

(2001)

## SEEKING SUSTAINABLE STRATEGIES: THE POLITICS OF RESOURCE RIGHTS AMONG THE CENTRAL KALAHARI SAN

Robert Hitchcock

### Introduction

A major problem that indigenous peoples have faced world-wide in their quest to achieve self-determination and social security is the fact that they are often discriminated against by governments, international agencies, and companies involved in development and conservation activities. Indigenous peoples frequently have limited access to crucial information about the plans that governments or development agencies have for their areas. They also experience constraints in getting data on ways to go about applying for land, jobs, or business licenses. As indigenous peoples' organizations have noted in numerous meetings over the past several decades, "We are the last to know and the first to go." This is particularly true in situations where governments and agencies with whom they work are involved in land-related conservation and development efforts.

In recent years, recommendations have been made by indigenous groups and their supporters that the goals of indigenous peoples can best be achieved if (1) they are allowed to participate fully in needs assessments, development planning, and project implementation, (2) they are provided information on which to base decisions, and (3) they have the right to determine their own futures (Hardbattle 1993; LeRoux 1996). Participatory development has become a catchphrase for the kind of approach that many indigenous peoples and the organizations with whom they work are advocating. Various means of bringing about local participation have been suggested, including allowing local people to take part in all phases of the development process and assuring that local people have control over their own land and natural resources.

A crucial concern of indigenous peoples, especially in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> centuries, has been to ensure that they have the right to a healthy environment and to the resources and information necessary for them to be able to make an adequate living. Indigenous groups and individuals have called for "eco-justice," policies and programs that link human rights and the environment. They point out that they bear a disproportionate share of the costs of conservation and development projects such as parks, game reserves, mines, and land colonization efforts. They also feel strongly that they have not received sufficient royalties or other kinds of compensation for the resource exploitation that has taken place on their lands.

### Participation and the San

The concept of participation is one that is not easy to define. It can mean the right to make decisions about development action. Participation can also mean the process whereby local communities and individuals take part in defining their own needs and coming up with solutions to meet those needs. In addition, participation can refer to situations in which local communities and individuals share in the benefits from development projects and are fully involved in generating those benefits. Rural development can be redefined to mean the enabling of poor rural women and men to demand and control

more of the benefits of development. Participation can thus be said to mean simply putting people first.

There is much debate among indigenous peoples -- including San -- about the goals and objectives of their struggles. Virtually all indigenous peoples want a greater say in decisions, which affect them, and they would all like to see their standards of living enhanced. Some indigenous people want autonomy, which they see as the right to make their own decisions. They argue that autonomy means the right to be different and to be able to preserve, protect, and promote customs, values, and ideals that they hold dear. In the case of the indigenous peoples of southern Africa, autonomy and sovereignty imply protection from discrimination and preservation of cultural, linguistic, and spiritual values from assault by the dominant majority. San, like other indigenous groups, want the right to practice their own culture, to teach their children mother tongue languages, and to be able to take part in their own customary activities without interference (see, for example, Hardbattle 1993; Saugestad 1998).

The document that emerged from UNCED did at least pay lip service to the rights of indigenous peoples and to protection of the environment. The Rio Declaration and Agenda 21 (United Nations Document A/CONF.151/4) both talked of the importance of conserving biodiversity and the peoples who depend on it. Indigenous groups have raised the crucial question, "Who owns biodiversity?" and they have sought to protect the rights to intellectual, genetic, and biological property. The global Forum at Rio called for alternative governance regimes that would protect the rights of indigenous peoples and their environments.

The organizations that are either formed by indigenous groups themselves or which are set up to help promote the interests of indigenous peoples engage in numerous activities, from taking cases to court to participating in demonstrations, and from holding workshops and training sessions to carrying out research and disseminating reports. They host meetings to which representatives of indigenous groups and others interested in indigenous issues are invited (such as the meeting on indigenous peoples in Africa held in Tuncel, Denmark in June, 1993 by the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs; see Veber et al 1993). Organizations such as IWGIA, Survival International, and Cultural Survival sometimes serve as liaisons between members of indigenous groups and governments or other agencies (e.g. state bodies devoted to indigenous affairs or international finance institutions).

Some of these organizations developed what they termed a "participative extension approach" to indigenous peoples' development and human rights. This kind of approach emphasizes community involvement in all aspects of planning, policy formulation, and project implementation. In some instances, this strategy results in the formation or strengthening of local institutions such as community organizations and farmers' cooperatives. A participative extension approach enables local people to share ideas, information, and experiences and to formulate strategies based on public consensus. If it is found that some members of the local community do not agree with the ways in which the projects or interventions are designed or being put into practice, then changes can be made. This flexibility is crucial to the success of these kinds of programs.

One way to promote indigenous participation has been to appoint local people as "change agents" or "community extension workers." By having these kinds of individuals at the grassroots level, it is possible for trust to be built up and for detailed knowledge about local situations to be drawn upon for useful ways in which to assist people. It is crucial, however, that these individuals are not seen as trying to direct the change process; rather, they must be viewed more as facilitators and serve as advisors or information-disseminators.

It has sometimes been said that local elites or extant authority structures get in the way of participatory development. One way to get around this problem is to involve elites and local authorities in the development process. Consulting local leaders (e.g. district councilors in Botswana) at all phases of project formulation and implementation enables communities and development organizations to obtain information, and it helps to ensure that the authorities are fully aware and supportive of program activities.

The building of capacity for local decision-making has been done in a number of ways. It has been facilitated through the holding of workshops or community discussion sessions in which ideas about democratic processes of public policy formation were addressed. It has also been promoted through training of various kinds (e.g. in how to form committees, draw up constitutions, and run meetings). In addition, it has been facilitated through a number of innovative non-formal educational means, including doing problem-solving exercises, drawing up case studies, and performing role-plays about situations in which communities find themselves. These kinds of strategies have been very effective in helping to establish community organizations and promoting community-based activities.

### The San of the Kalahari

The San (Bushmen, Basarwa, Khwe) are indigenous peoples residing in southern Africa who have had to contend with many if not most of the issues that face indigenous peoples elsewhere in the world (Young 1995; Saugestad 1998). Numbering over 100,000 people in six southern African states, the San are minorities in all of the countries in which they live. The majority of San today engage in mixed production and economic systems, combining agriculture, pastoralism, and wage labor with exploitation of natural resources for subsistence and income purposes (Hitchcock 1996; WIMSA 1998, 1999). A sizable proportion of the San in Namibia and Botswana live below the poverty line (Gulbrandsen, Karlsen, and Lexow 1986; Kann, Hitchcock, and Mbere 1990; Chr. Michelsen Institute 1996; Dekker 1999). Much of their land has been taken over by other groups or by the state, which has designated areas for commercial, development, or conservation purposes. Sizable numbers of San were dispossessed when freehold farms were established in Namibia, Botswana, and South Africa (Guenther 1979, 1986; Hitchcock 1978, 1996; Wily 1979, 1982, 1994).

On the positive side, San have also seen efforts to promote their rights by missionaries, traditional chiefs, and non-government organizations such as the Aborigines Protection Society and the Anti-Slavery Society for Human Rights. They have sought to have their voices heard in public meetings, and they have organized themselves in an effort to gain greater recognition of their social, economic, and cultural rights (Hardbattle 1993; Hitchcock 1996; Saugestad 1998). They have worked closely with both government officials and outside agencies, as well as researchers, to promote development and to gain more secure control over their land and resources (Wily 1979, 1982; Hitchcock and Holm 1993; LeRoux 1996; Saugestad 1998).

Many San today are concerned about what they see as constraints that affect their well being. Some of these constraints have been identified in the course of workshops and symposia on San that have been held over the past two decades. These constraints include the following: (1) poverty, (2) relatively low standards of living, (3) long distances to towns, markets, and social services, (4) relatively low levels of formal employment, (5) low wages and benefits, (6) insecurity in land tenure and resource

access, and (7) competition from other individuals, companies, and the state (Remote Area Development Program 1978, 1979; Gulbrandsen, Karlsen, and Lexow 1986; Chr. Michelsen Institute 1996; WIMSA 1998, 1999).

Some San note that they are subjected to what they see as discrimination against them on the basis of who they are and how they live. Some San believe that they have fewer chances to get land from land boards, district or regional councils, and government, something that appears to be borne out by research (see, for example, Wily 1994). They are concerned that governments have passed wildlife and natural resource conservation laws that limit their access to wild plants and animals, and they are unsure about their future in areas that may be turned into protected or tourism zones. They are worried about their children not having the chance to learn their own languages in school, and they want to see their young people have the chance to hear about their own cultural traditions and values (Hardbatt 1993).

Possibly the biggest problem facing the San today is the expanded pace of rural and urban development in southern Africa. As populations grow and the economies of these countries become more diversified, there is increasing pressure to utilize the wildlife, wild plant, mineral, and other natural resources on a commercial basis. In some areas where San reside, resources that they utilized extensively for both subsistence and income generation purposes have been commercialized. This includes both wild plants and wild animals. Extensive tracts of land in the Kalahari have been converted from open savanna areas that were communally owned and managed into private leasehold and freehold farms (Hitchcock 1996). This commercialization process has essentially turned what was communal tribal land into private land under the control of individuals or small groups.

Many of the San in Botswana today reside in settlements that together make up less than 1 percent of the country, some 3,523 square kilometers, or 0.6% of the surface area of Botswana. A significant proportion of Botswana's land is designated as state land (133,990 square kilometers), much of which is devoted to national parks, game reserves, and protected areas (101,535 square kilometers, or 17.4% of the country). A sizable proportion of the San settlements are located in areas that have been designated as Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), those areas where multiple land use is allowed (Republic of Botswana 1986). The difficulties facing those people living in Wildlife Management Areas include the facts that some of them have substantial numbers of livestock in addition to wildlife, and second, there are restrictions on the kinds of activities that people can engage in, for example, they are not supposed to establish boreholes for livestock watering purposes.

San are concerned about their rights in not only in Wildlife Management Areas but also in those areas that have been designated as national parks and game reserves. When Gemsbok National Park was established in South Africa and Botswana in the early 1930s, some of the San were required to move out of the area. In order to get around this problem, at least initially, San were actually defined as "fauna" in the South African Parliament so that they could still reside in a game reserve (Robert Gordon, personal communication, 1985). In Botswana, San were relocated out of several of the national parks and game reserves including Chobe National Park in the 1950s and 1960s and the Moremi Game Reserve in the 1960s and 1970s. San also faced restrictions on their access to wild animal resources as a result of the passage of faunal conservation legislation (Hitchcock 1995; Hitchcock and Masilo 1995).

In May-June, 1997, the Government of Botswana resettled several hundred residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in locations outside of the reserve. The justification for this resettlement was that it would promote conservation and development and would improve the standards of living of

the people being resettled. The Central Kalahari Game Reserve was established in 1961 in order to conserve the habitats and natural resources of a portion of the Kalahari Desert, a vast sand-sea that covers a significant proportion of the Republic of Botswana in southern Africa (see Figure 1). Covering an area of 52,347 square kilometers, the Central Kalahari consists of undulating savanna landscapes that are dotted with pans and dissected in some areas by fossil river valleys.

The resident population of the reserve consists primarily of G/wi and G//ana San and Bakgalagadi, a Setswana-speaking group that moved into the region over the past several hundred years. The G/wi and G//ana are Central Bush-speaking San who have been the subject of detailed anthropological studies by Silberbauer (1965, 1972, 1981a, 1981b), Tanaka (1980, 1987), Osaki (1984, 1990), Cashdan (1984a, 1984b), Sugawara (1991), Ikeya, Valiente-Noialles (1993), and others.

The G/wi and G//ana San of the central Kalahari and surrounding areas interact with other San groups, including the Nharo, /Kxau//ein, Kua, Tshassi, and !Xo and with Bantu-speaking groups such as the Herero, the Boloongwe (who are part of the Bakagalagadi), the Bakwena, and the Batawana (for a list of the predominant languages spoken by people in communities in the Ghanzi District, see Table 1).

The population of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve was estimated by Silberbauer to be as high as 5,000 people in the early 1960s, but it declined over time, in part as a result of out-migration of residents to towns, freehold farms, and cattle posts on the peripheries of the reserve. In 1988-89, the population of the reserve in 1988-89 was estimated by the Remote Area Development Program of the Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing to be approximately 1,660 people residing in 9 communities. The 1991 Botswana population census indicated a population of 994 people in 8 communities. After the relocation of the people from !Xade and some of the communities in the southern part of the reserve in 1997-98, the population of the CKGR was estimated to be between 420-450 in 1999 (see Table 2 for a breakdown of the population data for CKGR communities between 1988-89 and 1999).

Government-sponsored investigations of the central Kalahari include ones by Silberbauer (1965), Sheller (1977), English et al (1980); Childers, Stanley, and Rick (1981); and a government commission of inquiry (Government of Botswana 1985). Non-government organizations have also conducted investigations in the reserve (see, for example, Kalahari Conservation Society 1988; Mogwe 1992; Ditshwanelo 1996), and international human rights organizations such as Survival International have sought to publicize the issues surrounding the denial of land rights and the potential impacts involuntary relocation (Survival International 1989, 1997, 1999).

In order to understand the current situation facing the people of Ghanzi District and First People of the Kalahari, it is necessary to take a brief look at historical developments in the region. A general chronology of events in the Ghanzi District, including the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, is presented in Appendix 4. As noted in the Appendix, the Ghanzi District used to be part of British Crown Land (after 1895) and later became state land. Ghanzi District was subsequently established as an administrative unit, one of 10 districts in Botswana, with its own district council and land board.

Ghanzi was dominated by the presence of the Ghanzi freehold farms on the Ghanzi limestone ridge (Silberbauer 1965; Russell and Russell 1979; Guenther 1979, 1986; Wily 1979, 1982). The area was settled briefly by Afrikaaner farmers, part of the Dorstland Trekkers, who crossed the Kalahari, at great personal cost, in 1877 (Hitchcock 1978). In the late 1800s the Ghanzi area was ceded to the British South Africa Company of Cecil John Rhodes, much to the chagrin of the Batawana, who claimed territorial rights over the area. A new group of Afrikaaner farmers arrived to settle on the

Ghanzi Ridge in 1898, and the British Protectorate Government allocated them 41 farms in 1899.

The early 20th century saw the development of a number of these farms, and what was to become Ghanzi township as a service center to the farms and as a community that attracted people from the farms and from other areas of the country (Childers 1976; Guenther 1979, 1986; Barnard 1979; Wily 1982). The Ghanzi freehold farms were developed over time, but received an impetus after the re-opening of the abattoir in Lobatse in 1954. By the 1950s some of the farms were large-scale commercial livestock operations (Russell and Russell 1979).

As a result of the 1899 decision to allocate the farms to white farmers, the San and other people who lived on the farms either stayed on as laborers or had to find other places to live. Some of the San went to what became the town of Ghanzi; others went to cattle posts in the communal areas to the south of the Ghanzi Farms, and a few people moved east into what is now the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. The result of these movements was a restructuring of the social landscape of the Ghanzi region and the marginalization and impoverishment of a sizable proportion of the San population of Ghanzi District (Wily 1982; Guenther 1986).

In the 1920s and 1930s there were investigations of the status of the San and other peoples in Botswana who were classified as balata (serfs) (Schapera 1930:233-234, 1943:43; Silberbauer 1965:127-131; Silberbauer and Kuper 1966; Bieseke et al 1989). The British government, others by the League of Nations and the International Labor Organization, and still others by the Bechuanaland Protectorate Administration and the current government of Botswana instigated some of these investigations. One result of these hearings and investigations was the decision to make pronouncements concerning slavery by Protectorate Administration officials. This was done, for example, in 1936 in some of the digkotla (council places) in the country.

A second outgrowth of these investigations was the recommendation that settlement schemes for San be established. The first of these schemes 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 roadwork, trapping, and preparation of hides and skins for sale. The scheme was abandoned after a two-year period of existence when the District Commissioner who supported it, W.H. Cairns, was transferred out of Ghanzi District (Silberbauer 1981a:13-14).

During the Second World War, there was a considerable out-migration of San from the Ghanzi Farms, some of whom went to the mines and others of whom moved to communities outside of the farms in search of jobs on cattle posts. Other people went to the communal (tribal) areas where they attempted to forage for a living or they sold crafts and other items that they had produced in order to generate income. By 1953, according to the Ghanzi District Commissioner, there were 8,000 San in Ghanzi District, some of whom were still nomadic (Tobias 1956:179).

In the late 1950s, the Bechuanaland Protectorate government, realizing that the country was going to receive its independence before too long, decided that further efforts needed to 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.

At the time of the 1964 census, on which Silberbauer collaborated with Alec Campbell and other

protectorate administration officials, there were approximately 4,000 San estimated to be on the Ghanzi Farms. He broke the population into three categories: those who lived in the bush and had little or no contact with non-San groups, those who spent most or all of the year on water points belonging to non-San, and those who lived on the Ghanzi Freehold Farms (Bechuanaland Protectorate 1964:21). There were San and Bakgalagadi who were designated as 'nomads,' some of whom were in the Central Kalahari.

The CKGR was established initially not so much as game reserve, but as a means of protecting its human inhabitants, many of whom were either full-time or part-time hunter-gatherers. At the time the CKGR was being considered in the late 1950s, it was felt that new legislation would be required for a reserve specifically for people, so existing legislation for a game reserve was used instead. An additional reason that the reserve was not made specifically for people was that it was felt that this move might provoke Afrikaaner farmers residing on the Ghanzi ridge to the west of the central Kalahari, who were concerned about the problems of people coming onto their ranches and squatting. The advantage of giving the area the status of a game reserve was that on the one hand it would serve to protect the people and wildlife from encroachment by outsiders, and on the other it would help to conserve the resources upon which both people and wildlife depended for their survival.

The establishment of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in 1961 upon the recommendations of Silberbauer (1965) and the promulgation of regulations governing activities within the reserve in 1963 effectively limited the large-scale development of water points and cattle posts in the area and served to restrict the numbers of people coming into the reserve. There were those in Botswana who resented the setting up of a reserve since they felt that such a strategy would serve basically to isolate the residents of the area and thus prevent them from entering the mainstream of development in the country. By allowing hunter-gatherers to continue their traditional lifestyles, it was argued, they were being condemned to a "primitive way of life." Some people even went as far as to suggest that setting up a "Bushman Reserve" was an attempt on the part of anthropologists to preserve people in a kind of "human zoo" where they could be studied. Silberbauer made an important point with reference to this attitude when he stated,

The retention of Bushmen in the Reserve would appear to be a reversal of the policy of economic advancement advocated for the rest of the Bushmen of Bechuanaland. The resolution of this paradox is that it is not intended to preserve the Bushmen of the Reserve as museum curiosities and pristine primitives, but to allow them the right of choice of the life they wish to follow (Silberbauer 1965:133).

Basically, Silberbauer's approach was one of allowing people the right of self-determination, a position which was later to be espoused by the President of Botswana, Sir Seretse Khama, and by the various National Development Plans and white papers on rural development produced by the government of Botswana (see, for example, Republic of Botswana 1975, 1986; Ministry of Finance and Development Planning 1991, 1997).

In the 1960s, the people in the reserve were primarily hunter-gatherers who depended on a wide range of plant animal species. Mobility was relatively high, with annual moves of camps occurring as often as 10-15 times per year. Group sizes were small, averaging between 25 and 80, and they consisted of people related primarily through kinship, marriage, and long-standing friendship and

socioeconomic ties (Silberbauer 1965, 1972, 1981a, 1981b; Tanaka 1980). The people of the central Kalahari tended to range over large areas that averaged between roughly 900 and 4,000 square kilometers (Silberbauer 1981:193; Tanaka 1980:81). These ranges were generally structured in such a way that they contained all the resources necessary to sustain a group over the course of a year (for a map of the ranges of central Kalahari San groups, see Figure 2).

Over time, there has been a generation reduction in range sizes of groups in the central Kalahari, to the point where they averaged less than 450 square kilometers in the 1980s and 1990s. This reduction in territory size was related in part to increased sedentism on the part of the residents of the various communities in the central Kalahari. It should be noted, however, that the areas over which groups of hunters ranged for purposes of seeking antelopes and other game actually expanded, especially in the area around !Xade. Osaki (1984:56) reports that mounted hunters moved over an area of some 5,000 square kilometers in search of prey in 1982-83.

G/wi and G//ana have long-standing (customary) rights to blocks of land that were recognized not only by themselves but by outsiders as well. Bands (co-residential groups made up of people affiliated through kinship, marriage, friendship, and economic ties) had rights to areas that they passed from one generation to the next through inheritance and allocation processes (Silberbauer 1981:196-187, 192-194; Cashdan 1984). People were able to obtain rights to territories on the basis of birth, marital (affinal) ties, and formal requests of permission for use rights from the area's traditional occupants. There were also cases where people established customary land rights through colonization, that is, moving into areas that were either uninhabited or which had experienced population reductions due to drought, disease, or out-migration for employment (Silberbauer 1981:141-142, 290; Hitchcock 1988).

Among the G/wi and G//ana San of the central Kalahari, the territorial unit is known as a no or a nong. This unit is a named piece of land that contains what are believed to be sufficient food, water, and other resources to sustain a group over the period of a year. Group members have clearly defined genealogical ties to these resource areas, which are inherited from one's parents or in-laws. Leadership has traditionally been tied to stewardship of the resources of each territory by a core group of siblings. Usually there is one oldest man or woman from this core group known as the owner (master) who has guardianship but not authority over the resources of the territory. It is this individual from whom permission must be sought to enter the territory and utilize its resources.

Resources in the G/wi and G//ana territory are shared among the members of the land-holding group. In most cases, permission is granted to other people to visit the territory of a group and use its resources, but there have been times, especially in drought periods, when this permission was refused. In most cases, however, bands permitted members of other groups to come and visit them and use their resources, with the understanding that down the line, the other group would allow them the same opportunity if the need arose.

Significant changes have occurred over time in the socioeconomic and land use systems of resident populations in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. Whereas the people of the region were mobile foragers in the 1960s, by the late 1980s and 1990s the vast majority of the people living in the reserve depended on domestic foods, some of them provided through drought relief and other kinds of feeding programs or through purchase. Some people kept goats, dogs, donkeys, and horses inside the reserve, but, it should be noted, no cattle (Hitchcock 1988). This is not to say that some G/wi and G//ana did not own cattle, certainly a few did. Most of these cattle were kept by relatives, friends, or people whom they hired to watch them on farms or at cattle posts outside of the reserve.



There were a fairly sizable number of cattle posts and ranches on the boundaries of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, including a set of commercial leasehold livestock ranches in the Hainaveld to the north and dozens of cattle posts in the east-central Kalahari on the eastern boundaries of the reserve. One of the problems of having large numbers of cattle on the peripheries of the reserve was that some of the livestock ranged into the reserve to graze, a process that led to a reduction in grazing for wild herbivores. A concern of those interested in the well-being of the wildlife in the reserve was that cattle owners who lost animals to predators on their ranches were allowed legally to shoot these animals under Botswana's Predator Control Act. One result of the implementation of this act was that lions, leopards, hyenas, and wild dogs were shot, something that led to a reduction in the densities of these animals in and around the central Kalahari.

According to Mark and Delia Owens (personal communication, 1981), many of the lions that they had radio collared and tracked over a number of years in the 1970s and 1980s as part of their ecological investigations were killed by cattle owners, some of whom actually came into the reserve itself to shoot them. There were also reportedly some safari hunters who shot lions and other predators in the reserve. The loss of these animals affected the predator-prey balance in the region, which in turn had effects on the faunal composition of the central Kalahari Desert. The changes in wildlife numbers were to prove to have significance to the people of the central Kalahari both in terms of their access to subsistence and income-generating resources and in terms of the possibility of their being allowed to retain their residential and resource access rights in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve itself.

#### The Remote Area Development Program and the San

In 1974, the government of Botswana established a special development program for San and, later, for other poorer rural Botswana citizens. Known originally as the Bushman Development Program (BDP), this effort was incorporated into Botswana's Fourth National Development Plan in 1975 as Local Government and Lands (LG) Project 32. Promotion of economic opportunities, provision of social and physical infrastructure, and human resource development were some of the objectives of the program.

A series of "working principles" were put forth in the original project memorandum for what evolved into the Remote Area Development Program. First and foremost, San were to be given encouragement to exercise their rights as citizens of Botswana. Second, development projects were to be initiated only after careful analysis and discussion with local people. Third, the integration of San into the larger society and economy of Botswana would be sought, providing that local people agreed with this objective. Fourth, self-reliance was a major goal. Fifth, projects were to be designed in such a way as to be responsive to the variable situations of people in different areas (Wily 1979). Thus, the Bushman Development Program had as its major objectives participation, consultation, self-determination, and empowerment.

The issue of San land rights came into sharp focus during the discussions surrounding the implementation of the National Policy on Tribal Grazing Land (TGLP), which was announced in 1975 (Republic of Botswana 1975). The grazing land policy underscored the basic principle of the traditional land tenure system in Botswana, which was "the right of every tribesman to have as much land as

he needs to sustain him and his family" (Republic of Botswana 1975:4). There was also emphasis placed in the white paper on protecting "the interests of those who own only a few cattle or none at all" (Republic of Botswana 1975:6). As the TGLP policy paper stated, "Planning will aim to ensure that land development helps the poor and does not make them worse off" (Republic of Botswana 1975:2).

When it was found during the course of zoning surveys in the late 1970s that many of the sandveld areas had existing water points and people in them, land use planners responded by zoning the land either commercial or communal. No land whatsoever was zoned as reserved because it was felt that there was insufficient land for communal use already. Thus, in spite of the fact that the "reserved areas" were the only "safeguards for the poorer members of the population," (Republic of Botswana 1975:7), it was decided to forego zoning land in this way.

In response to this situation, the Bushman Development Officer, district officials, researchers, and development workers sought to get the land rights of San recognized. This was done in several ways: (1) It was argued that the San had rights to land under the Botswana Constitution as citizens of the country. (2) Efforts were made to obtain legal support for San land rights from the Attorney General's Chambers. (3) Efforts were made to get the District Councils to set aside blocks of land as what came to be known as communal service centers or settlements. These areas were supposed to be large enough to sustain groups of people either as foragers or as food producers (Wily 1979:123, 137-148; Hitchcock 1978:412-428).

It is important to note that the first district where these schemes were planned was Ghanzi. The Ghanzi District Council agreed to set aside a certain amount of land to accommodate those San who wished to leave the Ghanzi Farms and establish themselves in their own places. In 1975-76, a reconnaissance survey of the Ghanzi Farms and surrounding areas was undertaken by Gary Childers as a liaison between the Ghanzi District and what was by then termed the Basarwa Development Program (see Childers 1976). The survey took six months and was conducted under the auspices of the Ghanzi District Council and the Ministry of Local Government and Lands' Bushman Development Program (see Childers 1976; Wily 1979, 1982).

A total of 4,512 San were found by Childers in the Ghanzi Farms, with a breakdown as follows: Nharo, 2,529 (56%), Makaukau (/Xau//ei), 959 (21.1%), Tsaukwe, 364 (8.1%), G/wi, 351 (7.8%), G//anakwe, 210 (4.7%), !Xo, 21 (0.5%), while the rest were Nama or /Kaba, 78 (1.8%) (Childers 1976:20, Table 2). Based on his findings of the distribution, kinship, and historical connections to land of local San populations, Childers (1976) recommended that four settlement schemes be established in Ghanzi District: (1) Groot Laagte, (2) Rooibrak, (3) East Hanahai, and (4) West Hahanai. These settlements were planned in such a way that they could support some of the people leaving the Ghanzi Farms as well as people living in the communal (tribal) areas around the farms.

In 1977, the Basarwa Development Officer submitted a project memorandum entitled "A Land and Water Development for Ghanzi Farm Basarwa" (Sub-Project af of LG 32) to the government of Botswana. The capital cost of the project was P424,400 and the recurrent costs were P7,135. The project was funded by outside donors, and it began in the latter part of the 1970s. The implementation of the Ghanzi settlement schemes did not go as smoothly as had been hoped. In some areas, notably Rooibrak, it was difficult to find sufficient high quality water to sustain a settlement, something that is still true today. A second problem related to the size of the area to be allocated. The Basarwa

Development Program wanted to have fairly sizable areas within which they could carry out a variety of activities. The Ghanzi District Council decided to allocate blocks of land 20 X 20 kilometers in size (400 square kilometers) for the settlements.

There were other constraints that affected people in the settlements. The Botswana government's Land Development Committee (LDC), on advice from the Attorney General's Chambers, was reluctant to allow local residents of the settlements to fence their areas, arguing that this was not permitted under existing land legislation. As a result, people in the settlements had to contend with people from outside of their areas bringing their livestock and using the water and grazing. The consequences were damage to crops, gardens, and people's property by the livestock.

Another problem facing San in the Ghanzi settlements was getting sufficient water to meet their needs. According to informants in a number of settlements, much of the water went to livestock rather than people. Water levels declined in some areas, and people were no longer able to get sufficient moisture to sustain them during dry periods. Springs dried up and sip-wells no longer yielded as much water as they had in the past. Excessive use of the borehole equipment by cattle owners led to frequent breakdowns, which often took months to repair.

San on the Ghanzi Farms were badly affected by the drought of the early to mid-1980s. Many of the Ghanzi freehold farm laborers had to resort to supplementing their diet and incomes through foraging, collecting thatching grass and firewood outside of the farms for sale in Ghanzi Township, and making and selling handicrafts. Some of them also were able to gain access to drought relief food, some of which was given to Ghanzi farmers who then redistributed it to their workers and their families.

In August, 1985 a Fact Finding Mission on the Central Kalahari Game Reserve was appointed by the Honorable M.P.K. Nwako, the Minister of Commerce and Industry. This commission, which consisted of 8 members, some of whom had either lived in Ghanzi District or had worked in the Remote Area Development Program and other units in the government of Botswana (e.g. the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, the Rural Sociology Unit in the Ministry of Agriculture). The commission carried out its work for three months and reported back to the government on November 15, 1985.

On July 15, 1986 a Botswana Government white paper on remote area dweller (RAD) settlements in the CKGR stated that the government of Botswana policy was that existing settlements should be relocated in areas outside of the reserve. The Honorable Moutlakgola Nwako, Minister of Commerce and Industry, announced the Botswana Government's decision to have the communities move out of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve on October 12, 1986.

In 1992, a survey of the situation of San in Ghanzi District was done by Alice Mogwe (see Mogwe 1992). The report drew international attention to the plight of the San, and led to concerns being expressed about the human rights situation in Botswana by various governments, including the United States, the United Kingdom, Norway, Sweden, and the Netherlands. It also led to internal investigations and statements of commitment by government to fair and equitable treatment of Botswana citizens.

### The Founding of San Organizations

The struggle over the rights of San contributed to the desire of local people in Botswana to establish

their own non-government organizations. The first fully San organization, First People of the Kalahari (FPK, also called Kgeikani Kweni), was founded in 1992-93 in Botswana. John Hardbattle, a Nharo San from Buitsavango in the eastern Ghanzi District, and other San representatives the Botswana Society attended a workshop on "Sustainable Rural Development" held by the Botswana Society in Gaborone from April 13-15, 1992. The San spoke out forcefully at that workshop on the problem of the alienation from land and natural resources that they had experienced.

The San took note of their concern about the possible forced resettlement of residents from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, which they said would be harmful to the well being of local people. One of the recommendations that came out of the Botswana Society workshop in 1992 was that a national San organization be established. First People of the Kalahari was formed conceptually in 1992, and it was registered officially as a non-government organization in Botswana in July, 1993. There were a number of people from different San groups on the Board of FPK, including Aron Johannes (Nharo), Roy Sesana (G//ana), John Hardbattle (Nharo), Saikuta (G/wi), Gomme Kgao (Ju/'hoansi), and Tsao (Ju/'hoansi). A major goal of FPK was to promote the land rights of the San people, including those in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, to promote the human rights of people in the Ghanzi, Ngamiland, and Kgalagadi Districts of Botswana, and to raise awareness of the plight of the San generally.

#### Plans for the Removal of Residents of the Reserve

In the 1970s and 1980s, recommendations were made by ecologists and environmental organizations that the people of the CKGR should be relocated outside of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. Several reasons were given. First, it was suggested that the people of the central Kalahari were no longer "traditional" since they lived in stationary villages, kept domestic stock, and hunted with the aid of guns, horses, donkeys, and dogs. Second, it was argued that the people were having a negative impact on the wildlife in the reserve through their hunting activities. Third, it was noted that the reserve would have greater tourist value if it was "pristine" (i.e. if there were no people living inside the reserve). Fourth, it was pointed out that having all of the people grouped in a single location outside of the reserve would facilitate the provision of development services by government, including water, health, and education. Finally, it was noted that if local people were relocated to other areas, it would be easier to deal with them administratively.

In the mid-1980s, the Government of Botswana decided to investigate the status and conditions of the Central Kalahari Reserve and its residents. In 1985 a government commission was appointed to make recommendations as to the future of the reserve. The commission that was appointed did not include any representatives who were residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (Government of Botswana 1985). The commission's work consisted of interviews of government officials, reviews of documentary information on the Central Kalahari, and assessments of statements submitted by individuals. The commission itself was controversial; one member of the commission resigned in protest over the way in which the investigation was handled. Several members of the commission argued vociferously for greater consultation with those people in the central Kalahari who would be most affected by any decisions made about the future of the region, but the government position (which was never announced formally) was that direct consultation with the people of the central Kalahari should be kept to a minimum. Some of the people in the central Kalahari at that time (the mid-1980s) maintained that the government of Botswana was deliberately trying to prevent the spread of information

about the fact that there were investigations being done which had the potential of leading to the removal of local people.

In 1986, the government of Botswana published a circular on the Central Kalahari Game Reserve that stated that the conservation status of the central Kalahari should be maintained as a reserve and that residents of the reserve should be encouraged to move elsewhere (Ministry of Commerce and Industry 1986). From that time until 1997, various pressures were brought to bear on people inside the reserve to encourage them to move outside the reserve. One way this was done was through a policy of "freezing" development in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. When the borehole at !Xade, the largest community in the reserve, broke down, it took months before it was fixed. Buildings and roads were not maintained in the reserve except for those going to Department of Wildlife and National Parks camps and mining exploration camps such as those around Gope in the southeastern portion of the reserve. According to local people the drought relief feeding programs were implemented more slowly and less effectively in the central Kalahari than elsewhere in Botswana, a situation that threatened the well being of people in several parts of the reserve. An additional problem was the infrequency of visits by health teams.

The government of Botswana maintained that the reasons for moving people out of the reserve were (1) it was too expensive to provide services to such a remote and scattered population, (2) people and wildlife were incompatible in a game reserve, and (3) more effective development assistance could be provided in a location that was closer to roads, air strips, and other infrastructure. The government also maintained that an important aspect of the central Kalahari was conservation, something that, it was argued, could be beneficial to the tourism industry in Botswana (Ministry of Commerce and Industry 1986). A series of public meetings, known in Botswana as kgotla meetings, were held in which government officials discussed the findings of the commission and the decision of the government to have people resettle outside of the reserve. One of the complaints made by local people was that "their voices were not heard" in these discussions because, as they noted, they had little opportunity to respond to the statements of government officials.

Two of the major goals of Botswana are (1) to increase production and (2) to promote economic self-sufficiency (Ministry of Finance and Development Planning 1991, 1997; Republic of Botswana 1975). Many Botswana planners believe that the quickest way to bring about economic growth in the country is to expand industries that have highest rates of return, one of which was tourism. The Central Kalahari Game Reserve Fact Finding Mission recommended that the Department of Wildlife and National Parks take immediate steps to tap the tourism potential of the reserve (Government of Botswana 1985:37). One way of doing this would have been to have local people take part in community-based tourism operations. Another strategy, which the government elected to follow, was to remove the people and to allow safari companies to bring in tourists who would be able to see what they believed to be "the unspoiled wilderness," of the Kalahari Desert.

Part of the reason that tourists wanted to visit the Central Kalahari was that they wished to see wildlife in a relatively undisturbed set of habitats and the people that interact with those animals. Some tourists were attracted to the region because of the attention that it got in books and films (e.g. the books by Elizabeth Marshall Thomas [1958], by Mark and Delia Owens [1984] and the film People of the Great Sand Face by Paul Myburgh [1986]). Others came because they wished specifically to view and camp in unique habitats such as pans (clay depressions fringed by dunes and vegetation) and fossil river

valleys. At least two tourists said in interviews that they hoped to find archaeological remains. .

Detailed suggestions for tourism development were provided in the Management Plan for the Central Kalahari and Khutse Game Reserves (Kalahari Conservation Society 1988:43-50, 97-89). Little mention was made in this report of the local population other than the suggestion that employment opportunities in tourism should be created for people in the region (Kalahari Conservation Society 1988:63). It is important to note that when this report was done, the consultant was told specifically not to talk to people in the reserve and he was also told to downplay the fact that there were people living in the reserve. One possible reason for this admonition was that it was assumed that by the time the recommendations were implemented, the residents would have been resettled outside of the reserve and thus not be part of the planning process.

Besides land rights, a major issue of concern to the G/wi, G//ana, and other people of the central Kalahari was that relating to subsistence hunting rights. When the Reserve was first declared in 1961, it was agreed that residents would continue to have the right to hunt for subsistence purposes (Silberbauer 1965, 1981). Some restrictions were placed on this right when the CKGR Regulations were promulgated in 1963 (Silberbauer 1965; Hitchcock 1988). After 1979, local hunters were allowed to obtain a specified number of wild animals legally as long as they had in their possession a Special Game License (SGL) under the Unified Hunting Regulations of Botswana (Republic of Botswana 1979; Hitchcock and Masilo 1995). These licenses were still being issued for the Central Kalahari Game Reserve by the Regional Wildlife Officer (RWO) in Ghanzi, the district capital, in 1999, unlike some other parts of Botswana such as North West and Central Districts, where the granting of Special Game Licenses had been stopped altogether (Hitchcock and Masilo 1995; Hitchcock et al 1996). The topic of Special Game Licenses was seen as an important one by the people of the central Kalahari, since the failure to be in possession of an SGL while hunting could lead to arrest and detention, sometimes for extended periods of time. Such a situation did, in fact, occur, with the arrest of 13 men from New !Xade who were found hunting inside the CKGR in 1998.

Hunting proved to be a sensitive issue in the central Kalahari. One of the arguments that was made by ecologists (e.g. Owens and Owens 1981) was that the people of the Central Kalahari should not be allowed to hunt in the reserve "because they were no longer living traditional lives." By "traditional lives," they meant that they were now sedentary, keeping livestock, and hunting with the aid of dogs and horses and using modern weapons. It was suggested that the San were responsible for the loss of wildlife in the central Kalahari region. The Kalahari Conservation Society's planning document (Kalahari Conservation Society 1988:35, Table 3) estimated that hartebeest declined 86.1% and wildebeest 99% between March, 1979 and March, 1987. Whereas it was maintained that the losses of wildlife were due primarily to hunting activities of local people, the data suggest otherwise. According to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks' Research Division, between 1987 and the early 1990s, the biomass in the central Kalahari increased substantially. The only large mammals that showed any evidence of having declined were giraffes, and these animals were not being hunted by residents because they were off-limits according to Botswana faunal conservation legislation (Government of Bechuanaland 1961; Hitchcock 1988; Republic of Botswana 1992). Some antelope species, including hartebeest, wildebeest, and gemsbok, increased significantly, and according to the Department of Wildlife and National Parks' aerial census data, overall biomass in the reserve more than doubled between 1986 and 1996 (Department of Wildlife and National Parks, personal communication, 1998).

One of the arguments about the role of people in the reserve revolved around hunting practices and the sustainability of the hunting activities of people residing in the reserve. Data collected by

Tanaka (1980) in the Central Kalahari in 1968-69 indicated that a total of 5,600 kg of meat were obtained by a group of 50 people, or about 112 kg per person and 0.3 kg per person per day (Tanaka 1980:66-69, Tables 10 and 11). According to George Silberbauer (1981a, b), based on data obtained in the late 1950s and early 1960s, a band of 80 G/wi hunter-gatherers in the central Kalahari killed 14 species of mammals not including rodents, with the prey items ranging from springhare to giraffe. The total amount of meat obtained in a one-year period, including the meat of the mammals, birds, tortoises, reptiles, and invertebrates, was 8,630 kg, and the meat available per capita was 108 g (Silberbauer 1981: 483-487 and Table 12.3). The animals taken over the year varied considerably on a month-to-month basis, from a low of 128 kg in October (at the end of the dry season) to a high of 1,388 kg in January (at the height of the wet season). The amounts of meat available in the early summer period (September to November) fell below the minimum adult daily requirement (MDR) of protein (Silberbauer 1981:487, Figure 12.2).

Between the late 1960s and the 1980s, significant changes occurred in the subsistence hunting system in the Central Kalahari. One part of this change relates to the expansion of the number of horses in the reserve. By the early 1980s, there was a total of 20 horses and 70 donkeys being kept by the people of !Xade, then the main settlement in the reserve (Osaki 1980 p. 52). As Osaki (1984) has demonstrated, equestrian hunting was very effective. In a five-month period in 1982-83, a total of 91 large animals were obtained by hunters from !Xade (Osaki 1984:52-54, Table 1). The estimated total amount of meat obtained in that period was 23,700 kilograms. Of that amount, 22,800 kilograms of meat were obtained with the aid of horses. The balance was gotten either with bows and arrows or with spears and dogs (Osaki 1984:53). The area over which hunters ranged in search of game increased to 5,000 square kilometers, and the numbers of group expedition hunts in which people attempted to obtain several large animals at a time increased significantly (Osaki 1984:53-56). Long distance hunting was also facilitated by using donkeys to transport meat back to camp (Osaki 1984; Hitchcock 1988).

The changes in hunting methods and the increased effectiveness of hunting from horseback in the central Kalahari contributed to the growing perception among ecologists, environmental non-government organizations, and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks in Botswana that efforts were needed to stop hunting on the part of the residents of the reserve. One way to do this was to remove the residents of the central Kalahari to locations outside of the reserve and to turn the Central Kalahari Game Reserve into a full-fledged game reserve where people were not allowed to hunt whatsoever. Another way was to cease giving out Special Game Licenses (SGLs).

For a while in the CKGR the numbers of wild animals appeared to have declined considerably, but the numbers have increased in recent years. The primary factors involved in the decline in wildlife numbers were not so much a product of subsistence hunting but rather drought, habitat change due to the expansion of boreholes, livestock populations and cattle posts on the peripheries of the reserve, and the heightened presence of tourists and mining personnel in the reserve. As some of the people in the Central Kalahari have argued, preventing subsistence hunters from operating in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve may, in fact, actually lead to greater pressure on the wildlife resources of the reserve. Discussions with hunters in and around the Central Kalahari in 1978, 1988, 1995, and 2000 indicated that fewer people were engaging in hunting, and those that did hunt were going after only those animals listed on the Special Game Licenses.

The problems surrounding rights to wildlife and subsistence hunting have continued into the new millennium, with 13 San from New !Xade having been arrested allegedly for hunting illegally

inside the CKGR. At least some of these men, if not all of them, were in possession of Special Game Licenses, which theoretically should have meant that they had the right to hunt inside the CKGR. As of early 2000, no decisions had been made on their legal case.

### Resettlement and the Central Kalahari Game Reserve

In March, 1997, the Minister of Local Government, Lands, and Housing of Botswana requested that the Botswana Parliament approve a budget of P6,000,000 (P1 = US \$0.22) for the resettlement of people outside of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. Most of these funds were to be used in the development of New !Xade, a settlement located just outside the boundaries of the reserve in the Okwa Wildlife Management Area. The Ghanzi District is 117,910 sq km in size, nearly 45% of which is made up of Wildlife Management Areas and conservation land, including the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, which is considered state land. In the Ghanzi District, as is the case in other districts in Botswana, individuals in local communities must apply to the Ghanzi Land Board for land for arable, residential, and business purposes. The land to which people were moved is designated as being primarily for wildlife-related usage (e.g. safari hunting, ecotourism) under Botswana's conservation legislation.

In May-June, 1997, the government of Botswana went ahead with its intentions of resettling the people of !Xade, the largest community in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. There were also people from communities in the south-central part of the CKGR who were resettled in Kweneng District. The resettlement of the people of !Xade to New !Xade in the Okwa Wildlife Management Area of Ghanzi District has had significant impacts on a population that in early 2000 numbered over 1,100 people. At this stage, there are some 400-450 people left in the Central Kalahari, many of them in a few settlements (see Table 2 for a summary of the data on the population of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve between 1988-89 and 1999).

A major difficulty that arose in the course of the relocation process was that the compensation payments that were made to people were, from all reports, either not forthcoming, or they were too low to enable the resettled households to restore their livelihoods to the levels that existed prior to the relocation. What this means is that the resettlement has led to a reduction in the quality of life of the people who were moved. Thus, the resettlement process did not meet international standards as outlined by the World Bank and other agencies.

People still residing in the CKGR as well as those outside are highly uncertain about the future and even distressed about their chances for being able to develop in areas where they reside at present. San organizations, local community leaders, and advocacy groups all maintain that it is necessary to gain not just de facto control over land and resources in their areas, but also de jure legal control. One way to do this is to negotiate binding agreements with government agencies (e.g. the district land board), while another is to seek recognition of land and resource rights through the courts.

Of the representatives of households in West Hanahai and East Hanahai settlements in Ghanzi District who were interviewed in August, 1999, only 60% had a Land Board certificate for their plots. When land board members were asked why San were sometimes not given land board certificates, it was noted that it was because there was a possibility that people would be relocated to places away from their present settlements. This issue of potential resettlement is a tremendously sore point among the San and other peoples of western Botswana. People East Hanahai, for example, said that they had been informed by the Land Board and by other Ghanzi District and central government officials that they



were going to be relocated to another place in the district. Others said that only those with large herds of livestock would be relocated. A third group said that everyone would be relocated except for the children, who would be able to stay in East Hanahai to attend school. It was clear that there was a great deal of confusion and uncertainty surrounding the land situation in East Hanahai. This was one of the reasons that not much progress had been made on establishing development projects in East Hanahai (Bollig et al 2000).

People in Ghanzi and other parts of Botswana understand that they can apply for rights over community-controlled hunting areas (CCHAs). Some of the San in Ghanzi and Ngamiland (North West District) have taken the opportunity to apply for rights in these areas, and they were successful in two cases: (1) /Xai/Xai in western Ngamiland, which formed the /Xai/Xai Tlhabololo Trust in October, 1997, and (2) Groot Laagte and Qabo in northern Ghanzi District, which formed the Huiku Trust in the Groot Laagte Wildlife Management Area in May, 1999.

Yet another issue that has arisen in discussions both with people in the reserve and with non-government organizations is the degree to which mining operations are having an impact on the central Kalahari Game Reserve and its habitats and people. A major mining strike was made by De Beers, the diamond mining company, at Gope in the southeastern portion of the CKGR in the 1980s. This mine is slated to be developed. As one G//ana man from the CKGR put it, "So much for conserving the environment in the central Kalahari." Mineral exploration camps have been established recently (as of September, 1999) within 20 kilometers of a large settlement in the northeastern CKGR, Molapo. The workers staying at the mining camp have gone to Molapo to seek meat, for which they pay either cash or, in some cases, beer, wine, or hard liquor. Some of the local people are concerned about the increased availability of alcohol, which has social and physiological costs ranging from interpersonal violence to premature mortality. They are also worried about the possibility of people being infected with diseases, including HIV/AIDS.

The people of Ghanzi whose territories lie within the boundaries of the reserve wish to be able to continue to use the Central Kalahari and its resources. Some of these people have pointed out to the San NGOs working with them that they wished to collaborate with the Botswana Government, particularly the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, in the implementation of community-based resource management project activities in the reserve. They suggested that it would be useful to engage in small-scale community-based tourism (CBT), and they noted that they were willing to collaborate with DWNP as well as with private sector partners willing to do small-scale, relatively inexpensive tourism activities in the Central Kalahari.

It is ironic, local people argue, that the land and resources of the Central Kalahari are now being exploited not by the people who had lived there and managed the resources for generations, but rather by outsiders, including sizable numbers of tourists as well as mining companies. The question that local people ask is whether or not the Government of Botswana actually intends to promote conservation of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, or whether it is using the conservation and sustainable development rhetoric as a means of getting other governments to go along with their efforts to promote the interests of large-scale well-to-do agencies and individuals at the expense of the local communities.

The current wildlife policy of Botswana empowers the DWNP to work out arrangements with local communities and district authorities on how the wildlife resources within their areas will be handled. Local communities not only can apply for the wildlife quota, but they can also lease out some or all of that quota to private safari operators. Alternatively, they can keep the quota for themselves and

use it for subsistence purposes or not use it at all, making the choice instead to conserve it for the future. The rules by which the communities operate are made by community members and their local institutions in conjunction with district authorities and the DWNP (Botswana Natural Resources Management Project 1999). In some cases, communities have sought the advice of non-government organizations to assist in establishing policies and programs at the local level.

While wildlife ownership resides with the state in Botswana, this is not the case for wild plants on communal land. The laws of Botswana do not specify ownership or use rights of wild plant (veld) products. The only restriction on veld products relates to one species, devil's claw (also known as grapple plant, sengaparile, Harpogophytum procumbens). One must obtain a license from the Agricultural Resources Board (ARB) to harvest grapple plant commercially. In Botswana, therefore, veld products are essentially an open access resource. Thus, controlling access, a basic responsibility of management, is a very difficult issue. CBNRM does not, and cannot under the law in Botswana, promote community ownership of either wildlife or veld products. The only way a community can de jure ownership rights over land and natural resources is to purchase freehold land, something that is impossible for most rural residents, who generally lack sufficient cash to pay for the land. One strategy, which has been used to good effect in Ghanzi, North West, and Kgalagadi Districts, is to establish quota management committees (QMCs) and community trusts and to register blocks of land with the district councils and the land boards.

Some San in Botswana have sought to register land and gain title over it (Hitchcock 1978, 1986; Wily 1979, 1982, 1994; Chr. Michelsen Institute 1996). In order to do this, they have gone through adjudication processes, those legal steps whereby decisions are made about claims to land (e.g. determining prior claims). This is similar to a kind of title search in contemporary real estate law. Regularization of land includes establishing areas that are recognized legally. In order to do this, careful surveys must be done of areas that take into account both de facto (customary) and de jure (legal) claims to land. These surveys include (1) interviews of local people, (2) assessments of archival materials, (3) evaluations of records in Land Boards and the files of government land ministries and the Attorney General's Chambers, and (4) mapping of areas using aerial photographs and space imagery.

In some cases, as in the case of the !Goshe area of western Ngamiland, mapping efforts were undertaken (Albertson 2000). Two people from First People of the Kalahari, Jumonda Gakelebone and Musodi Gakelekgolle, were trained in the course of this mapping process, and hopefully, they will be putting their training to use in the CKGR mapping exercises that are on-going. These mapping exercises have enabled local groups to participate extensively in the identification and demarcation of their traditional areas. The impacts of these efforts range from enhanced knowledge of groups' resources to greater degrees of social political cohesion.

Some communities have gone through adjudication processes, those legal steps whereby decisions are made about claims to land (e.g. the determination of prior claims). This was done by San who were affected by the establishment of commercial ranches under the Tribal Grazing Land Policy (TGLP) (see Hitchcock 1978; Wily 1979, 1982). Local people made their case during adjudication hearings that were advertised by district land boards and what was then the Ministry of Local Government and Lands. In the case of state land, it was the Department of Surveys and Lands that held the adjudication meetings (e.g. in the case of the Nata Ranches that were allocated in the late 1970s in Central District).

A major effort of San NGOs has been to get land set aside for use by local people. They have a

clear strategy for doing this. They engage in Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRAs), careful consultation, community meetings, training, oral history information collection, mapping of the boundaries and of the important resource localities and culturally significant places in the territories, and they assist in the application to the Land Board for the land (Bollig et al 2000; Albertson 2000).

A meeting was held on community mapping in Windhoek, Namibia on February 26, 2000 that was attended by various groups involved in mapping in southern Africa. People who took part in this meeting included Hugh Brody and Nigel Crawhall of Open Channels and SASI who are working community mapping of the Kalahari Gemsbok Park and surrounding areas. Representatives of Kuru Development Trust (Rein Dekker), the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (Axel Thoma, Joram /Useb), and First People of the Kalahari (Ivan Baehr) also attended the meeting. WIMSA is coordinating work in Namibia and will help facilitate the mapping of the Hai//om areas in and around the Etosha National Park. One of the goals of the meeting was to set some priorities in community mapping. It was decided that these will be (1) Kalahari Gemsbok, (2) the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, and (3) Etosha. It should be noted that all of these places are protected areas. It will be necessary for the mapping exercises to focus not only on the parks and reserves themselves but also on the adjacent areas (the buffering zones).

A detailed mapping exercise was done by Arthur Albertson and a team from Kuru Development Trust of the Ncgwahom area (NG 10 and 11), a region covering 800 square kilometers and containing some 5,000 people, including Mbukushu, Bayei, Herero, and Bugakwe and G//anikwe San. The planning for this area included what has become a "cultural trail" from Kapatura north of the Okavango River and close to the Namibian border to a point some 30 km downriver. There are a number of communities along this route that could potentially benefit from the cultural trail once tourists are brought in. It is hoped that formal relationships can be established with tourism companies that will then provide fees to local communities. It should be noted, however, that concentrating a great deal of investment and effort on tourism may prove to be a risky strategy. Thought needs to be given to diversifying the production systems of the communities and to having a variety of different options for local people to generate income.

The !Goshe region, which was mapped by the Kuru team in 1999, covers some 1,400 sq km, with the community of !Goshe at its center. The n!oresi (traditional territories of the Ju/'hoansi San) related to !Goshe differ in status and importance (Albertson 2000). There is a hierarchy of significance of the territories based primarily on the reliability of local water supplies. Veld foods were of secondary significance, and hunted foods (fauna) were of tertiary importance. The most important n!oresi were those that had reliable water that was permanent and not affected by droughts. There were others that lacked dry season water points that were occupied only during the wet season or during foraging trips.

In western Ngamiland the traditional land use system still influences the contemporary land use patterns. N!ore kxausi (traditional territory 'owners') are still recognized, although the degree of their authority has lessened somewhat. Most people still hunt and gather in their original n!oresi. Today, however, people remain primarily in core n!oresi such as !Goshe where there are both water and social services. The centralization process has led to resource depletion in the vicinity of the main n!oresi (e.g. G!oshe, /Xai/Xai, Dobe). This is one of the reasons that people wish to move out to their other n!oresi. A major question for the people is what will happen if they move out to the peripheral n!oresi and stay there permanently. Theoretically, they can establish water points in their new localities once the Land Board makes the land allocation formally. This assumes that the Land Board will accept the detailed

land management plan based on the community mapping done in the area.

Among the Ju/'hoansi San, resources in the territories are supposed to be shared among the members of the land-holding group. This sort of sharing has an information-spreading function as well as a risk-reduction one in areas of patchy rainfall. The sharing of resource areas associated with territories is organized along lines of kinship, historical association, and specific local resource availability. This system provided a flexible, yet generally agreed upon, method for adapting socially and numerically to a resource situation that was often relatively unpredictable.

One of the strategies for coping with drought or resource failure employed by the Ju/'hoansi and other San was to request permission to move to another group's territory which had sufficient resources to sustain a larger number of people. Usually people asked permission to visit the territories of people with whom they already had social ties, such as those created through marriage (affinal ties) or ones that came about through trade partnerships (e.g. hxaro ties, long-term reciprocal exchange relationships). If the territory owners feel that there are enough resources available in their area, they will give permission for other people to enter. Herein lies the problem. The Ju/'hoansi, who have long-standing social and economic ties to Herero and Batawana, may be unwilling to refuse permission to those people who request access rights. The end result could be that the areas that they have mapped and obtained rights over fill up with people who then compete with one another for resources.

The sub-land board at Gomare in Ngamiland has declared that the people of Dobe and !Goshe will be able to get Land Board certificates for their n!oresi. Once these are certificates are issued, which has to be done by the main Tawana Land Board in Maun, the people can go ahead with the next stage of the process which is detailed land use planning. After those plans are made and agreement is reached on where they will establish boreholes and wells, the communities will then start the drilling of the boreholes and preparation of the n!oresi for occupation by people and their herds. The key to success of these efforts will be detailed consultation, negotiation, and wide-ranging participation on the part of all local people.

The territories of the Ju/'hoansi, G/wi, G//ana, Nharo, Kua, and other San are used to meet the basic needs of local people. In some cases, these needs are met through the exploitation of resources, which are then sold for cash. The money is then used to purchase goods such as blankets, soap, or iron pots, to pay school fees, or to invest in productive assets such as livestock. San women and men maintain that subsistence is far more than simply a means of making a living. They see it also as a complex system of obligation, distribution, and exchange that is crucial to the well-being of both subsistence producers and market-oriented producers. Without these reciprocal exchange systems, people's quality of life would be much worse, and levels of social conflict would be higher than they are at present.

A classic example of this situation is the manufacture and exchange of ostrich eggshell bead necklaces and bracelets that occurs in the northwestern, western, and central Kalahari. The egg of the ostrich (Struthio camelus) is an important wild resource that women and sometimes men exploit extensively. San women manufacture beads from broken pieces of ostrich eggshell, and both women and men decorate whole ostrich eggs by carving designs in them with a pointed tool. The exchange of these items links people together in a complex system of mutual reciprocity in the Kalahari Desert. At the same time, the manufacture and sale of ostrich eggshell items is an important source of income for a sizable number of San households. The ostrich eggshell items are sold to the various craft organizations

operating in rural Botswana, including Kuru Development Trust, Gantsicraft, and Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust.

The problem facing women and other people who utilize ostrich eggshell products now is that the government of Botswana established a new Ostrich Policy in 1994 (Republic of Botswana 1994). This policy stipulates that people must obtain licenses from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks before they can obtain and sell ostrich-related products. Fees must be paid in order to obtain the permit. Another stipulation of the policy is that ostrich eggshells are to be collected only from April to August. In addition, organizations involved in ostrich egg collection must establish a facility where the shells are kept, and the premises are supposed to be inspected on a regular basis by the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP file WP UTI, Vol. VI, 2. Game Farming, 3. Ostrich).

San women in rural Botswana are worried that the Ostrich Policy will result in their being arrested. Some women, such as those in East Hanahai in Ghanzi District, have attempted to establish ostrich user groups, but it has taken them years to get the license necessary to exploit and sell ostrich products (Hitchcock and Masilo 1995). The DWNP has argued that women's groups have to be organized and recognized officially before they will grant them an ostrich egg collecting quota. The East Hanahai Women Ostrich Eggshell Collecting Group was formed in 1993 and made a formal request for a quota in November, 1993. This request was not acted on until 1995, and a permit was issued on 8 June 1995 (DWNP file WP UTI 2/3, Vol. VI, 2). In September, 1994, Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust sent a letter to the DWNP in which they asked about the policy concerning ostrich eggshell collection. Subsequently, on March 31, 1995, they made a formal request for a Directors Permit to Collect Hatched Ostrich Eggshells. The Department of Wildlife and National Parks granted them this permit on May 5, 1995 (DWNP file WP UTI 2/3, Vol. VI, 2). What this means, in effect, is that MTDT can potentially serve as a repository for ostrich eggs, which can then be allocated to individuals for craft production purposes.

There is still some uncertainty over the timing of egg collection, general reporting procedures, and the rights of people to collect eggs in the field. One of the Regional Wildlife Officers interviewed in 1995 argued that the manufacture of ostrich eggshell products by NGOs was illegal because it would contravene Section 65 of the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act of 1992. This section states that "No person other than the holder of a trophy dealer's license shall employ or engage any other person to manufacture any article from any trophy" (Republic of Botswana 1992:A.155). If hatched egg pieces are considered to be trophies, which the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act appears to suggest, then this would mean that women in craft groups in central and western Botswana are potentially breaking the law. Ironically, the Ostrich Management Plan Policy maintains that wild ostrich eggs can be harvested for food and as the raw material for traditional craft items. The conflict between the Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act and the Ostrich Management Plan Policy leaves ostrich eggshell collectors and craft producers in a position where they could be viewed as violating the law on the one hand or complying with it on the other. This policy conflict must be resolved in order to safeguard the rights of people in remote and rural areas in Botswana.

Given that ostrich egg products are an important source of women's income, the new policy has the potential for harming not only rural women but their families as well. It is apparent that women must be incorporated more directly into the planning and implementation of wild resource management and development projects. This will ensure that these initiatives do not favor males over females and that equity and broad-based community participation are achieved.

Kuru Development Trust and Maiteko Tshwaragango, along with Gantsicraft, have assisted people in and around the central Kalahari by purchasing crafts and other items, thus providing a source of income to local people. Other non-government organizations working in western Botswana have assisted San, as well, one example being Permaculture, which has provided San in some of the Ghanzi settlements with advice on how to go about engaging in sustainable agriculture and construction of homes.

Kuru Development Trust personnel have worked with local people on the raising of cochineal (*Dactylopius coccus*), a small insect that feeds on prickly pear cactus (*Opuntia ficus indica*). Cochineal is used for the manufacture of carmine dye, which is used in food coloring and cosmetics. While a number of communities in the Ghanzi District in Botswana are involved in the cochineal project activities of Kuru Development Trust (see, for example, Bollig *et al* 2000) people in the central Kalahari communities have not been involved in this activity. One strategy for FPK to pursue would be to invite some of the members of the Natural Resource and Extension Section of Kuru Development Trust to accompany them on trips into the Central Kalahari Game Reserve so that they could discuss with local people the possibility of engaging in cochineal production. Another strategy would be for IWGIA to consider examining the possibility of bringing in a cochineal marketing expert in order to make recommendations to the communities in Ghanzi as to how best to market their products.

### Conclusions

The Central Kalahari case provides an excellent example of some of the kinds of responses that local people in southern Africa are employing to deal with the situations they are facing as a result of wildlife preservation and management efforts. The San organized themselves at the grassroots level in order to draw attention to some of the problems that they were facing. They sought international attention through going to meetings and holding press conferences as well as through networking and coordinating their activities with a variety of kinds of support groups, including other San non-government organizations, human rights groups such as Ditshwanelo, and law firms such as Chennels Albertyn in South Africa.

Throughout the 1990s central Kalahari San sought to gain greater control over their areas so that they could utilize local natural resources for their own benefit. In order to do so, they realized, they needed to have the rights to their areas better defined. They also came to the conclusion that they needed to have legal representation in order to press their case for land and resource rights.

A strategy that was employed by the people of the central Kalahari was to form linkages with individuals who could assist them in their efforts to organize. One example of such an individual was Dr. Samora Sefapaano Gaborone, a lecturer in Adult Education at the University of Botswana. Dr. Gaborone had worked with the San residing in the village of Khwaai on the northern margins of the Moremi Game Reserve and had experience in dealing with government. First People of the Kalahari drew on the services of Dr. Gaborone, who assisted them in identifying some of the problems with the ways in which government policies were being implemented in the central Kalahari case (see Gaborone 1997).

A second strategy was to form a negotiating team consisting of San representatives from the various communities in the CKGR (7 at the time the team was established) and San non-government organizations, including FPK, Kuru, and WIMSA. Representatives of the negotiating team met with the

out-going President of Botswana, H.E. Sir Ketumile Masire, on March 24, 1998. According to members of the negotiating team, the meeting was conducted in a cordial atmosphere and President Masire was very receptive to the team. President Masire even agreed to assist the team should they need advice after he left office.

Judging from the analysis of the central Kalahari case, it is evident that the Government of Botswana needs to reassess its policies on natural resource management, development, and consultation, especially as they pertain to the rights of G/wi and G//ana San and others who are heavily dependent on wildlife and other natural resources. If this is not done, the problem of acute poverty will persist, and Botswana will not have fulfilled its goals of promoting participation, fairness, and social justice.

As LeRoux (1996) has argued, it is important to carry out "community-owned development" in which local people have control over all aspects of development, from needs assessments to project planning, and from development project implementation to monitoring and evaluation. Building on the cultural values of the group or community is essential. There are some basic principles by which San populations operate, including (1) respect for the land, (2) consensus-based decision-making, (3) sharing and reciprocal use and exchange of resources, information, and indigenous knowledge, (4) gender equity, and (5) mutual respect for people=s ideas, values, and ideology. By incorporating these principles into a holistic development approach, it may well be possible to bring about local empowerment and to promote sustainable, community-owned development and human rights for all.

