, and the Attorney General (in his capacity as the recognized agent of the Government of the Republic of Botswana) was held at New Xade and Ghanzi in Ghanzi District, Botswana. In the first phase of the case, which lasted only a few weeks, only three witnesses were interviewed, including George Silberbauer, former Bushman Survey Officer of the government of the Bechuanaland Protectorate, and two former residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. The case was continued because of lack of funds on the part of the applicants.

In September, 2004 the San and Bakgalagadi of the Central Kalahari dismissed the legal team that was representing them. On November 5th, 2004, the court case resumed. At this time, representing the people of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve were Gordon Bennett, an international lawyer from the United Kingdom and Duma Boko, a Motswana lawyer.

The situation facing the |Gui, ||Gana, Tsilla, and Kua San and Bakgalagadi of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve worsened considerably in the latter half of 2005. In June, 2005 a group of San men hunting in the reserve was arrested and allegedly were tortured. One member of this group Selelo Tshiamo, died from his wounds in early September, 2005. The Government of Botswana announced in early September, 2005 that people would be required to leave the Central Kalahari Game Reserve and that the reserve was off limits to people. The Department of Wildlife and National Parks refused entry on the part of the lawyers involved on the side of the San and Bakgalagadi seeking rights to return and live and use the resources in the reserve, which was in contradiction to the orders of the High Court, which said that they should have the right to enter the reserve to confer with their clients.

On September 12, 2005, the CKGR court case was adjourned to February 6, 2006. This case is already the longest and most expensive of its kind in Botswana history. The same day, September 12th, 2005, armed police and wildlife officers entered the reserve and told people living there to leave. This began a process where people allegedly were (1) prevented at gunpoint from hunting and gathering, (2)

dozens of people were loaded onto trucks and removed from the reserve against their will, (3) goats were removed from the reserve or, in some cases, allegedly were killed, (4) people who were suspected of hunting illegally were beaten, tortured, and in at least one case shot in both legs while standing unarmed with his arms raised. Three days later, on 15 September, 2005 the radio belonging to First People of the Kalahari was confiscated, making it impossible for communications to be maintained between people in the reserve and those outside.

Subsequently, on September 24th, 2005 government lawyer Sidney Pilane was with a group of armed police and wildlife officers who opened fire with rubber bullets and tear gas on a group of 28 San who were attempting to enter the reserve to bring food and water to their relatives and friends. Many of the people, including four members of First People of the Kalahari were arrested and allegedly were beaten and kept in jail for several days. The entire group, including the FPK representatives, was charged with unlawful assembly. Three people were hit with rubber bullets, one of whom was wounded seriously and was hospitalized. The group included both male and female adults and children, including a 7 month old baby. In September and October, a number of people living in the reserve and some in the settlements outside of the reserve said that they were harassed and intimidated by armed police. Some individuals reported receiving death threats, in one case, at least, directly from police officers.

On 28 October, 2005, the High Court ruled that one San man, Amogolang Segotsane and his family, had the right to go back into the reserve and to take water with them. The court also ordered that his goats, which had been confiscated, be returned to him. The larger case was on-going at the time of writing. Some people have argued that the government of Botswana should enter into negotiations with all of the stakeholders involved in the Central Kalahari court case and come to an equitable, fair, and just solution which guarantees the former and current residents of the reserve basic human rights and the right to return to their ancestral areas. As Ingstad and Fugelli point out in their chapter in this volume, the San see their health and well-being as linked inextricably to the land, and resettlement and removals of people from their ancestral areas undermines both the perceptions and realities of health status.

SAN HEALTH AND NUTRITIONAL STATUS ISSUES IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

Southern African peoples, including the San, are facing some major health issues, including HIV/AIDS (Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome), tuberculosis, and malaria. While the health statuses of many people, including children, improved over the past several decades due to the expansion in preventative and curative health programs in many of the areas in which San reside, there have also been problems, notably with the coverage of antiretroviral (ARV) drugs for people with HIV/AIDS. As noted by Draper and

Howell in their chapter in this volume, there have been changes in survivorship among the elderly. Sedentism and population aggregation appear to have contributed to larger numbers of elderly people in the population. There are gender differences in the survivorship patterns, with mothers of adults surviving better than fathers. Possible reasons for the greater survival of the elderly relate to longer-term occupation of single residential locations, access to western medicine, improved water supplies, and livelihood support programs including drought relief and pensions for the elderly.

Traditionally among the San in western Botswana, women contributed a significant proportion of the daily food supply and did a great deal of the household work. The elderly, both females and males, were respected for their knowledge and experience, and older people played important roles in San society, doing numerous domestic tasks, taking care of children, and passing on knowledge to younger generations. Many San possessed knowledge about healing and herbal and other kinds of medicines which they put to good use (Biesele 1993; Katz, Biesele, and St. Denis 1997).

The San exhibit some significant features in terms of population and health. In the 1960s, the Ju|'hoansi San of Ngamiland had one of the world's slowest rates of population growth (Howell 2000). The number of children born to women was between four and five. The average number of children who survived was slightly over two, meaning that the Ju|'hoan fertility was holding the population at the replacement rate. Infant mortality rates were moderate. The reproductive health of women was relatively good, though there were cases of venereal disease and infertility.

Hunting-gathering Ju|'hoansi San had very low serum cholesterol, low blood pressures that do not increase with age, and little in the way of heart disease. The Ju|'hoansi were very active, going on forays for foraging and visiting purposes, carrying infants, and engaging in extensive work activities both in their camps and in the bush. Their nutritional status was relatively good, high in vitamins and nutrients. The diet was also diverse, with as many as 150 species of plants and over 40 species of animals consumed. There were periods, however, when people went hungry, especially during the late dry season, and under-nutrition was a problem with which the San had to contend.

The demography of the Ju|'hoansi reveals that the population under hunting and gathering conditions had a fairly high proportion of older adults and a relatively low proportion of people in younger age categories (Lee 1979a; Howell 2000). The population pyramid of the Ju|'hoansi differs from that of most developed countries, which have a high proportion of younger people. Developing countries tend to have a lower proportion of elderly people (those over 60) and a high proportion of young people. When one compares the figures for the Ju|'hoansi in the 1960s (9–11% elderly) with those of developing countries (5–7%), it is clear that the Ju|'hoansi have more older people in their populations, somewhat like developed countries such as the U.S. and Japan. Part of the reason for this situation, apparently, is the

healthy diet and activity levels of the Ju|'hoansi.

There are some differences between the San in mobile hunter-gatherer situations and ones where they are settled. The birth rates in the settlements are much higher than they were in mobile foraging contexts, with population growth rates in sedentary contexts averaging around 2.5%. Changes occurred in the Crude Death Rates (CDRs), with a decline seen in the settlements, in part because of greater access to medicine and health facilities. Infant mortality rates dropped, in part because of better clinic-based pre-natal care and post-natal care. Life expectancy for the Ju|'hoansi was higher than the national average in Botswana in the 1960s, but there have been changes in life expectancy over time in Botswana, with people living longer, at least until relatively recently. However, the impact of HIV/AIDS on life expectancy is substantial, and the average age at death has declined significantly in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe in the past several years.

Trefor Jenkins (personal communication) points out that malaria sweeps the Kalahari in epidemics depending on the rains. In some instances, entire villages came down with malaria, so much so that the residents had difficulty collecting sufficient food or performing agricultural and domestic work. Some people noted that gastroenteritis was a problem for some of the infants and young children, particularly at times of the year when seasons changed. Some of the people to whom we spoke said that they were hungry. As one man put it, "Look at us. We are thin. We are dying from hunger." It should be noted, however, that not a single life was lost to starvation during the severe droughts of 1982–1985 and the early 1990s, thanks to the effective nutritional and health surveillance and relief programs that were established by the Botswana government.

A major event that affected the well-being of San populations in Ngamiland (North West District), Botswana, was the outbreak in 1995 of Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP), or lungsickness among cattle. Because of the outbreak, the Botswana government took the decision to dispatch all of the cattle in the district, some 320,000 head. Teams of government workers went to every part of the district where there were cattle and shot them, burying the carcasses in large pits. As a result of this process, people who up until then had been depending for part of their subsistence on milk had to fall back on other foods. From 1996 through 2001, many of the families in Ngamiland received food rations as part of the CBPP campaign. The ration basket consisted of maize (corn) meal, sorghum, beans, and oil. The amounts of food given to people depended on household size, with the breakdown being 1–4 people, 5–8 people, and 9 people and over. There was a fair amount of pressure for households that received greater amounts of food to share it in line with traditional rules of reciprocity. Failure to do so sometimes caused resentment. One result was that some segments of the population did not get sufficient food to maintain nutritional well-being.

There is no question that the loss of livestock in Ngamiland had significant impacts on local people. Researchers were told that people were low on energy

because of their reduced food intake during the CBPP crisis. Some people fell back on foraging, going into the bush to collect wild foods. Others crossed the border into Namibia to live with relatives or moved south into Ghanzi District. Still others moved to the towns around the Okavango Delta such as Gomare, Tsau, and Maun where they sought employment or lived with relatives. An outgrowth of the CBPP crisis was the decision taken by a number of San communities, including |Xai|Xai in western Ngamiland and communities along the Okavango River to get involved in community-based natural resource management projects with their neighbors, including Herero in the case of |Xai|Xai and Mbukushu and Yeei in the case of the Bugakhwe and Khwe communities in the Teemashane region.

As it turns out, a large number of elders may prove to be particularly important for this transitional population. Older people remember the former nomadic life and have a better knowledge of the diversity of plants and animals and the different areas of the Kalahari in which they were found. As the San and other Kalahari populations become more aware of the fragility of the environment, the knowledge that only elders have of a lifestyle that was usually in harmony with nature will become more valuable as time passes.

The San may be suffering more from the “diseases of development” — cancer and heart problems — but this situation is offset by the fact that they now have greater access to health services. Clinics and health posts have been established in the remote regions where the majority of San reside, and there are mobile health services that provide health care, immunizations, and medicines to local people. Family planning services and information are more available than they were in the past. The population, health, and family planning programs are having some positive effects on the San and their neighbors in western Botswana, and population growth rates have begun to decline in some communities. Women’s reproductive health is better in some places than it was in the past, as well.

Southern Africa in many ways is the global epicenter of HIV/AIDS in the new millennium, and tremendous efforts must be made to curb the spread of the disease, especially among people in the 15–24 age range. Non-government organizations and state health agencies increasingly are targeting women and young girls, who appear to be more prone to acquiring the HIV virus at younger ages than boys and young men. The HIV/AIDS prevalence rate is roughly 1–2% in areas where data have been obtained (e.g. in Tsumkwe District, Otjozondjupa Region, Namibia, as noted by Lee and Susser in their chapter in this volume). It should be noted that although the HIV/AIDS rate among San is much lower at present than is the case in the general population of Botswana and Namibia (estimated by some analysts to be as high as 15–30%, depending on the area), the infection rate is on the increase.

San non-government organizations such as the Kuru Family of Organizations, First People of the Kalahari, and the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa have become more involved in HIV/AIDS education as part of their programmatic efforts to assist San and other rural people. Kuru and FPK staff members have attended some AIDS workshops, and health workers from the

Ministry of Health have been doing workshops and providing other kinds of assistance in the towns and communities of western Botswana. If these organizations are to ensure the well-being of the populations with whom they deal, they will have to incorporate HIV/AIDS awareness programs into its education and outreach efforts. Efforts will also have to be made to make available antiretroviral drugs (ARVs) to people with HIV.

Another issue that was raised in discussion among people in rural Botswana was the availability of alcohol. Medical personnel from the Ministry of Health and from the South African Institute for Medical Research (SAIMR) have noted that the fairly high prevalence of folate, thiamin, and iron deficiency in the population may be related in part to alcohol consumption. Alcohol was sold in the settlements in Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa both by residents and, in some cases, by outsiders, including government employees, who visited the settlements. Some health workers have noted that there is an important connection between the consumption of alcohol and the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Alcohol-related violence was responsible for a substantial number injuries to women, children, and men (Sylvain 1999, this volume; Felton and Becker 2001). Alcohol contributes to spousal and child abuse, and is a major cause of social conflict. San women have suggested in interviews that a “community wellness program” should be instituted that includes an alcohol and tobacco awareness component as well as a component dealing with sexually transmitted diseases. Having a culturally sensitive intervention program for substance abuse that treats not only the symptoms but also addresses some of the root causes of the problems would go a long way toward assisting the people in the communities of southern Africa.

SAN LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND EDUCATION

Over the last two decades, through joint efforts of scholars and Kalahari communities, Khoesan languages have ceased to be mere exotic, marginalized “clicking” curiosities and have moved to prominence in educational and cultural development. There has been an increasingly practical focus on the use of linguistic scholarship to benefit local language communities. There are several current struggles and victories of Khoesan-speaking peoples of Namibia and Botswana in gaining control of their own educational and language development activities. At last seen by the world community as human cultural rights, long-term language preservation and locally-defined education are increasingly being undertaken by indigenous communities themselves.

An early example of community-based language development and education was the Nyae Nyae Village Schools Project (VSP) in northern Namibia, built around linguistic and curriculum-development work in the Ju|’hoan language. Between 1989 and 1992, the late South African linguist Patrick Dickens revised and streamlined the existing Ju|’hoan orthography for native speakers and scholars, and used a Ju-Afrikaans dictionary developed by linguist Jan Snyman as basis for his

English-Ju|'hoan, Ju|'hoan-English dictionary (Dickens 1994). Just published at this writing (March, 2006) is Dickens' *A Concise Grammar of Ju|'hoan*, based on the numerous curriculum materials he produced in typescript for teaching Ju|'hoan, until then an exclusively oral language written only by a handful of scholars. Dickens had used these materials around the time of Namibian Independence to teach adult literacy and the first sixteen young Ju|'hoan people who would become primary teachers in Nyae Nyae communities.

Since then, the American linguist Miller-Ockhuizen has used Dickens' legacy in a number of educationally pro-active projects involving the Ju|'hoan language. These include an update and extension now in progress on Dickens' English-Ju|'hoan, Ju|'hoan-English dictionary carried out as a community project through the Ju|'hoan Curriculum Committee recognized as language authority by the Namibian Government. Anthropologist Megan Bieseles, working with Dickens and his VSP trainees, began to turn her Ju|'hoan-language folklore collections back to the people in the form of school curriculum materials. Due to technological developments it became possible to do this in ever-closer collaboration with local adults and children for promotion of their own heritage-preservation and language development. This work has had profound effects on Ju|'hoan cultural self-awareness.

The Village Schools Project has continued much as it was envisioned. In September, 2004, the VSP was incorporated into the national educational system of Namibia: this development was part of the original plan. Though it has experienced expectable political ups and downs through the first years of Namibian independence, the VSP has been seen as a model for a number of other educational efforts by indigenous peoples of southern Africa. It is particularly its combination of local-language promotion with an alternative, holistic approach to community education that has made it attractive to otherwise marginalized peoples who still value their own traditions.

"Mainstreaming" educational and language policies have been common to many countries with indigenous minority populations (cf. Bieseles and Hitchcock 2000b). Even in countries where government lip service is paid to educational experience that says literacy is best achieved through a first 3-4 years in the mother tongue, then generalized to the necessary *lingua franca*, all too often there is no provision for further development of an adult literate tradition. Projects like the VSP aim to propel literacy efforts for and with Ju|'hoan people towards a truly lasting and meaningful status, one that will grow along with political empowerment and other human rights.

The Nyae Nyae Conservancy of northern Namibia, a Ju|'hoan San people's organization, had since 1987 been making requests to scholars associated with the Kalahari Peoples Fund for Ju|'hoan-language literacy texts. The basic need for literacy primers in some minority languages, including Ju|'hoansi, is at last being addressed to some extent by the Namibian government. But KPF agreed with the NNC's Education Committee that without reading materials beyond the primers,

Ju|'hoansi would fall out of use as children became literate in English. Thus in the interest of linguistic and cultural preservation, KPF has begun to be instrumental in helping Ju|'hoan community members in developing, publishing, and evaluating enrichment materials to promote Ju|'hoan reading and writing skills over the first three years of school and beyond. Teachers and other local Ju|'hoan-speakers have been involved in each phase of the project, which has an ultimate goal of encouraging publication of works of all kinds by Ju|'hoan authors.

The VSP is now only one of many in southern Africa doing training and research work involving the production of authoritative texts of many kinds by members of Khoesan communities. They have been made possible by dovetailing academic and practical activities that facilitate writing and reading in the local languages. These activities include training in the use of electronic literacy media and in the production of educational and cultural materials toward the development of a literate tradition for long-term language preservation.

One critical area where these projects have managed to keep open a space for creativity is in promoting the idea of Balanced Literacy (called Integrated Literacy in Southern Africa). Balanced Literacy is an international reading and writing program that matches the egalitarian values of the San and their deep belief in the value of children's participation in community life. In particular, there has been a realization that genuinely creative literature and non-fiction learning materials must be produced for readers beyond the first three years, to enable an actual literate tradition to developed for adults, as well.

Participants in projects have felt it important to empower San individuals in both the technical tools for literacy development and in an analytic, grammatical understanding of their language so that those who chose could not only teach their language more effectively to young people, but could become scholars of it, as well. This aim reflects a growing worldwide movement in the linguistic and technical empowerment of young indigenous people, particularly those whose languages are only recently written down, for documentation of oral history, relationships to ancestral environments and lifeways, and organic language and intellectual development for advancement of local heritage.

Of utmost importance in Botswana, where linguistic mainstreaming in Setswana and English is still enforced and little support is given to mother-tongue language initiatives, has been the participation of closely involved local communities, organizations, and committees. These include Curriculum Committees and bodies like Intersectoral Task Forces which the which to some extent bring together the government and NGO entities involved in education for San and other marginalized children. The NGO called Trust for Okavango Cultural and Development Initiatives (TOCaDI), in conjunction with PANOS Institute (London), the Bernard van Leer Foundation (The Netherlands), and the University of Botswana San/Basarwa Research Project, has enabled community-based oral history projects and publications in the San and Khoekhoe languages in Botswana that now serve as models for similar projects in Namibia. In late 2004, a major publication San

communities prepared from their own oral traditions, *Voices of the San*, was published to celebrate the ending of the United Nations Decade of Indigenous Peoples (LeRoux and White 2004).

For San literacy in northwest Ngamiland, Botswana, where national language and education policies have enforced mainstream learning in Setswana and English only, the participation of community-based organizations has been essential to recent progress. Starting in 2003, TOCaDI has budgeted for Ju|'hoan-language work to be done in the Dobe, Qoshe, Cgae Cgae and Tsodilo areas (spellings follow current Botswana map conventions). It is based on the model and mentoring of the Khoekhoegowab project of the Khwe people (under leadership of David Naude) further north, already successfully underway. For the future, it is planned that a language development project in each San area of Botswana is to be started as part of the CBO (community-based organization) development there. Each project will be supervised by a Language and Education Committee chosen from the participating communities. The committees will appoint one or two literacy specialists tasked to hold community workshops and train others to train their own children and families on their own schedules. Texts are developed for use in literacy work and to prepare community history books from collected testimonies.

Recent language projects in the ≠Khomani (N|u) community near Upington, South Africa have benefited from the experiences of both the Namibian and Botswana San communities. Young local people are in training to collect and authoritatively transcribe the oral testimonies of the eight remaining native speakers of the ≠Khomani language. They are working with a number of highly qualified scholars, including Nigel Crawhall, Amanda Miller-Ockhuizen, Chris Collins, Levi Namaseb, and Tom Gueldemann. The texts resulting from this work are of great interest in the reconstruction of the social history of this critical area of South Africa before, during, and after Apartheid. Clearly, a major issue among San in southern Africa is the desire for language preservation, and, as Megan Biesele notes in her chapter in this volume, significant efforts are being made to develop San literate traditions.

HUMAN RIGHTS LAND RIGHTS, LIVELIHOODS AND COMMUNITY-BASED DEVELOPMENT

In 1999, a survey of the impacts of the veterinary cordon fencing used to prevent the movement of livestock and wild animals that might be afflicted by livestock disease was carried out in Botswana. Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia relief efforts continued in the North West District, with people receiving food and other commodities. Progress continued in the promotion of community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) initiatives with the organization of the |Xai|Xai (Cgae Cgae) Tlhabololo Trust in western Ngamiland, Botswana in 1998. In the late 1990s two other large community trusts were established in Ngamiland: (1) Jakotsha, which covers the area around Etsha and includes 5 communities in NG 24,

a community-controlled hunting area in northern Ngamiland, and (2) Teemashane (Teemacane) Trust, which covers NG 10 and 11 along the Panhandle of the Okavango (also known as the Ncwaagom [Ncoagom] area). The latter includes a cultural trail that will be of interest to tourists and thus a source of income and employment for local people.

In October, 1999, TOCaDI personnel and consultants carried out a community mapping exercise in the Dobe-!Goshe area (NG3) and applications were made to the Tawana Land Board for land. Mapping of traditional and contemporary land use and tenure patterns has proved to be an important strategy in the effort to gain more secure access to land and to help promote land conservation and development efforts among San. Land mapping efforts have been initiated among ≠Khomani in South Africa, among the Hai||om and Ju|'hoansi in Namibia and among Khoe, Bugakhwe, Ju|'hoansi, |Gui, and ||Gana San, among others in Botswana. The efforts have proved to be useful in enhancing knowledge about various groups' histories and have served to instill pride among local peoples.

At |Xai|Xai, the Cgae Cgae Tlhabololo Trust leased out a portion of its wildlife quota to a safari operator, but the lease was withdrawn because of alleged irregularities in the tendering process. Another safari operator was engaged to conduct safari enterprise activities. 24 people were employed by the new safari operator, Bernard Horton, and P250,000 in returns made available to the |Xai|Xai Trust. !Kokoro Crafts continued to sell crafts at |Xai|Xai. In !Kokoro Crafts there were 80 members, 75% of whom were women. This craft operation has become an important source of income and pride for Ju|'hoansi San women at |Xai|Xai.

In 2001 the Tsodilo Hills were granted World Heritage Site Status by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). The Khwai Development Trust auctioned off its quota to a number of private safari companies. The Trust for Okavango Cultural and Development Initiatives continued its work in the Dobe, Tsodilo, and Okavango Panhandle areas. Progress was made in the mapping and organizational work with the Teemashane Trust, the trust on the Okavango Panhandle. The Khwe of the Okavango region published a book of their own entitled *The Khwe of the Okavango Panhandle: The Past Life, Part One: Origin, Land, Leaders, and Traditions of the Bugakhwe People* (Teemashane Trust 2002). Khwe members of the Teemashane Trust presented their findings at the international conference on Research for Khoe and San Development held at the University of Botswana from 10–12 September 2003. San from a number of different communities took part in the international conference, and recommendations were made about issues ranging from health, education, and leadership to gender, language, and human rights (see Motshabi and Saugestad 2001).

In 2001, contention continued over management and organization arose in the CBNRM program in the Khwai community near the north gate of Moremi Game Reserve that resulted in the Department of Wildlife and National Parks not allocating the 2003 hunting quota to the trust. Subsequently, a new Khwai Development Trust (KDT) board was elected democratically with the help of Eco-

Tourism Support Services (ESS). A major lesson learned was the importance of having a responsible and accountable board, transparency, accountability, and sound financial management systems.

In 2002, with the death of Jonas Savimbi and the end of the civil war in Angola, peace talks were held, and arrangements were made for Angolan refugees in Namibia, Zambia, and the Congo to be repatriated to their home areas in Angola. The plans to relocate the large (21,000-plus persons) refugee camp at Osire to the M'kata area in Tsumkwe District West in Namibia were shelved. A new conservancy, the N|a Jaqna Conservancy, was gazetted in Tsumkwe District West in July, 2003, and work on conservation, development, and land use planning was initiated in the area in conjunction with the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa. Particular emphasis had to be placed by the N|a Jaqna Conservancy Development Team on conflict resolution and dealing with illegal occupation of conservancy land and rest camps by outsiders. Progress has been made in addressing these issues and in institutionalizing the N|a Jana Conservancy, which played a significant role in lobbying against the idea of the relocation of the Osire Refugee Camp to M'Kata (Hitchcock 2001; WIMSA 2005).

One of the ways in which San have responded to threats to their land base has been to organize themselves and to seek legal assistance. As Robert Hitchcock describes in his chapter in this volume, San see themselves as 'owners of the land' even in the face of government policies that hold that San do not have legal rights over land. In the late 20th century and early part of the new millennium, San groups have sought to obtain legal rights over land. One of the ways that they have done this is to seek legal judgments in favor of their land claims. In the 1990s, the Khoe of West Caprivi, Namibia, asked for legal help from the Legal Assistance Center in Namibia to prevent the Prisons Department of the Namibian government from taking over land on which they had a community campsite for a prison farm. The case was settled out of court, and the Khoe community was able to retain its rights to the land. The ≠Khomani San of South Africa were also able to negotiate a land claim in 1998–1999 that allowed them access to 65,000 hectares of land as well as resource use rights in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (Chennels and du Toit 2004). The ≠Khomani had been evicted from what was then the Kalahari Gemsbok Park soon after its founding in 1931, and some of them had dispersed as far as Cape Town and Johannesburg. The successful ≠Khomani land claim was the first of its kind in southern Africa and instilled confidence in San communities across the region.

In 2005 the South African Human Rights Commission produced a 'Report on the Inquiry into Human Rights Violations in the ≠Khomani San Community.' This inquiry was commissioned after a number of complaints were received about the status and treatment of ≠Khomani San in South Africa. In spite of the fact that the ≠Khomani had successfully negotiated a land claim with the government of South Africa and had received land and economic benefits from the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (Robins 2000, 2001; Chennels and du Toit 2004), people were still living in poverty-stricken and difficult conditions, without the ability to enjoy

many of their human rights. ≠Khomani complained to the South African authorities and the Human Rights Commission that one of their members, Optel Rooi, had been murdered by the police, and other ≠Khomani had been harassed, intimidated, and mistreated by police officers. There were also charges of sexual and physical abuse of San children in the local school. In addition, there were indications that the Department of Land Affairs had not been as pro-active in providing support to the ≠Khomani community in their land and settlement development efforts as it might have been. People interviewed by the Human Rights Commission noted that there were issues of concern in the ≠Khomani communities themselves, including factionalism, governance, substance abuse, and interpersonal conflict. The Human Rights Commission made a number of recommendations that were aimed at improving the ≠Khomani human rights situation, some of which were in the process of being implemented at the time of writing of this book.

It is useful to differentiate the various types of rights with which indigenous peoples like the San are concerned. These include (1) civil and political rights, (2) social, economic, and cultural rights, (3) rights to development, (4) planetary rights (environmental rights) and (5) the right to peace. There is a major debate in the literature on indigenous peoples and on human rights generally about the issue of individual rights *vs* group rights (collective rights) (see, for example, Anaya 1996: 48–49, 77–79, 85–88, 97–112). Some San say that they would like both sets of rights protected; they would like to have individual rights, but at the same time they would like to see collective rights (peoples' rights) observed so that they can maintain their identities, customs, languages, and belief systems.

Security rights include the rights to be free from torture, execution, and imprisonment, or rights relating to the integrity of the person. This set of rights is especially important in light of the frequency of allegations of alleged torture and mistreatment of suspected “Poachers” by game scouts and other government officials in southern African countries including Botswana, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. These rights are also important in the face of claims about extrajudicial killings of people by police such as those alleged to have occurred in South Africa.

Subsistence rights are those rights related to the fulfillment of basic human needs (e.g. water, food, shelter, and access to health assistance and medicines). The denial of the right to hunt, gather, and fish, according to some indigenous peoples, is an example of restrictions placed on subsistence rights. An important right cited by indigenous people, including the |Gui and ||Gana of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve region in Botswana, is the right to water. In January, 2002, the Government of Botswana stopped delivery of water to the people in the Central Kalahari, and water points (boreholes) were made inaccessible as part of an effort to get people to move out of the Central Kalahari to settlements on the periphery where the Government was providing services, including water. The denial of water rights was part of the legal case brought against the Botswana Government in February, 2002. This case is still ongoing.

In March, 2000, the government of Botswana issued new *National Parks and*

Game Reserves Regulations (27 March, 2000), Botswana Government Gazette (Republic of Botswana 2000). Section 45.1 of these regulations makes the following point:

Persons resident in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve at the time of the establishment of the reserve or persons who can rightly lay claim to hunting rights in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, may be permitted in writing by the Director (of Wildlife) to hunt specified animals species and collect veld products in the game reserve, subject to any terms and conditions and in such areas as the Director may determine.

Remote area populations in Botswana had the right to hunt using Special Game Licenses in Botswana from 1979 until the issuing of the new wildlife regulations. In some cases, districts stopped issuing the Special Game Licenses, as was the case with Ngamiland in 1996. Other districts, notably Ghanzi, continued to issue these licenses until 2000. There were cases where people even in the possession of licenses were arrested, as occurred in July, 1999 when 13 men from New Xade, one of the CKGR resettlement locations, were arrested for allegedly engaging in illegal hunting. In this case, 7 of the men were arrested inside of the CKGR in contravention, allegedly, of section 2(3) of the *Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act 1992* (Republic of Botswana 1992) In addition, 6 men were charged with having killed a gemsbok in GH 10, one of the controlled hunting areas in Ghanzi District. In that case, they were charged with having contravened Section 19(3) of the *Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act*. Since the men arrested had special game licenses, the charge of hunting without a license was thrown out of court. Eventually, the cases against the men were dismissed after the efforts of a Moptswana lawyer, Rahim Kahn, were successful.

Subsistence hunting rights are also an issue among San in Namibia. The only San communities that have the legal right to hunt using traditional weapons in Namibia are the Ju|'hoansi of the Nyae Nyae region (Tsumkwe District East). Ju|'hoansi, !Xu, Vasekele, and Mpungu San in Tsumkwe District West do not have the same rights, nor do the Hai||om and the Khoe in northern Namibia. One of the concerns of the Ju|'hoansi in Nyae Nyae is that even with hunting rights, they are not allowed to kill certain animals even if those animals are threatening their lives and their assets such as their boreholes and gardens. The Ju|'hoansi have had to contend with lions killing their livestock and elephants destroying their water points for some years. Efforts are now being made to protect the water points and gardens through the construction of elephant-proof facilities including rock walls and railway sleepers set in cement with razor wire strung along the top (Polly Wiessner, personal communication, 2005).

While subsistence rights are arguably a concern of all of the governments in South Africa, there is no question that hunger and poverty affect sizable numbers of San and other people in the region. The availability of food is of tremendous concern in many settlements, and people sometimes go to extraordinary lengths to

obtain food. Drought relief and livelihood support programs do help alleviate hunger among San, but there are sometimes problems with the timeliness and quantities of food deliveries. In Zimbabwe, Tyua and other people in the Matabeleland North Province have experienced hunger as droughts have occurred and the political and economic situation in the country have worsened. In northern Namibia, elephants have destroyed gardens and broken water pumps, resulting in hunger and thirst. Wiessner (2004) estimates that caloric intake in the Nyae Nyae region dropped to between 500–1,000 calories a day in 1998–1999 and 2003. Approximately a quarter of all calories in the Ju|’hoansi diet in Nyae Nyae today come from white sugar. Many Ju|’hoansi today lack fresh vegetables and fruits in their diet for all or most of the year (Wiessner 2004).

One way to get around these problems would be to enhance self-sufficiency in food production among San populations. Governments in all six of the countries where San reside currently have agricultural development programs that they are in the process of implementing. In many areas, San are engaged in raising crops and caring for livestock. They do, however, face constraints, ranging from drought and poor soils to lack of water, tools, and seeds. It is for this reason that some of the non-government organizations working with San are attempting to provide secure access to water and land and are seeking to diversify the kinds of development activities being carried out in San communities.

As many San note, a crucial factor in the survival of their communities is the protection of what some refer to as the social fabric. Social relationships among people are as critical to their survival as are their subsistence strategies. San social groups are tied together in a variety of innovative ways, and sharing and reciprocity are critical to their well-being. Observers often remark about the degree to which San are egalitarian and respectful of one another. There are concerns today that some of the traditions, customs, and values of San are breaking down, and that the respect with which San generally treat one another is no longer viewed as important as it once was. Consensus-based decision-making is seen as more and more difficult as powerful elites emerge in some of the communities. As Wiessner (2004: 155) points out, ‘The Ju|’hoansi are no longer able to secure themselves through storing social ties and obligations with others living in the wider region.’ Ingstad and Fugelli note in their chapter in this volume that San — especially those who have been resettled — have suffered a loss of spiritual resources, cultural resources, dignity, and self-esteem.

Cultural rights include the rights of people to practice their own cultural activities, ceremonies, and customs, and to speak and teach their own languages. Governmental spokespersons in southern Africa maintain that San generally have been allowed to practice their own dances and healing ceremonies without interference. They have also been able to practice most of their customs. As noted previously, one area where there have been difficulties for San is in the area of being able to speak and learn their own mother-tongue languages. There have been calls heard at various conferences on San education (e.g. the one on education for remote

area dwellers in Botswana held in Gaborone in November, 2000) for greater efforts to teach San languages and to develop culturally-relevant curricula for San students and others. There are now pre-school programs for San children in the Tsumkwe region of Namibia, western Botswana, and South Africa, and San children in a number of cases are able to learn the languages of their parents and grandparents.

The Second WIMSA International Conference on San Languages in Education was held at Penduka Training Center, Katatura, Namibia, from 31 August to 2 September, 2004 (WIMSA 2004). There were speakers of Ju|'hoansi who attended the meeting (including one from the Qooshe Community Organization) and from the Teemashane Community Trust. In 2004–2005, final preparations were made for the official opening of the !Khwatla San Culture and Education Center in South Africa, as discussed in the chapter 8 in this volume by Irene Staehelin.

Another issue of importance to indigenous peoples that is associated cultural rights is that of repatriation, or the return of culturally significant human remains and associated artifacts. The debate over repatriation has extended from people's ancestral remains to the cultural items that were once in the possession of native peoples but that are now in museums and universities around the world. This is the case, for example, with the heads of San individuals who were killed in South Africa and whose remains are currently in the possession of the British Museum (Skotnes 1996: 17–19). While the British Museum has yet to give up its San 'trophies,' other museums have decided to return materials identified as being San. This was the case, for example, with the return to Botswana in 2000 of 'El Negro' or 'El Bosquimano,' a Motlhaping man whose body and possessions had been on display in a museum in Banyoles, Spain for many years (see Parsons 2002; Davies 2003). The man was laid to rest in Tsholofelo Park in Gaborone, the capital of Botswana, in an elaborate ceremony in October, 2000.

Intellectual Property Rights include rights to indigenous knowledge, such as knowledge of the properties of plants, animals, and other items that are part of people's belief systems, ideologies, and oral history. The roles of traditional healers (non-western doctors) are important ones in many if not most indigenous societies. In this era of globalization, there have been numerous controversies over the acquisition of intellectual property and biological property by private entities (e.g. transnational pharmaceutical companies). Some progress is being made in a limited way in this area, as indigenous peoples have sought legal assistance to contest being denied compensation or royalties for the utilization of drugs developed from plants that they identified as having important medicinal or physiological properties (WIMSA 2004, 2005). To take an example, the succulent *Hoodia gordonii*, used by San in order to suppress thirst and appetite, especially during long distance treks and hunting and gathering trips, has been the subject of intense interest on the part of pharmaceutical companies and the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR). The South African San Council and the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa negotiated with CSIR concerning their patenting of the active ingredient of Hoodia, known as P57. In 2002, a memoran-

dum of agreement was signed between CSIR in which the organization acknowledged the San's prior intellectual property rights to Hoodia as an appetite suppressant, and a benefit-sharing agreement was reached in March 2003 (WIMSA 2004: 54). Income generated from the product will be paid to the San Hoodia Benefit Sharing Trust which represents all San communities in the region.

Heritage Rights. Recent legislation in South Africa governing national heritage resources (the *National Heritage Resources Act*) requires natural heritage authorities to develop the capacities and skills of individuals and communities involved in heritage management, and it stipulates that non-government organizations may nominate people to serve on heritage resources councils at the national and provincial levels. Some indigenous and minority groups in South Africa see this legislation as a means of gaining greater control over culturally significant sites such as those containing rock art. There have been discussions between San organizations and those working with them (e.g. WIMSA) about the establishment of rock art centers, one example being the efforts to build a rock art center in Cathedral Peak National Park, part of the Drakensberg-Maluti Mountains Transfrontier Park (South Africa and Lesotho). The South African San Council and WIMSA addressed the issue of lack of San involvement in the planning of the rock art center. As a result, the San are now participating in the planning of the project with Ezemvelo KwaZulu/Natal Province Wildlife. The Didima Rock Art Center was opened formally to the public on 18 August, 2003. San organizations and representatives have also been involved in discussions surrounding the South African Museum of Rock Art (SAMORA) in Johannesburg.

With respect to *Sub-Surface Rights*, rights to those resources that are below ground (such as diamonds, gold, platinum, and chromium), none of the states in southern Africa have granted sub-surface resource rights to communities except for South Africa, and in this case it was only because of a legal challenge by the Nama that was heard in the Constitutional Court of South Africa in 2003. Mineral resources are considered state resources by all of the southern African states (and indeed, by nearly all states worldwide). The state does, however, have the power to make concessions, usually to companies, many of them transnational corporations, to exploit the sub-surface resources in exchange for royalties. Some countries with mineral-led economies, such as Botswana, have reinvested mining revenues in broad-based development programs. But by and large, there has been a marked reluctance to allow specific communities or ethnic groups to profit directly from sub-surface resources.

While few nations allow ethnic groups sub-surface rights, many societies do allow benefits from sub-surface resources to go to groups in effect by allowing 'derivation rights' whereby the state uses part of the income to support local areas, whether defined for that purpose or defined as sub-national jurisdictions — states, municipalities, territories. In Russia and the United States one can incorporate an enterprise in many different places, and where that is done it generates revenue for that location independent of other streams of the income. In Nigeria, oil-producing

states get 13 percent of the on-shore petroleum income, but these states now are arguing for 50 percent. Non-oil producing states are saying, on the other hand, that they produced peanuts or cocoa for years and never got any special set-asides on the income stream. So there are pressures from various directions on the state when it comes to allowing sub-surface resource benefits to flow to local-level entities or groups (Dan Aronson, personal communication, 2005). This issue has relevance to San living in areas where diamonds and other valuable minerals have been found, as is the case, for example, at Gope in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in Botswana.

An important precedent for sub-surface rights was established in South Africa, where the Nama sought to claim land and resource rights in the Land Claims Court, and then, losing that, appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of Appeal and eventually the Constitutional Court. In October, 2003, the Constitutional Court of South Africa ruled that the Nama of the Richtersveld, who had filed a claim in 2000 but had seen it dismissed by the Land Claims Court, had rights to land as well as to mineral resources in the Richtersveld (*Alexor v. Richtersveld Community*). This successful legal decision allowed the Richtersveld community ‘the right to exclusive beneficial occupation and use, akin to that held under common law ownership’ of the subject land (Chan 2004: 120). The Supreme Court of Appeal of South Africa cited aboriginal title articles and cases as precedents in this decision but left open the question of whether or not the land was being granted under aboriginal title. The issue of indigenous land rights continues to be of major concern to San and other groups in all of the states of southern Africa.

Like other indigenous peoples in the 21st century, the San are gaining new ground in terms of land, cultural and language preservation, intellectual property rights, and political representation. In Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, community-based natural resource management and development programs have been initiated. Some of these programs have served to increase incomes of local people. They have also, in a number of cases, provided employment and training opportunities for members of the community-based organizations that have been established. San have also, in number of cases, benefited from mineral exploration and exploitation efforts. In the Nyae Nyae region of Namibia, for example, over a dozen Ju|’hoansi were employed by a mining company. San from Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia, and Zimbabwe have all worked in the mines of South Africa, although the numbers of San men employed in the mines have declined significantly in recent years as the mining industry has changed and as the mining companies, with government encouragement, have placed greater emphasis on hiring workers from South Africa.

One of the problems faced by local people in Angola is that many of the funds generated by oil and mineral sales did not reach the local population either directly or indirectly because they were siphoned off by either government or other organizations (e.g. UNITA, the *Unido Nacional para a Independencia Total de Angola*. ‘Conflict diamonds’ — those diamonds that were exploited by guerrilla groups in order to support their on-going military activities, were seen as a major

problem in Angola. In the case of Zambia, the bottom fell out of the copper price, and the country was left in a position where it needed to diversify its economy. In Zimbabwe, the deterioration of the economy in the 1990s and into the new millennium saw mining being responsible for a greater percentage of the Gross Domestic Product as agriculture deteriorated. Tyua in the Tsholotsho and Bulalima-Mangwe Districts of Zimbabwe did sometimes obtain semi-precious stones which they sold in order to raise income, but the government even considered attempting to curtail these activities, giving preference to private sector commercial operators.

Angola has been of particular interest recently in terms of San well-being and the role of San communities in development. The Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa, in conjunction with Trocaire Angola and other organizations, has been working with Angolan San since 2001. A workshop was held in Windhoek in 2002 in which representatives of the !Xun and Khwe San communities from Angola, Namibia, and South Africa were brought together. As WIMSA (2004: 65) notes, this was the first contact of !Xun and Khwe from the three countries since they were torn apart in the mid-1970s by the war in Angola.

In 2002 there were reports from San communities in Angola that they were facing a humanitarian crisis. As a result, the WIMSA General Assembly in 2002 agreed to appoint a consultant to assess the situation in Angola and make recommendations. This assessment took place in the period from 17 June to 14 July in the main areas where Angolan San communities are located (Huila, Cunene, and Cuando Provinces in the southern part of the country; see Pakleppa and Kwononoka 2003). The study was commissioned by the Irish Catholic Agency for World Development (Trocaire) Angola in partnership with WIMSA and the Organizacao Crista de Apoio ao Desenvolvimento Comunitario (OCADEC). One of the concerns that had been raised was whether or not aid was flowing to the San communities in the wake of the end of the Angolan civil war. There were also concerns about insecurity of land tenure and discrimination against San by other groups.

Both Schapera (1930) and Bleek (1928b) noted that the Angolan San were influenced to a considerable extent by their Bantu-speaking neighbors, who, as Schapera (1930: 34) put it, 'are their overlords.' Some San moved out of the area during the fighting that occurred in Angola in the 1970s through the 1990s. In 2001, it was estimated that there were fewer than 1,500 San in Angola (Suzman 2001a: 5; Robins, Madzudzo, and Brenzinger 2001: 55). The reduction over time in the numbers of San was due primarily to conflict, which resulted in decisions by some San groups to leave the country. Some San moved across the border to neighboring Zambia or Namibia to seek refuge.

There were also San who were resettled out of Angola by the South African Defense Force — including some !Xu and Khwe San who were moved to South Africa in 1990 and established in a settlement by the South African government at Schmidtsdrift near Kimberley (Robins, Madzudzo, and Brenzinger 2001: 8–25). In the mid-1970s, as many as 6,000 !Kung and Kxoe were resettled in Namibia when members of their groups joined the South African Defense Force (Pakleppa and

Kwokonoka 2003: 7). These so-called 'Bushman battalions' fought on the side of South Africa against the South West African Peoples Organization (SWAPO) in the bush war in Angola and Namibia in the 1970s and 1980s. It was members of these groups that opted for the South African resettlement program. In addition, there were San in southern Angola who moved out of the region of their own volition in order to take advantage of economic opportunities in northern Namibia, western Zambia, and, in some cases, Botswana.

In their work in July, 2003, Pakleppa and Kwononoka made contacts with over 2,000 San, primarily !Kung, in Huila, Cunene, Cuando Cubango, and Moxico Provinces. It was found that almost all of the San communities depended to a significant degree on food that they received in exchange for work that they did for their Bantu-speaking neighbors. Some of their subsistence was also derived from foraging. The majority of the San were found to be highly vulnerable, impoverished, and food-insecure. In addition, as Pakleppa and Kwononoka (2003: 1) noted, 'San communities throughout southern Angola experience social exclusion, discrimination, and economic exploitation.'

Some of the !Kung of southern Angola had experienced difficulties in getting food relief from the government or non-government organizations, in part because other, more powerful groups, tended to divert it to their own needs. One of us (Hitchcock) was told in an interview in Namibia in 2001 that some well-to-do farmers hoarded the food aid in order to ensure that their San workers continued to be dependent on them. Some Angolan San view themselves as being the clients of other groups, working for them in exchange for food, cash, and sometimes livestock. The dependency relationship between San and Bantu-speaking groups in some cases is well-institutionalized, and San clients feel that they have little choice but to comply with requests and demands from the families with whom they are linked.

Many Angolan San felt insecure in the 27 years up to 2002, and it is only now that some San have begun to re-establish their communities and resume agricultural activities. As is the case with San in Zambia, most San in Angola do not have much in the way of direct government assistance, in part because of the lack of extension work and development personnel in areas where warfare and conflicts prevailed. They are, however, getting help from some non-government organizations, some of them faith-based.

One of the principles of participatory development and indigenous peoples' rights is that people should have the right to control their lands and resources (Anaya 1996). On a theoretical level, San in Angola have the right to land that they have occupied for 20 or more years; in other words, they have customary rights under Angola's land law. Pakleppa and Kwononoka (2003: 8) were told by the coordinator of the Human Rights Commission in Huila Province that the provincial government is willing to allocate land to San and will request the Ministry of Agriculture to issue title deeds to San 'once their land needs have been established.' In other words, assessments will have to be done by the Ministry of Agriculture before land allocation and land titling can occur. The danger here is that the assessors may

decide that the land needs of San households are not significant, especially if they are seen as dependent on other groups who have land or they are engaged in foraging or small-scale craft production in order to generate income.

Another problem facing those Angolan San who have returned to their ancestral homes from other places now that the war is over will be competing for land with local people. At the same time, there are well-to-do Angolans and outsiders, few, if any of whom are San, who are attempting to establish claims to land and resources in areas that are inhabited by San. This situation is made even more complicated by the fact that Angolan government has yet to define exactly the institutions that will be responsible for allocating land (Pakleppa and Kwononoka 2003: 9). There is a Land Bill under consideration in Angola which does not recognize land rights acquired on the basis of customary occupancy. What this could mean for San and other poor Angolans is that their land rights will be overlooked in favor of private sector interests that have the cash to pay for land.

The Angolan San assessment carried out by Pakleppa and Kwononoka and their colleagues revealed that virtually all of the San populations with whom they came in contact were considered to be highly vulnerable. For their purposes, vulnerability levels were determined on the basis of 'the expected ability of people to maintain a minimum level of consumption until the next harvest' (Pakleppa and Kwononoka 2003: 19). These populations could presumably meet their minimum subsistence requirements during some seasons but they would be expected to experience privation and hunger during the lean season. These populations will require food aid and medical intervention during at least some parts of the year. In order for this to be possible, the social and physical infrastructure of southern Angola will need to be repaired or constructed, and land mines will need to be cleared from roads, fields, and border areas.

In some parts of southern Angola, access to water for San communities is problematic. Some groups do not have local rivers, streams, or springs nearby, so they must walk long distances to obtain water. According to Pakleppa and Kwononoka (2003: 23), some people who were growing gardens along water courses were forced to abandon them by other people, probably because the perception that the gardens were in competition with domestic water needs. The provision of water facilities and water containers was seen as an important need by Angolan San.

One of the problems faced by San during the civil war and in the liberation war prior to independence in 1975 was forced conscription. Some men and boys, and a number of women and girls, were taken away from their homes and pressed into service in the military. Some people never returned to their homes and families; others who did come home were sometimes different than they were before they left. Drinking was more of a problem than it had been in the past, and there were cases of domestic abuse. Community and household cohesion had broken down in a number of places in southern Angola. On the other hand, participation in the war effort has had some benefits, not least among them a greater awareness of human rights and a greater willingness to press for respect and fair treatment.

From the standpoint of public participation and political rights, the San of Angola face some major constraints. There are few, if any, cases where San leaders are recognized by the government or by local Bantu tribal authorities. San leaders do not have the same degree of authority as do non-San leaders, and they have little say in decision-making at the local level. Decision-making tends to be top-down, from non-San leaders and government officials to the San, who represent the bottom rung of the sociopolitical system in Angola. It is not surprising, therefore, that Pakleppa and Kwononoka (2003) have described Angola as a place 'where the first are last.' This is not to say, however, that Angolan San are unwilling to organize themselves in pursuit of human rights and development. There is a widespread awareness of the importance of human rights and social justice, and the Angolan San hope to capitalize on this awareness so that they can be, as one !Kung man put it, 'equal to other Angolans.'

In the overview assessment of the status of San in southern Africa published in 2001 by the Legal Assistance Center of Namibia, the San of Zambia were estimated to number less than 130 in November, 1999 (Robins, Madzudzo, and Brenzinger 2001). The expansion of military operations into southeastern Angola in December, 1999 triggered a wave of migration of people, some of whom were San, from Angola. It was estimated that some 300 Kxoe were among those who took refuge in Zambia. The majority of Kxoe San came from Angola in the 1960s during the liberation war between freedom fighters and the Portuguese. Nearly all of the Kxoe in Zambia are originally from the Buma and Ngarange areas of Angola. A few people, one family of four, lived in a small village north of Sesheke.

The San from Angola were registered officially as refugees by United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in 1971–72. Some of the Kxoe San, about 50 in number, live in the Meheba Refugee Camp near Solwezi on the border with the Democratic Republic of Congo. It should be noted that the only San who receive regular assistance from government sources in Zambia are those residing in refugee camps. Those living outside of refugee camps, such as the 50 or so Kxoe residing on the Sioma Plains, do not receive drought relief nor do they qualify for other Zambian government assistance. This situation underscores the complexities of San status in Zambia. The Zambian government does not recognize San as being citizens, seeing them primarily as refugees or immigrants from a nearby country, Angola. The San in Zambia can be seen as being transboundary-oriented, but this should not preclude their rights to assistance. Most Zambian San live in the western borderlands region; in the past, they moved back and forth across the Zambia-Angola border, depending on the security situation and the frequency of border patrols. They had relatives living on both sides of the Angola-Zambia border and they tried to maintain close social and economic links.

Many of the San in Zambia have experienced resettlement, sometimes as a result of having to move out of conflict areas. There were also efforts by the Zambian government and military agencies such as the South African Defense Force (SADF) to resettle San in new places. There were reports in the media in the 1970s

that the Kxoe San of Zambia had been forcibly removed, and some officials termed the forced removals as genocidal in intent. Many of the San in Zambia today have experienced conflict, resettlement, and relocation. There are some Zambian San who wish to see greater opportunities to take part in development and political decision-making in Zambia, but they are fully aware of the constraints that they face as a result of the perception that they are either refugees or supporters of institutions that challenged the nation-states of Zambia and Angola.

In Zimbabwe in 2000, President Robert Mugabe lost a referendum on a new constitution that his government had drafted, one that would have expanded the powers of the presidency. Particular emphasis was placed by the Mugabe government on revising Section 16 of the Zimbabwe Constitution of 1980 which guaranteed the right to property. The Mugabe government had blamed white farmers for encouraging opposition to the new constitution. In 2000, ex-fighters and some members of the ZANU-PF ruling party began to occupy farms and to intimidate people on the farms, including both farm owners and farm workers. Their goal was to force them off the land and to take over the farms for themselves. By 2004–2005, over half of Zimbabwe's 12 million people were threatened with starvation, and some were leaving the country for neighboring states. By the latter part of 2004, most of the whites and some 1.2 million black farm workers and their family members had been driven off the land. As a result, there were sizable numbers of internally displaced people in Zimbabwe, many of them unable to meet their food needs due to lack of supplies and high prices that resulted from inflation.

Some people fled Zimbabwe as refugees, going across the border into neighboring Botswana, for example, where they found refuge in the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees camp at Dukwe. Botswana resorted to building what some describe as a 'security fence' on the Botswana-Zimbabwe border, ostensibly to prevent movements of livestock across the border which could bring diseases such as Foot-and-Mouth Disease. But there were also rumors to the effect that the fence was set up in part to restrict movements of people across the border. The Tyua of Zimbabwe have relatives on both sides of the Botswana-Zimbabwe border, and in the past they moved across the border regularly. This movement is now much more difficult than it was in the past. The Tyua in Zimbabwe have attempted to diversify their subsistence and income activities, but their efforts to sell crafts, for example, have been hurt by the reduced numbers of tourists coming to Zimbabwe and the declines in the Zimbabwean economy. Their involvement in the community-based natural resource management programs of CAMPFIRE (the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources) in Zimbabwe also appear to have declined significantly as the political and economic crisis in the country has worsened.

CONCLUSIONS

Any volume that purports to be an update on an entire set of peoples must address the concerns that individuals and groups have about their statuses, their well-being, and their future. As this volume attempts to show, San in southern Africa are engaged in struggles for survival and solidarity. Southern Africa has undergone massive transformations over the past three decades, with the end of Apartheid in South Africa in April, 1994 being but one momentous event of many. The signing of the Peace Accords in Angola in April, 2002, the repatriation of Angolan refugees from the Congo, Namibia, and South Africa to Angola, the precedent-setting legal cases involving San and Nama land and resource rights in South Africa, and the rise in San self-representation and the establishment of San National Councils in Namibia and South Africa are all evidence of significant change in the region. At the same time, none of the governments of southern Africa have signed the only international human rights convention dealing with indigenous rights, the International Labour Organization Convention 169 Concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. Some southern African governments have incorporated changes into their constitutions to deal with indigenous peoples' rights, notably South Africa, while others, such as Botswana, have removed clauses that in the past protected San rights. Botswana has argued vociferously that all people, regardless of their ethnic background, should be treated equally, and virtually all San and other minority groups in southern Africa would agree with that position. One of the issues that looms large in southern Africa, as elsewhere, relates to affirmative action on behalf of peoples who historically were disadvantaged. What are the best ways to promote human rights and development for people who historically were discriminated against and who did not have equal rights before the law? Many San in southern Africa are living before the poverty line. What are the fairest and most effective strategies that can be utilized to assist them? Should they continue to receive financial, technical, and food assistance from their governments and from international donors and non-government organizations, or should they be encouraged to become self-sufficient on their own?

This volume examines conventional wisdom concerning the San, and it challenges some of the stereotypes and perceptions. It raises questions about the best ways in which to assist indigenous and minority peoples. It examines San development and challenges in development cooperation among communities, peoples, governments, international donors, and non-government organizations. Case studies and comparative assessments involving San are presented, and priority issues are identified, including food security, land and resource access, health, education, and welfare. It is our hope that the lessons learned from the experiences that San peoples have had will enable them to be able to live productive and prosperous lives and to enjoy the benefits of development, equity, and human rights.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank all the San, anthropologists, development workers, human rights activists, and others who provided the information and insights that have been drawn upon for use in the production of this document. We also wish to thank the authors of the papers in this volume for their patience and their willingness to respond to repeated requests for changes and updates.

REFERENCES

- Anaya, S. J.
 1996 *Indigenous Peoples in International Law*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Barnard, A.
 1992 *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Batibo, H. M. and B. Smieja (eds.),
 2000 *Botswana: The Future of the Minority Languages*. Basel: Peter Lang.
 Bechuanaland P.
 1961 *Fauna Conservation Proclamation (No. 22 of 1961)*. Gaborones: Bechuanaland Protectorate Government.
 1963 *Central Kalahari Control of Entry Regulations. Government Notice No. 38 of 1963*. Gaborones: Bechuanaland Protectorate Government.
 1964 *Report on the Census of the Bechuanaland Protectorate 1964*. Gaborones: Bechuanaland Protectorate Government.
- Bieseke, M.
 1993 "Women Like Meat": Ju/'hoan Bushman Folklore and Foraging Ideology. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press and Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
 1994 Human Rights and Democratization in Namibia: Some Grassroots Political Perspectives. *African Rural and Urban Studies* 1(2): 49–72.
 2003 The Kalahari Peoples Fund: Activist Legacy of the Harvard Kalahari Research Group. *Anthropologica* 45(1): 79–88.
- Bieseke, M. and R. K. Hitchcock
 2000a The Ju|'hoansi San under Two States: Impacts of the South West African Administration and the Government of the Republic of Namibia. In P. Schweitzer, M. Bieseke, and R. Hitchcock (eds.), *Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-Determination*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, New York: Berghahn Books. pp.305–326.
 2000b Ju|'hoan Language Education in Namibia and Its Relevance for Minority-Language Education in Botswana. In H. M. Batibo and B. Smieja (eds.), *Botswana: The Future of the Minority Languages*. Basel: Peter Lang. pp.237–265.
- Bleek, D. F.
 1928a *The Naron: A Bushman Tribe of the Central Kalahari*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 1928b Bushmen of Central Angola. *Bantu Studies* 3: 105–125.
- Cassidy, Lin, K. Good, I. Mazonde, and R. Rivers
 2001 *An Assessment of the Status of the San in Botswana*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance

- Center.
- Chan, T. M.
2004 The Richtersveld Challenge: South African Finally Adopts Aboriginal Title. In R. K. Hitchcock and D. Vinding (eds.), *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. pp.114–133.
- Chennels, R. and A. T.
2004 The Rights of Indigenous Peoples in South Africa. In R. K. Hitchcock and D. Vinding (eds.), *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs. pp.98–113.
- Childers, G. W.
1976 *Report on the Survey/Investigation of the Ghanzi Farm Basarwa Situation*. Gaborone: Government Printer.
- Davies, C.
2003 *The Return of El Negro: The Compelling Story of Africa's Unknown Soldier*. London: Viking.
- Dickens, P.
1991 Ju | 'hoan Orthography in Practice. *South African Journal of African Languages* 79: 403–408.
1994 *English-Ju/ 'hoan, Ju/ 'hoan-English Dictionary*. Köln: Rudiger Köppe Verlag.
- Felton, S. and H. Becker
2001 *A Gender Perspective on the Status of the San in Southern Africa*. Windhoek, Namibia: Legal Assistance Center.
- Gordon, R. J. and S. S. Douglas
2000 *The Bushman Myth: The Making of a Namibian Underclass*, Second Edition. Boulder and London: Westview Press.
- Guenther, M. G.
1986 *The Nharo Bushmen of Botswana: Tradition and Change*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag.
- Heinz, H. J.
1975 Acculturative Problems Arising in a Bushman Development Scheme. *South African Journal of Science* 71(1): 78–86.
- Hitchcock, R. K.
1996 *Kalahari Communities: Bushmen and the Politics of the Environment in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen, Denmark: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
2001 *Anthropological Study on the Potential Impact of Refugees in M'Kata, Namibia*. Windhoek, Namibia; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.
2002 'We are the First People': Land, Natural Resources, and Identity in the Central Kalahari, Botswana. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 28(4): 797–824.
- Hitchcock, R. K. and D. Vinding (eds.)
2004 *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Ikeya, K.
1999 The Historical Dynamics of the Socioeconomic Relationships between the nomadic San and the Rural Kgalagadi. *Botswana Notes and Records* 31: 19–32.
2000 Environment and Resource Management among the San in Botswana. *Nomadic Peoples* 4(1): 67–82.
2001 Some Changes among the San under the Influence of Relocation Plan in Botswana. In D. G. Anderson and K. Ikeya (eds.), *Parks, Property, and Power: Managing*

- Hunting Practice and Identity within State Policy Regimes. Senri Ethnological Studies* 59. Osaka: National Museum of Ethnology. pp.183–198.
- Katz, R., M. Biesele, and V. S. Denis
 1997 *Healing Makes Our Hearts Happy: Spirituality and Cultural Transformation among the Kalahari Ju/ 'hoansi. Rochester, Vermont: Inner Traditions.*
- Lee, R. B.
 1976 Introduction. In R. B. Lee and I. DeVore (eds.), *Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers: Studies of the !Kung San and Their Neighbors.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. pp. 3–20.
 1979a *The !Kung San: Men, Women, and Work in a Foraging Society.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 1979b Hunter-Gatherers in Process: The Kalahari Research Project, 1963–1976. In G. M. Foster, T. Scudder, E. Colson, and R. V. Kemper (eds.), *Long-Term Field Research in Social Anthropology.* New York: Academic Press. pp.303–321.
 2002 *The Dobe Ju/ 'hoansi*, Third Edition. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Lee, R. B., M. Biesele, and R. K. Hitchcock
 1996 Three Decades of Ethnographic Research among the Ju|'hoansi of Botswana, 1963–1996. *Botswana Notes and Records* 28: 107–120.
- Lee, R. B. and I. DeVore (eds.)
 1976 *Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers: Studies of the !Kung San and Their Neighbors.* Cambridge and Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Lee, R. B., R. K. Hitchcock, and M. Biesele (eds.)
 2002 *Foragers to First Peoples: The Kalahari San Today.* Special issue of *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 26 (1), 8–61.
- Marshall, L.
 1976 *The !Kung of Nyae Nyae.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 1999 *Nyae Nyae !Kung Beliefs and Rites.* Cambridge and Massachusetts: Peabody Museum Press.
- Marshall, J. and C. Ritchie
 1984 *Where Are the Ju/Wasi of Nyae Nyae? Changes in a Bushman Society, 1958–1981.* Cape Town: Center for African Area Studies, University of Cape Town.
- Miers, S. and M. Crowder
 1988 The Politics of Slavery in Bechuanaland: Power Struggles and Plight of the Basarwa in the Bamangwato Reserve, 1926–1940. In S. Miers and R. Roberts (eds.), *The End of Slavery in Africa.* Madison: University of Wisconsin Press. pp.172–200.
- Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing
 1993 *Regional Conference on Development Programmes for Africa's San/Basarwa Populations, Gaborone, Botswana, 11th–13th October, 1993.* Gaborone: Government Printer
- Mitchell, P.
 2002 *The Archaeology of Southern Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Motshabi, K. and S. Saugestad (eds.)
 2004 *Research for Khoe and San Development, International Conference, University of Botswana, 10–12 September, 2003.* Gaborone: University of Botswana and Tromso: University of Tromso.
- Namaseb, L.
 2006 Language, Environmental, and Community in Story-Telling of the Khoekhoe, ≠Khomani, English, and Afrikaans. Toronto: Ph.D. Dissertation, University of

- Toronto, Canada.
- Parsons, N. (ed.)
 2002 *'El Negro and the Hottentot Venus: Issues of Repatriation. Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies (special issue) 16(2): 1–69.*
- Pakleppa, R. and A. Kwononoka
 2001 *Where the Last Are First: San Communities Fighting for Survival in Southern Angola. Report of a Needs Assessment of Angolan San Communities in Huila, Cunene, and Cuando Cubango Provinces from 17 June to 14 July 2003.* Windhoek, Namibia: Trocaire Angola, Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), and OCADEC.
- Republic of Botswana
 1992 *Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act, 1992.* Gaborone, Botswana: Government of Botswana.
 2000 *National Parks and Game Reserves Regulations (27 March, 2000).* Gaborone: Government of Botswana.
- Republic of Namibia
 1992 *Regional Conference on Development Program's for Africa's San Populations, Windhoek, Namibia, 16–18 June, 1992.* Windhoek: Government of the Republic of Namibia, Ministry of Lands, Resettlement, and Rehabilitation.
- Rheinalt J., J. D. and C. M. Doke (eds.)
 1937 *Bushmen of the Southern Kalahari.* Johannesburg: University of the Witwatersrand Press.
- Robins, S.
 2000 Land Struggles and the Politics and Ethics of Representing 'Bushman' History and Identity. *Kronos: Journal of Cape History* 26: 56–75.
 2001 NGOs, 'Bushmen', and Double Vision: The |Khomani San Land Claim and the Cultural Politics of 'Community' and 'Development' in the Kalahari. *Journal of Southern African Studies* 27(4): 833–853.
- Robins, S., E. Madzudzo, and M. Brenziger
 2001 *An Assessment of the Status of the San in South Africa, Angola, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.* Windhoek: Legal Assistance Center.
- Schapera, I.
 1926 A Preliminary Consideration of the Relationship between the Bushmen and the Hottentots. *South African Journal of Science* 23: 833–866.
 1930 *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa: Bushmen and Hottentots.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
 1938 *A Handbook of Tswana Law and Custom.* London: Frank Cass.
 1939 A Survey of the Bushman Question. *Race Relations* 6(2): 69–98.
 1943 *Native Land Tenure in the Bechuanaland Protectorate.* Alice: Lovedale Press.
 1947 *Migrant Labor and Tribal Life: A Study of the Conditions in the Bechuanaland Protectorate.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
 1953 *The Tswana.* London: International African Institute.
- Schapera, I. and D. F. van der Merwe
 1945 *Notes on the Tribal Groupings, History, and Customs of the Bakgalagadi.* Cape Town: University of Cape Town.
- Silberbauer, G. B.
 1965 *Report to the Government of Bechuanaland on the Bushmen Survey.* Gaborones, Bechuanaland: Bechuanaland Government.

- 1981 *Hunter and Habitat in the Central Kalahari Desert*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skotnes, P.
1996 Introduction. In Pippa Skotnes (ed.), *Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen*. Rondebosch: University of Cape Town Press. pp.15–23.
- South African Human Rights Commission
2005 *Report on the Inquiry into Human Rights Violations in the ≠Khomani San Community*. Cape Town: South African Human Rights Commission.
- Suzman, J.
1995 *In the Margins: A Qualitative Examination of the Status of Farm Workers in the Commercial and Communal Farming Areas in the Omaheke Region*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Center.
2000 *'Things from the Bush': A Contemporary History of the Omaheke Bushmen*. Basel: P. Schwettwein Publishing.
2001 *An Assessment of the Status of the San in Namibia*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Center.
- Suzman, J. (ed.)
2001 *An Introduction to the Regional Assessment of the Status of the San in Southern Africa*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Center.
- Sylvain, R.
1999 'We Work to Have a Life': Ju|'hoan Women, Work, and Survival in the Omaheke Region, Namibia. Toronto Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto, Canada.
2002 'Land, Water, and Truth': San Identity and Global Indigenism. *American Anthropologist* 104(4): 1074–1084.
- Tagart, E. S. B.
1933 *Report on the Conditions Existing among the Masarwa in the Bamangwato Reserve of the Bechuanaland Protectorate and Certain Other Matters Appertaining to the Natives Living Therein*. Pretoria: Government Printer.
- Tanaka, J.
1980 *The San, Hunter-Gatherers of the Kalahari, A Study in Human Ecology*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Teemashane Trust
2002 *The Khwe of the Okavango Panhandle: The Past Life, Part One: Origin, Land, Leaders, and Traditions of the Bugakhwe People*. Shakawe: Teemashane Trust.
- Thoma, A. and S. Lawry
1978 *A Spatial Development Plan for Remote Settlements in Northern Kgalagadi*. Tsabong: Kgalagadi District Council.
- Tobias, P. V.
1975 Fifteen Years of Study on the Kalahari Bushmen or San. *South African Journal of Science* 71(1): 74–78.
- Vierich, H. I. D.
1981 *The Kua of the Southeastern Kalahari: A Study in the Socio-ecology of Dependency*. Toronto: Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto.
- Vierich, H. I. D. and R. K. Hitchcock
1996 *Kua: Farmer/Foragers of the Eastern Kalahari, Botswana*. In Susan Kent (ed.), *Cultural Diversity Among Twentieth Century Foragers: An African Perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp.108–124.

Wiessner, P.

- 2004 Owners of the Future? Calories, Cash, Casualties, and Self-Sufficiency in the Nyae Nyae Area between 1996 and 2003. *Visual Anthropology Review* 19(1-2): 149-159.

Wilmsen, E. N.

- 1989 *Land Filled with Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wily, E. A.

- 1979 *Official Policy towards San (Bushmen) Hunter-Gatherers in Modern Botswana: 1966-1978*. Gaborone: National Institute of Research.

Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa

- 2004 *Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) Report on Activities April 2003 to March 2004*. Windhoek: WIMSA.
- 2005 *Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) Report on Activities April 2004 to March 2005*. Windhoek: WIMSA.

Websites

<http://www.Kalaharipeoples.org>

<http://www.san.org.za>

<http://www.firstpeoples.org>