

CURRENT SITUATIONS FACING THE SAN PEOPLES OF SOUTHERN AFRICA¹

Kristin Broyhill, Robert Hitchcock, Ph.D., Megan Biesele, Ph.D.

Foreword

Even as the struggle of the San for land rights and human rights in southern Africa is beginning to catch the attention of the international community, social ills such as economic dependency, alcoholism, malnutrition, and societal breakdown continue to threaten their survival. Many of these problems were instigated or made worse by policies created by governments which did not consider the San's culture legitimate or allow their political participation. San egalitarian cultural values and norms in leadership, along with the value they place on sharing via a gift economy, have left them vulnerable in a continent being colonized for its resources. Basic human rights have been stripped from them, their land, food and traditions have been taken away, their freedoms have been restricted and they have been socially shunned. Only now, after 400 years of colonization, have the San had a chance to make headway in political mobilization, to participate in policies that affect their future, and to reclaim their culture.

Introduction

The 1990s proved to be the decade of indigenous rights. The international community brought public attention to the struggles that indigenous peoples had been engaged in for decades. International efforts were made to help indigenous peoples to ensure their human rights and to preserve their culture and knowledge in the countries in which they reside. During this time, the San were able to make major strides in organizing themselves to take on such challenges within their own countries' political institutions, many of which contained institutionalized discrimination. The San have made significant gains in the areas of land rights and ownership, political recognition and representation, and cultural rights; however, the 100,000 San throughout southern Africa still are fighting against marginalization, poverty, unemployment, health challenges and intellectual property exploitation as they face an uncertain future.

Development programs and research groups are incorporating, seeking participation and consulting with locals, now more than ever before. Researchers now spend less time on acute case studies and more time on widespread social issues in order to reach more communities. With this local participation and collaboration with government officials, non-government organizations, scientists, and private enterprises; the program beneficiaries will be able to make a vested interest in the programs and witness the benefits at the ground level.

History of San Marginalization

The San peoples of the Kalahari Desert in southern Africa successfully adapted as nomadic hunter/gatherers and managed their scarce water, plant and animal resources within a shared economy and egalitarian society for centuries. In the past two millennia, the San experienced substantial changes, with the introduction of livestock, immigration of non-San peoples into the region, and colonization. As their world was exposed to colonizing powers and government establishment, the San, like other minority groups, lost their traditional livelihoods and became a marginalized society due to misunderstood cultural differences at the onset of colonization, namely in ownership and leadership.

In the 1800s and 1900s, the San were seen by the colonizing powers as serfs without conventional leadership, with little wealth, and who did not provide goods or services to the more prominent groups of the colonies or protectorates. Therefore, in the eyes of the colonial governments, it was justifiable to regard the San as a culturally inferior society with no need for political representation in public policy.

Contrary to popular perceptions at the time, the San did have a longstanding, legitimate and respected leadership system within their societies. The system was based on the facilitating role of respected individuals in the community to lead decision making efforts in reflecting community consensus.

Along with the colonial governments' views of San leadership and culture in Botswana, the San were viewed by outsiders as neither owning land nor needing any. Marginalization was perpetuated by clashing views of ownership. For the San, land could not be owned, only shared, preserved, and used for necessity. Neighboring San groups met to discuss areas where they could gather and hunt in order to ensure food security of everyone. If their resources ran low, bands relocated in order to allow the area to replenish themselves. If there was an environmental disaster such as a drought, the bands would ask neighboring groups for permission to hunt and forage in their territory. As farmers and ranchers moved into the area with their own ideas of land management, the new settlers became angered and annoyed as San 'squatted' on 'their' land and used what they felt to be 'their' resources. Thus, the San further became the subject of discrimination and persecution. Indigenous peoples were often forced to become laborers or slaves. As the only other alternative, many chose to move further into the Kalahari Desert and live in marginalized areas with scarce resources, with lower living standards and less access to wildlife and foraging.

Loss of Traditional Ways

Hunting

The San have witnessed their customary hunting rights gradually stripped since the 19th century. In Botswana, hunting at first, was protected by the British colonial government. Eventually, restrictions were implemented on game, by reserving "royal game", and

enforcing quotas and hunting seasons. In the name of conservation, many countries in southern Africa eventually banned hunting and indigenous peoples on game reserves altogether. This forced the people on to government issued settlements which provided no alternative livelihood.

Botswana and Namibia became the only countries in Southern Africa to allow indigenous peoples to hunt for subsistence purposes. In 1978, the government of Botswana declared that the San were nomads, and thus had no land rights; however, they did have hunting rights. But hunting restrictions in Botswana made it nearly impossible for the San to sustain themselves as hunter/gatherers.

In 1979, as a response to conservation efforts involving ecologists and social scientists, the government of Botswana issued a Special Game License (SGL), which gave those who qualified, the right to hunt for food, raw materials for handicraft production, and to sell these items as a security measure for the rural poor. Qualified persons had to be hunter/gatherers, nomadic, use traditional weapons with no hunting aids, and wear traditional clothes while hunting. These licenses were free and available for year round use. However, there were quotas on the numbers and types of animals hunted. These licenses were issued, with much controversy, until the late 1990s.

There were many criticisms from non-San peoples, eco-oriented organizations and wildlife officials regarding the SGLs. Botswana's government was first and foremost accused of granting special rights to one ethnic group. There were also complaints and accusations stating that the San inhumanely killed their prey, exceeded quotas, took advantage of the licenses by transferring them to unqualified persons, and it was argued that such hunting threatened the wildlife populations. It is necessary to note that Botswana's Predator Control Act, which gave farmers the right to shoot large predatory wild animals (e.g. lions) if it had killed livestock outside of park boundaries, proved to be detrimental to the subsistence hunting on which the San survived.

In reality, wildlife declines were due to drought, habitat change including boreholes, veterinary cordon fences, livestock, cattle posts, poachers, and increased tourism. Most San killed only a few large animals throughout their lives and hunting pressures were generally below levels of replacement. This halt in licenses also hurt communities, especially the women, who lost access to many raw materials they needed to produce and sell crafts. Without this income, and without the ability for the community to provide food for themselves, basic necessities were not met. They only raw materials the San now had access to were the cattle and goats in which the government encouraged the San to raise to lessen their dependency of aid.

Unfortunately, the halting of the SGLs happened at the same time as a lung sickness (Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia) was affecting cattle. Over 400,000 head of cattle were killed by the government in order to contain the virus from spreading to wildlife game. More veterinary cordon fences were erected (a major inhibitor to healthy wildlife populations which started in the 1940's). Thus, they had to resort to more intense dependency on the government. Compensation was given to herdsmen in cash for 70%

of loss and in gifts in kind for the remaining 30% which included cash for work programs, however, it was not enough.

Governments and NGO's must realize the importance of subsistence hunting to the cultural and physical survival of the San. Subsistence hunting also provides a service which sustains animal herds by controlling herd numbers and by eliminating the sick and old.

Government Relocations and Dependency

One of the problems facing San was dispossession. Some of this was due to the establishment of national parks, game reserves, and other kinds of protected areas. But even more significant was the reforming of land and the establishment of freehold farms, as occurred, for example, in parts of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. In Botswana alone, 90% of the San in the country had been resettled (moved to new villages where water points and social services were provided) by the early part of the new millennium

As a severe drought ravished the Kalahari desert in the 1980s and without their past mobility which allowed them to adapt to survive, San were encouraged in Botswana to move to settlements, where they could not only get access to water, schools, and health facilities, but also be in a position where government rations could be provided. Some of these rations were specifically for Remote Area Dwellers (RADS), as they called them in Botswana, some of them came as a result of droughts and government decision to provide food aid. One of the difficulties that people faced is that the food handouts, while appreciated, encouraged a fair degree of dependency among San.

One of the other strategies of the government of Botswana was to provide Remote Area Dwellers with livestock (cattle) and small stock (goats) in order to encourage the establishment of an agropastoral production system. At first, the idea was to have people repay the livestock loans with progeny (the first born calves or kids) but later on, livestock was provided freely, usually 5 head of cattle or 15 goats. One of the difficulties was that there was uneven distribution of wealth in the form of livestock, and San had a difficult time getting access to water points and grazing. As it turned out, most land boards in the various districts in Botswana where San were found did not allocate land or water sources (borehole rights) to groups, only to individuals, the vast majority of whom were non-San. Many San also earned supplemental cash and food by foraging, selling firewood and producing handicrafts, but returns from these activities were meager.

Even though the government settlements were meant to increase the quality of life for the San of Botswana by providing education, social services and health facilities; an overall feeling of discontent has endured. Along with the dependency, poverty, lack of alternatives to their former hunting and gathering lifestyle, and new health concerns (especially tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS); the relocations have separated families and located the San next to different tribes and ethnic groups with whom they are

unaccustomed to living. Many times these different ethnic groups are wealthier than the San and have more political influence. Sometimes this uneven distribution of wealth has given the other ethnic groups the advantage of more resources and has led to human rights abuses such as restricting access to sacred religious sites.

Central Kalahari Game Reserve Resettlement

Botswana's Constitution guarantees all citizens land rights, however, for the San, those rights have never been fully recognized. Section 14 of the country's constitution states that all citizens have the freedom of movement within Botswana and the freedom to reside where they wish. It further states that no law can override this right. Subsection 3(c) of Section 14 is an exception to this law which is; in order to protect the Bushmen from outsiders, non-Bushmen could not enter Bushman territory. Conveniently, this subsection was deleted when the government relocated the San out of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR).

During the initial planning of the CKGR in the 1950s, Botswana's government intended the reserve to be a protection for San peoples (as well as Bakgalagadi) located in the Central Kalahari. Officials decided that new legislation, which would institute protections for certain peoples as well as animals would be politically tricky. The officials instead included the San as fauna, which under the existing wildlife and conservation legislation was protected from outside influences, in order not to anger area farmers, who did not want squatters on their land. However, by the establishment of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in 1961 and subsequent government legislation passed in 1963, restrictions were placed on the number of persons allowed to live in area as well as on the keeping of livestock. The population of the CKGR in 1960s was 5,000, compared to 450 by 1999, after decades of displacement from freehold farms, drought, relocation and out-migration to cities in search of a better life.

The process of considering the resettlement of local people out of the CKGR began in 1985 when the government of Botswana hired a team of consultants to investigate the situation and conditions of the CKGR residents. They were instructed to have minimal contact with the local people. In 1986, a government decision was taken that the CKGR should be strictly a wildlife reserve and that residents should be moved elsewhere. The government then recommended the relocation of local people. The official reason stated that the relocation was due to the high expenses of providing social services to such a scattered and remote population.

After this announcement, the people of the CKGR expressed their wish to stay in the reserve and work with the government and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) to implement community-based resource management activities such as small-scale tourism. However, political officials ultimately seemed to side with the private tour companies, which were seen to be more capable in generating tourism income and filling the country's economic goals of increasing production and to promote self sustainability and to do so by bringing about economic growth by expanding industry at the highest rates of return.

This outlook on economic growth threatens the culture of hunter and gatherers, such as the San, as they continue to be removed from their traditional lands. After their proposed offer was declined, the residents of CKGR resisted this resettlement and were answered by the government with threats resulting in; development program budget freezes, unmaintained infrastructure, and slowed assistance in drought relief, education, and healthcare.

In 1997, the CKGR residents were resettled from !Xade in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve to New !Xade, a large settlement in Ghanzi District, outside of the reserve, and Kaudwane, a large settlement in Kweneng District not far from Khutse Game Reserve; promises were made that there would be substantial compensation, so much so, people were told in kgotla meetings, that there would be enough cash for them to buy their own vehicles. Those that chose to relocate soon discovered these promises were not kept as they did not even receive enough compensation to keep the same standard of living they had on the reserve. The majority of the remaining residents were forced to relocate in 2002, when the government shut off services (including water) to the reserve.

In response to the shutting off of services and forced relocation, First Peoples of the Kalahari (FPK), a San-run NGO, worked with local residents of the reserve, who opted to take the Botswana government to court. The legal proceedings began in 2004 to determine if the government's actions of shutting off services in 2002 were legal, and if the San and Bakgalagadi residents living in the CKGR were legally the owners of the land when the government relocated them.

The government of Botswana argued that they had the right to remove the residents in the interest of conservation, tourism, and development; and that all the removals were voluntary. The San argued that they legally owned the land and had rights to utilize its resources; and were forced from their homes to live on settlements with a lower standard of living.

In 2005, the government ruled that the CKGR was off limits to people even though residents still lived there. The DWNP refused entry to the lawyers representing the San in this case, even when their entrance was granted by the High Court of Botswana. In September 2005, San persons attempting to bring food and water to friends and relatives still living in the CKGR were allegedly fired on by government officials using tear gas and rubber bullets. San individuals were injured, arrested, and detained on account of unlawful assembly. Some of them were jailed and later released. As of 2007, formal charges have not been brought against any of the people involved in the incidents.

In October 2005, the high court ruled that one San man and his family had the right to return to the CKGR, to take with them enough water and to reclaim their goats, which were confiscated during the forced relocation.

The final judgment, read on December 13, 2006, stated that the government was not required to restore services, and that it was not illegal for the government to stop these

services; but that the removal of residents and denying them access to means of subsistence (hunting, gathering, water) was indeed, unlawful.

On December 14, 2006, the 189 surviving San who filed the lawsuit were granted permission to return, with their families, to the CKGR. They were to be able to bring water with them; however, they were not allowed to bring in any domestic animals. By the latter part of 2007, there were some 200 people in the reserve, living mainly off food that they obtained outside of the reserve or off wild foods that they collected inside of the reserve. The people residing in the Kalahari still had not been issued any Special Game Licenses, in spite of the High Court's decision that they should be given these licenses. As a result, the San and Bakgalagadi currently are confronting not only legal issues with respect to wildlife access but also what to do about access to social services and water.

Nyae Nyae Conservancy, Namibia

In the early 1980s the Ju/'hoansi San of Nyae Nyae, Namibia, moved out of the Tjum!kui government settlement in order to support themselves in independent and traditionally organized units. These communities exist through a mixed economy of foraging, agriculture, livestock, small scale industry and wage labor. Problems the Ju/'hoansi are facing in these settlements include dependency, poverty, unemployment, alcoholism, lack of access to services, lack of technical assistance, constraints on income generation, and increased pressure on land and resources.

In 1986, the Ju/'hoansi formed the Ju/wa Farmers Union which was to assist in livestock raising and other development projects. The union represented Ju/'hoansi interests, such as land reform, at local and national levels. In the early 1990s, the Ju/'hoan community gained support from the office of the President of Namibia, while participating in national and international forums on indigenous rights. With the support of the President's office, from which they had gained during these conferences, the Ju/'hoansi were able to expel the Herero pastoralists from their land several times in order to protect their ecosystem and culture.

Ju/'hoansi leaders are aware that they need a strong and united political voice in their newly independent country (majority rule and independence from South Africa were granted in 1990). They understand the need of a written form of their language in order to be seen in the public eye, after years of marginalization, as having a legitimate and civilized culture. In order to ensure future political participation and group representation, the Ju/'hoansi want their children to have culturally appropriate schooling within in their mother tongue as well as in English.

This desire, along with their awareness that the linguistic, ethnic and geographic culture of the existing Namibian public schools was hurting their children's chances of academic and life success, was the basis of the Village Schools Project. This project was made possible by support from the Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative (now Conservancy), the Namibian government, the Swedish and Norwegian governments, the Nyae Nyae

Development Foundation of Namibia, the Kalahari Peoples Fund in the United States, and the Ju/'hoansi community.

Political participation also meant creating conventional leadership to represent their community at the local and national level. Nyae Nyae has thus created its own governing bodies such as the Nyae Nyae Conservancy (NNC), a representative body of Ju/'hoansi used for community decisions. Each of the 37 communities in Nyae Nyae has two representatives, of which one is supposed to be a woman, although this is not always the case. The representatives are supposed to travel throughout the region to each community in order to hear concerns, share information, and attempt to reach consensus on issues of public importance. The organization is recognized by the Ju/'hoansi community as a legitimate leadership and governing body and even has its own bank account and handicraft production operation.

The process for gathering community decisions and bringing them to a consensus through the NNC is time-consuming. However, it has been proven that once a decision has been made, it is fully supported throughout the area. The NNC's activities include promotion of development, convincing outsiders moving into the area to move elsewhere, and participation in land use planning with the government, NGOs and the private sector. The body also works with the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDNFN) to improve financial, human and fiscal resource management.

In 1998, the Nyae Nyae Conservancy became a Trust recognized by the government. The Namibian government sees this as a step to empowering the local people, who now have access to and communal ownership of the land which the trust oversees. Local people, however, are cautious; many see this process as a government "thing" which provides jobs, but which will eventually lead to a government takeover of the land for reserves or for outside organizations to further their interests at the Ju/'hoansi's expense.

The key to successful development in Namibia has proven to be the empowerment and participation of the San communities from the bottom up. However, there is still a long way to go. Some development programs, such as the Integrated Rural Development Programme in Nyae Nyae, which has provided the San with cattle, tools, and seeds, is the product of a collaboration of several San representative bodies (including the NNDNFN and NNC) and the government.

San were also involved in the land ownership process by establishing operating and resource rules and mapping new areas. However, there is a discrepancy in continuing development as some individuals would rather continue development work with NGOs and the government while others want to be left alone.

Along with development projects came socio-economic stratification due to unequal availability of cash from jobs, pensions, crafts and tourism; something that the Ju/'hoansi of Nyae Nyae are not culturally accustomed to in their traditional gift economy. The problem with cash funds and salaries is that the money disappears quickly due to social obligations to share with relatives. The societal pressures some face to spread their

income amongst the desperate community have become a difficult burden on the employed few. However, development project leaders have been learning a great deal in recent years about ways to promote equity using traditional Ju/'hoan and other San sharing and communication systems.

Some Government Policy Impacts in Botswana

Ostrich Policy of 1994

Botswana's Ostrich Policy of 1994 states that one needs a license from the DWNP before legally obtaining and selling products containing ostrich parts. This license can only be obtained by an organized group, which will be assigned a quota. There must also be a special building set aside to house these products and which can be investigated at any time by government officials.

The first group to apply for a license was the East Hanahai Women's Ostrich Eggshell Collecting Group, which had applied for a quota in 1993, but was not granted one until 1995.

The Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust went a different route, applying for a Director's Permit for hatched eggshells. This permit was granted two months later and would allow this trust to operate as the middleman allocating shells to those who need them for crafts.

Policies like this hurt women more than men because crafts are traditionally done by females with their profits directly benefiting their families. This policy however, contradicts the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992. In the former case, any product, even hatched eggshells, could be seen as a trophy product and therefore illegal to collect and use, whereas in the latter, ostrich eggs are seen as a source of food and raw materials for crafts on which micro-economic projects are dependent, and are therefore legal to possess.

Tribal Grazing Land Policy

The Tribal Grazing Land Policy of 1975, states that individuals have access to as much land as needed in order to sustain themselves and family, and that land policy should not create situations where the poor would be worse off. But in the late 1970s, land in Botswana was zoned into commercial (ranching) or wildlife management area (wildlife, tourism), and communal zones with no reserved areas as safeguards within which the poor could forage, raise crops and livestock, and engage in small-scale rural enterprises in an effort to survive.

In response, the San have tried to gain ownership of their native land by having blocks of land set aside by district councils, which then will send an application for trust status into the state for ownership recognition. The first to engage in this was the Ghanzi District Council; however, difficulties with both securing enough water and obtaining permission

to install fences to keep out outsiders from intruding on their water and land, made it difficult to maintain livelihoods.

Land Rights and Trusts

After years of land loss and the cultural and economic loss correlated to it, the Botswana San are now organizing to attain state-recognized ownership of traditional lands and to gain the right to hunt on these lands. There were two ways to do this, the first, was purchasing freehold land, the second, a more viable method for a cash-strapped society, was to create a government-approved land trust through their community.

In 1986, Botswana established community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) programs which called for communities to form councils, adopt a constitution, establish a board of directors, and register with government, which recognizes this legal entity. Since the program itself cannot own land, the communities must set up trusts in order to register land blocks for community purchase with district councils, which then apply for the land through government land boards. If the process is successful, the government then entrusts the land to the community to oversee wildlife resources and other activities on the land. By 2000, there were ninety trusts or councils in place in various stages of development and implementation.

One successful example of these trusts was established by the Ju/'hoansi San and Herero in northwestern Botswana. The /Xai /Xai Tlhabololo Trust was created in Botswana in 1997, to enhance the well-being of the /Xai /Xai community, diversify their economy, engage in craft sales and tourism, promote biodiversity, preserve their cultures and raise social awareness of their culture in order to save it.

In order to register land and get a land title, one must first go through an extensive adjudication process called Participatory Rural Appraisal, to establish what areas are already legally recognized. This process involves going through historic customary and civic ownership records, interviews, mapping and location of any culturally significant locations. Many San have taken part in this process by partaking in land mapping training and using this to benefit their communities. Some communities, such as those in what was then the Kuru Development Trust (with the assistance of Arthur Albertson) have been able to map out areas which can be used as tourism areas. However, most of the individuals who have applied for land ownership titles have been denied on the grounds that they will be relocated, even when the San have not been officially informed of any possible relocations.

One social issue involved with mapping and assigning land territory is that San area borders have always been fluid or flexible, a necessity for survival in the desert. For generations, if one group of San could not survive on their land due to environmental reasons, they sought refuge in a neighboring area where there were kinship, friendship and business ties. If there were enough resources to share, they were granted permission to utilize the area's resources. If the land is mapped with legal borders and the

environmental or man-made factors cause there to be a lack of resources, the people will again seek refuge in a neighboring area. Many San in that area will not refuse this kind of request. Certain mapped areas could become overpopulated, and without the flexibility of movement, groups could become fierce competitors for the scarce resources on that land.

Problems with multiethnic trusts, such as these due to relocations of many ethnic groups to one area, are played out in favoritism and domination by the more powerful and wealthier group. Usually the San are on the bottom of this ladder. The government needs to establish more equitable procedures of management and administration of trusts to ensure full community participation from the bottom up.

In 2001, the government of Botswana ruled that community councils and trusts did not have the right to control their own assets any longer. CBNRM activities were shut down and their assets frozen, at least for the time being. This occurred in part because of a lack of government appreciation for the financial management systems of some community trusts, at least some of which were not working as well as they might. There was also a sense on the part of District Councils that the community trusts were making too much money which, councilors felt, could potentially go to council treasuries. Fortunately, the holding up of the operations of community trusts was relaxed, and although the government never rescinded its ruling, community trusts are operating today in Botswana.

Civic Participation

With as much ground they have gained, the San still face institutionalized discrimination by governments, international agencies and private companies in the areas of public policy, development and conservation. The San have limited access to crucial information on development plans and the implications of those plans to their people. They lack information on how to gain access to land, jobs and business licenses.

The San need to be granted their full civil rights of participation in government and must be fully informed and have the right to self-determination. They also need a healthy environment and full access to land resources, ability to earn an adequate living, and to have their human rights guaranteed. In addition, they deserve fair royalties for their part in conservation and from outside exploitation of their land as well as more autonomy, increased standards of living, and access to participation in the national life so as to preserve culture, customs and values.

Struggling for these rights is particularly hard for the San because their traditional leadership was organized so differently from that of their colonizers, government and neighbors. The establishment of contemporary leadership in an egalitarian society is tough because it must transcend centuries of social attitudes against self-aggrandizement while upholding traditional traditions and values. New leaders must try to represent a whole society in a new democratic system, having new and old social values collide. The

San faith in their leaders is not concrete because they are not used to this system, nor have mainstream government and leaders benefited them. San have, however, engaged in leadership training and capacity building activities, and there are now San leaders in a number of communities, some of whom are gazetted headmen and headwomen in Botswana and traditional authorities in Namibia.

Political Mobilization

Since the 1980s, the San have begun to politically mobilize at the grassroots level, in part due to the Central Kalahari Game Reserve resettlement. San participated in Botswana in the national elections in the 1980s. San organizations were founded in the 1980s, one example being Kuru Development Trust (now the Kuru Family of organizations). First People of the Kalahari was established in 1993, and in 1995 the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) was established as a San NGO which sought to promote San interests including land rights and public awareness of the San struggles.

Alice Mogwe's 1992 survey of the San's contemporary situation in Ghanzi District, Botswana awakened the international community to the San's plight. International organizations, non-government organizations, and agencies began to look at San human rights issues. Governments in southern Africa attempted to establish policies and procedures to protect San and other minority interests, something that also happened in South Africa after majority rule was established in April, 1994.

Health

Today, the San have a longer life expectancy due to their sedentary life style and access to healthcare. However with this new lifestyle has come a dependency on non-traditional food items such as mealie meal, beans and oil. Adult onset diabetes, cardiovascular disease and cancer are sharply increasing as a result in part of dietary and lifestyle changes.

Alcoholism has become prevalent due to social discontent and increased availability of alcohol from outsiders. This has led to alcohol related violence in the community, including domestic violence.

Exposure to miners, military personnel and tourists have also subjected the San to an increasing number of STDs including HIV/AIDS, for which there is little money or access to anti-retroviral drugs in their isolated communities.

Education

The Remote Area Development Program, established by the government of Botswana, involves the education of rural area dwellers. This program builds schools, provides

salaries, hostels, supplies, transportation, uniforms, fees and food for students. However, this program has again created another layer of government dependency. Local people have little interest in this program or their child's education because little of their time is vested into it. The program's educational culture, reflected in the country's goal of creating a national identity, has created cultural misunderstandings between parents and children and in turn a loss of culture, due to the lack of shared experiences, knowledge, values and time away from home.

After independence in 1966, Botswana wanted its people to see themselves first as citizens of Botswana, not as their ethnicity. This nation-building included the implementation of Setswana as the official language, and English as the secondary school language of instruction.

The boarding schools in Botswana have proven a major obstacle in the education of the San. The physical separation of parents and children is foreign. Thus a major reason for dropouts is homesickness. Other reasons for San children dropping out of school include physical and sexual abuse by staff, poor hostel conditions, a stigma for being San, monotonous food, and no cultural sensitivity. Lessons are taught in the dominant culture by teachers who are of that culture, who instruct in unfamiliar teaching styles and who are not fluent in San languages, causing student alienation.

Development Projects

Due to the traditional San leadership systems and lack of consultation by government organizations and NGOs and consensus of settlements; many development programs have had little sustained impact in the San settlements. Remoteness for supply chains and lack of attention, training, mentoring and follow through of organizations to help implement a fully established internal governance have added to the failure of outside implemented development programs.

In 1974, Botswana established a Bushman Development Program, later, the Remote Area Development program (as it came to be known in 1978). This program is a government effort to assist remote area dwellers, those living outside of gazetted villages. It has had some significant impacts, especially in the area of infrastructure provision. It has been less successful, admittedly, in helping provide employment and income generating opportunities.

Separate from the Remote Area Development Program was the government of Botswana's efforts in community based natural resource management. In 1989, a regional natural resource management project was established by USAID and several governments, including Botswana, Malawi, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. In 1992, the Living in a Finite Environment (LIFE) project was established between USAID and the government of Namibia. These projects have been important because they helped generate income for local people and community trusts were formed which got access to

wildlife quotas and, in some cases, to safari operations which provided funds and training to local people. . Ideally, these efforts were geared toward allowing the San to exercise full rights as citizens, be consulted in policy and planning decisions affecting them, and be integrated into mainstream society. It emphasized self-reliance, and project development of projects responsive to San needs.

For instance, in the 1990s, communities associated with Kuru Development Trust were raising cochineal, a small insect that is used to make carmine dye. With the potential for area success and economic growth from this market activity, Kuru hoped to facilitate the growth of a local economic activity which communities could control. The problem, however, was that market access was difficult, and other countries were already producing carmine dye.

Hunting and handicrafts may be waning economic markets. Hunting's cultural importance for the younger generation of men has declined due to the increased restrictions, government presence, generational dependency on government support, and risks of being arrested. When asked, young men stated that they don't want to live like their ancestors. Much of this view is a result of the stigma and degradation of culture in which the younger generations of San have endured while being integrated into the mainstream Tswana culture without the success of the Tswana.

Along the same lines, young women are less willing to learn cultural crafts. When asked, some women stated that they were afraid of wild animals; others were afraid for their safety when collecting raw materials in the bush due to the increase presence of wildlife officers, government officials, tourists, miners, and military personnel.

Some San, the majority being women, have suggested wellness programs to be integrated into development programs. Such programs would include public awareness of STDs and community healing and treatment of alcoholism and its social effects, such as domestic violence and community conflict.

Implementing Successful Development Programs

Many San are uncertain of their future because of consistent changes in government policy and regulations forcing them to resettle and restricting access to their tradition ways of life. Without a certain future, they are unable to gain development funds or to finish development projects. They must be able to unconditionally own land and its resources in order for development to succeed. The efforts to gain de facto access to land through various means (for example, seeking land rights from Land Boards) have been somewhat successful in getting a degree of control over land and resources. The problem, however, is that people from the outside can come in and take over land or the water points on that land, and the San have to seek help from Land Boards, District Councils, or non-government organizations such as Ditshwanelo, the Botswana Center for Human Rights, or the Kuru Family of Organizations.

The development process must also include proper information, consultation and local participation. The programs must include the San values of respect for the land, decision making based on consensus, a gift economy basis of resources, information and indigenous knowledge sharing, gender equality, and mutual respect for ideas and values. These programs must bring local empowerment, sustainability and human rights to the communities which they affect.

For Further Consideration and Research

With all of the policy changes and limiting factors of government regulations, there should be examination of the intentions behind such policies. Governments need to make the policies regarding conservation, hunting and gathering, consistent and steady, based on uncompromised studies. Contemporary mining and tourism activities have added to biodiversity degradation as opposed to those activities carried out by those who have lived on this land and have successfully sustained its resources for thousands of years. Are conservation policies really a catchphrase to recruit foreign governments to help with such issues when the real intention is to further the interests of big business? Are these policies in fact intended to eradicate the San, or perhaps to continue the civilizing mission of indigenous peoples left behind from the country's own colonial history? Or are these policies really meant to help conservation efforts of endangered wildlife? If the last fact is true, the government must reassess the real reasons of wildlife population declines and address the root of the problem, which has to do more with issues such as climate change and changes in habitats at the local level. NGOs, settlement residents, and the public need to know to what degree mining operations have affected or could potentially affect the environmental, social, economic, and health situations of people in protected as well as non-protected areas

Research also needs to look at how these policy and cultural changes, dependency, learn self-helplessness are affecting the San psyche and chances of cultural survival. Generational differences need to be examined in order to identify ways to increase family and community cohesion as each generation has established a different worldview in relation to ones culture and values due to the different political environments of each generation during their coming of age years.

Southern Africa's governments need to reassess their policies on resource management, development, consultation, and local ownership. If this is not done, the countries in the region will have failed to fulfill their own goals of all-inclusive public participation, fairness and social justice set forth in their constitutions.

¹ This is a brief summary of the current social and economic situation of the San peoples of southern Africa. Some of the information in this paper is derived from the research of, and papers and reports written by Robert Hitchcock, Ph.D. and Megan Biesele, Ph.D., for

the Kalahari Peoples Fund. Considerable effort was invested by Kristin Broyhill in drawing together material for this summary and writing up the information. The San (Bushmen) peoples occupy several countries throughout southern Africa and as an underrepresented minority, the San are subject to marginalization in all of them. This paper focuses on the broad issues facing many San communities in Botswana and Namibia.