

(2002) Paper presented at
CHAGS 9, Edinburgh, Scotland, 9-13 September 2002

<http://www.abdn.ac.uk/chags9/Hitchcock.htm>

Robert K. Hitchcock

CONSERVATION, PRESERVATION, AND SUSTAINABLE USE:
CONFLICT AND COOPERATION IN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT
AMONG KALAHARI SAN¹

p17 → locations of reserves + trust
inhabitant

Introduction

CURRENT
LOCATIONS

Many of the issues facing indigenous peoples today -- including the San of southern Africa -- are the result of global processes, including international economic development, the transboundary movement of goods and services, environmental change, and competition for resources. Today, another global process, the world wide effort of indigenous peoples and their supporters to develop and enforce international standards relating to indigenous rights, has the potential of redressing some past injustices and ameliorating present circumstances (Anaya 1996; Cohen 1998; Bodley 1999). For the 550-650,000,000 indigenous people on the planet today, including some 90,000 San (Bushmen, Basarwa) in Southern Africa, it is crucial to identify and implement the best combination of legislation, policies, and governance systems in an effort to promote human rights and to enhance living standards while at the same time ensuring that environments and ecosystem processes are protected so that future generations can sustain themselves.

Of the world's contemporary peoples, those groups defined as indigenous tend to be over represented in the categories of those lacking basic human rights, living below the poverty datum line (PDL), and working for others under exploitative or unjust conditions (Maybury Lewis 1997; Bodley 1999). The indicators of indigenous peoples' deprivation are stark. They tend to have some of the lowest health and nutritional standards, the highest rates of unemployment, the lowest incomes, the highest infant mortality rates, the shortest life spans, and the lowest degrees of political participation of the various categories of people in the countries in which they reside.

For the past several decades, since the late 1960s, the indigenous peoples of the world -- including some who are hunter-gatherers -- have sought to have their civil, political, social, economic, and cultural rights recognized (Wilmer 1993; Bieseke, Schweitzer, and Hitchcock 2000). They have done so through a number of means. Passive resistance methods, building on the approaches of Mahatma Gandhi of India and Martin Luther King, Jr. of the United States, have been employed to significant effect by a number of indigenous groups in various parts of the world. These approaches have included labor strikes, boycotts, blockades, teach-ins and sit-ins, demonstrations, and civil disobedience.

Indigenous and other peoples have engaged in strikes for better pay and working conditions, as occurred, for example, on cattle stations in the Australian outback in the 1960s and 1970s. They have blockaded entrances to national parks, as seen, for instance, in the cases of the Penan of Malaysia in the 1980s and the Hai//om

San of Namibia in 1997. Some indigenous groups have taken legal cases to court, as was done, for example, by the Huaorani of the Oriente Region of Ecuador, who sought a judgment against the oil company Texaco in federal court in New York.

The colonization of Africa, the Americas, Australia, Asia, and the Pacific by various European nations from the 15th to the 19th centuries saw the expansion of contacts between indigenous peoples and non-indigenous governments and agencies (Perry 1996). Indigenous peoples were subjected to policies that ranged from outright genocide to paternalism and benign neglect (Bodley 1999; Totten, Parsons, and Hitchcock 2002). Some groups chose to accept their situations, others resisted what they saw as an onslaught, and still others took advantage of new opportunities.

From the perspective of indigenous peoples, colonization was essentially AEuropeanization,@ involving the imposition of European concepts of sovereignty, religion, and civilization. One effect, perhaps the crucial one, was the drastic reduction of indigenous peoples= land bases and their restriction to progressively smaller areas. In the United States, for example, Native Americans had surrendered 2 billion acres through treaties by 1887, leaving a residual 140 million acres. Another 90 million acres was lost through the allotment policy that operated to privatize Native American lands until 1934. As a result, today Native Americans retain less than 1 percent of the United States (Sutton 1985).

In Australia, no aboriginal title was recognized. Instead, the land was defined as terra nullius (>empty land=) and assumed to be without the impediment of indigenous rights (Young 1995). The Crown assumed title over the land, which it disposed of as it saw fit. When their lands were lost, Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islanders also lost livelihoods, graves and other sacred sites, history -- for history was written on the landscape -- and much of their religions. Europeans and their colonial offshoots offered in return their form of civilization, based on Christianity, individualism, and private property ownership.

In recent years indigenous peoples have re-asserted their rights to traditional homelands and have challenged the assumptions and mechanisms that resulted in their dispossession. In doing so, they have extracted some concessions from the still-colonizing powers that govern them. In Canada, for example, the 1982 Constitution Act formally recognized for the first time the inherent Aaboriginal rights@ of First Nations, paving the way for Supreme Court decisions that confirmed their original title to the land. And in Australia, since the June 3, 1992 High Court decision in Eddie Mabo and Others v. The State of Queensland, which affirmed aboriginal title, Aboriginals and Torres Strait Islanders have the opportunity to prove their rights to ancestral lands and to be compensated for their

losses (Young 1995).

In Africa and many parts of Asia, however, indigenous peoples have not had the same opportunities to assert their rights, especially in those areas that have been declared 'state lands.' In such countries as India, Malaysia, Indonesia, Kenya, Tanzania, the Congo, Botswana, and, until recently, South Africa, indigenous peoples have been unable to get legal rights to land recognized, in part because the governments of the nation-states in which they live do not recognize them as being indigenous and therefore as warranting protection of their civil, political, and socioeconomic rights. In many countries in Africa and Asia, the imposition of laws that govern the management of natural resources, especially wildlife and forests, has led

to people losing rights to land and resources upon which they had depended for generations. The purpose of this paper is to assess some of the evidence of conflicts and cooperation among indigenous peoples, particularly those who historically have foraged for a living, as they relate to land and wildlife conservation, preservation, and sustainable use. Particular emphasis is placed on the San of the Kalahari Desert in southern Africa who today are engaging in efforts to reclaim lands that they have lost, to obtain greater rights to natural resources, and to promote community-based conservation and development.

Wildlife Conservation Strategies

Wildlife conservation has become one of the most visible and contentious areas of conflict between indigenous peoples in Africa and the governments of the nation-states in which these groups reside (Marks 1984; Gibson 2000). Sizable numbers of indigenous and other peoples in Africa were dispossessed of their ancestral homelands as a result of the establishment of national parks, game reserves, monuments, and sanctuaries. Natural resource legislation also led to people losing the rights to hunt and gather. There are numerous cases in Africa where local people were arrested and jailed for engaging in what they believed to be culturally appropriate behavior.

The effort to save Africa's natural heritage has been seen as a moral duty for many conservationists. For purposes of this paper, I will define conservation to mean those actions and policies that are designed to prevent or mitigate resource over harvesting or environmental degradation (Smith and Wishnie 2000:501). Some of Africa's best-known conservationists, including Dian Fossey, Richard Leakey, John Waithaka, David Western, and George and Joy Adamson, are hailed by many as heroes for their efforts to conserve African wildlife. At the local level, on the other hand, conservation efforts have sometimes been viewed with suspicion by Africans because many of the strategies employed to preserve resources have infringed upon what local people see as their rights to earn a living.

Wildlife conservation strategies in Africa generally fall into four major categories: (1) species protection, (2) habitat protection, (3) control of trade in wildlife products, and (4) community-based conservation (CBC). *Species protection* is done through the enactment of wildlife legislation that stipulates that certain animals are off-limits either all of the time or at certain periods of the year. What this means, in essence, is that in order to hunt, one must obtain a license from the government. In some parts of Africa, local people are not allowed to hunt, but safari hunting companies are allowed to do so. This is the case, for example, in Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe. In order to enforce the legislation on wildlife exploitation and trade, African governments have established units within departments of wildlife and national parks to monitor wildlife areas and to enforce hunting legislation. One result of this enforcement is the arrest of local people for contravening wildlife conservation legislation.

The second category of species conservation in Africa is *habitat protection*. In Africa, this is done primarily through the establishment of conservation areas, including national parks and game reserves. Kenya alone has over 50 national parks and game reserves. The Republic of Botswana, Africa's longest-standing multiparty democracy, has devoted 17% of the total surface area of the country to national parks and game reserves. Another 34% of the land in Botswana is zoned as land in which wildlife-related activities are the major form of land use (i.e. as Wildlife Management Areas). Thus, half of Botswana's land is designated as having some form of wildlife-related use. According to estimates of the World Resources Institute, approximately 4.7% of the land of Africa is protected (Musters, de Graaf, and Keurs 2000:1759, Table 1).

This can be compared to the amount of land in Latin America and the Caribbean that is protected (11.3%). Some conservationists have argued that a target of 50% of the total surface area is needed if global biodiversity is to be protected (Musters, de Graaf, and Keurs 2000:1759). There is pressure in Africa and elsewhere to increase the amount of land under protection and to improve resource management in areas outside of protected regions.

A problem with the habitat protection approach is that often, local people were forced to leave areas that in many cases they had occupied for generations, sometimes for centuries. In numerous instances, when protected land was declared, people had to move to other areas that were more marginal ecologically and where population densities were higher. One outgrowth of these processes was that competition for resources increased in the buffer zones around protected areas. A sizable number of the people in these areas became impoverished, and number of them left their homes in order to seek work and alternative sources of income and subsistence, a process that had impacts on the stability of the family and the community.

In southern Africa, some of the people who were required to leave their homes because of the declaration of blocks of land as conservation areas were hunting-gatherers and part-time foragers. Table 1 presents data on conservation areas in southern Africa that resulted in the involuntary resettlement of local populations. Data collected among some of the people who were resettled reveal that many of them consider themselves worse off than they were before they were moved out of their areas, and socioeconomic information tends to support their positions (Hitchcock in press). This was the case, for example, among the Hai//om San of northern Namibia, who lost access to Etosha National Park in 1954. Many of the Hai//om became landless laborers on commercial farms or moved into communal (tribally-owned) areas where there were already sizable numbers of people (Widlok 1999:34-35). Similar conditions faced the Tyua of western Zimbabwe who were moved out of Hwange National Park in the 1920s (Hitchcock 1995).

The third strategy of wildlife protection is that related to the *control of trade in wildlife products*. There are several levels at which this conservation strategy is implemented. At the international level, control of trade is done through legislation relating to endangered and threatened species, notably the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna (CITES). CITES is the one of the more visible examples of international environmental law currently in force.

The control of trade is based on the assumption that wildlife products have an economic value that can be determined in monetary (e.g. dollar, yen, mark or pound) terms. An elephant, for example, has certain High Value Body Parts (notably tusks, which are made of ivory). Currently, elephants are on Appendix I of CITES, which means that no trade of elephant products can be undertaken, a decision that was made at the CITES Convention in 1989. According to local people in western Zimbabwe, including Tyua and Ndebele, the 'elephant ban' has had negative effects on their livelihoods which included the production and sale of crafts made of ivory and other elephant parts (e.g. bracelets made of elephant hair). Some people have been arrested for attempting to transport elephant products across borders in southern Africa. Several southern African countries have sought the right to sell ivory, including Botswana, Namibia, and Zimbabwe, but they have not been able to convince the international community that such sales should be allowed to take place.

While wildlife ownership resides with the state in Africa, this is not the case for wild plants on communal land. The laws of most African countries do not specify ownership or use rights of wild plant products, including those that local people use for medicinal purposes (e.g. traditional pharmaceuticals). Plant

products, with few exceptions, are essentially open access resources. It is for this reason that multinational corporations, including large-scale pharmaceutical companies, have been able to obtain wild plants that they then analyze and use to develop medicines and other economically significant products.

Currently, there is considerable controversy between indigenous peoples and multinational corporations regarding intellectual property rights, with groups such as the ?Khomani San of South Africa claiming that they should receive royalties for the use by pharmaceutical companies of plants that were utilized by local people. One of example of these plants is hoodia, a kind of cactus that contains an active ingredient used as an appetite suppressant (there are some 20 species of hoodia, are number of which are used by San, Nama, and other peoples in southern Africa. The ?Khomani and other San negotiated with the state scientific organization and pharmaceutical firms that were involved in the development of the drug and are now in a position to get at least some benefits from its sale.

There are indigenous groups, including San, who want to see greater controls exercised over the exploitation and movement across borders of plants and other economically valuable products, and they have argued for strengthening sections of CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) in order to ensure that valuable resources receive greater protection. As one San put it, "We would like to see CITES and the Convention on Biological Diversity used to control the exploitation and trade of important species that we depend on for our survival."

A fourth major conservation strategy in Africa is *community-based conservation* (CBC) or *community-based natural resource management* (CBNRM). The main idea behind community-based conservation is that communities get the rights to the benefits from natural resources. This is done through the passage of legislation to allow local or regional bodies to profit from conservation areas and from activities that take place in conservation zones such as tourism.

Allowing communities the right to obtain some of the benefits of wildlife is a relatively recent phenomenon, dating to the 1980s. Zimbabwe, for example, devolved authority over wildlife from the central government to the country's districts under a program known as CAMPFIRE -- the Communal Areas Management Program for Indigenous Resources, in 1986. In Zimbabwe, some of the districts in which CAMPFIRE exists have generated fairly sizable amounts of money that is used for development purposes such as the establishment of schools, health facilities, and community centers. In some cases, payments are given to local households in CAMPFIRE areas (Child 1995). It is important to note that in some of the districts in which community-based natural resource management programs have been implemented, the numbers of large mammals, including elephants, have increased, in part, according to some observers, because people are making greater efforts to monitor the resource base and to report the presence of individuals engaged in illegal hunting (Child 1995).

Wildlife-related tourism is a major source of income in Zimbabwe and other parts of eastern and southern Africa. Ecotourism can be defined as responsible travel that conserves natural environments and sustains the well-being of local people. Environmentally related tourism generates income for the state through gate receipts for entry into national parks and through taxes on companies and individuals involved in tourism activities. In some cases tourism benefits go to local communities through the sale of goods or through tourism-related employment.

Indigenous Peoples and Land and Resource Rights

In many parts of the world, including the Kalahari Desert and surrounding areas, "indigenouness" has taken on added political and economic significance because it is used to claim title over blocks of land, certain types of resources, development assistance, or recognition from states and intergovernmental organizations (Saugestad 2001; Hitchcock in press). Indigenous organizations, local leaders, and advocacy groups all maintain that it is necessary to gain not just de facto control over land and resources, but also de jure legal control. One way to do this is to negotiate binding agreements with states, while another is to seek recognition of land and resource rights through the courts. In the 1980s, the Ju/'hoansi of the Nyae Nyae region of northeastern Namibia sought successfully to prevent the establishment of a game reserve in their area through a carefully orchestrated lobbying and public awareness campaign (Bieseke 1994; Bieseke and Hitchcock 2000). In the new millennium (April, 2002), the San and Bakgalagadi of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve sought legal support for their land and resource rights in central Botswana, but the case was dismissed by a judge of the Botswana High Court. Currently, plans are being made for an appeal of the judgment.

A problem facing the San and other indigenous peoples in southern Africa is that the process of turning common property rights into nationally recognized legal rights is difficult if not impossible. Thus far, the only way in which San in Botswana have been able to get legal rights to land is through purchase of freehold land by a non-government organization with the aid of donor funds. Land rights of San groups have yet to be recognized by Land Boards, the land-allocating bodies in Botswana, although some San individuals have been able to get allocations of residential and business plots in some parts of the country. The real challenge is whether or not San will be able to get rights over blocks of land that correspond to their traditional ancestral territories.

Indigenous peoples are sometimes characterized by themselves and others as "guardians of the land" or as "native stewards." This argument was used, for example, by G//ana San spokesperson Roy Sesana and John Hardbattle, a Nharo San from Buitsavango in Ghanzi District, when they addressed the Human Rights Commission of the United Nations in Geneva in 1996. Anxious to ensure that the government of Botswana did not relocate the G//ana and G/ui San and Bakgalagadi outside of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, Sesana and Hardbattle argued vehemently that the best managers of natural resources -- including wildlife and wild plants such as melons -- were local peoples. Sesana and Hardbattle noted in their discussions that indigenous peoples in Botswana have been and are innovative managers of natural resources. They argued that the San were 'indigenous conservationists' who engaged actively in efforts to promote sustainable use and reduce environmental degradation.

The San of western Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa realized full well that they needed to gain greater control over their areas if they were to be able to ensure that they would have long-term occupancy and use rights. One way that they attempted to do this was to take part in countries' community-based natural resource management programs. Some San, such as the ?Khomani of South Africa, have engaged in a whole series of strategies to regain rights over land that they lost. The ?Khomani, working with a team of lawyers from South Africa, sought land rights and compensation from the government of South Africa for their ancestral lands in what is now the northern Cape region of South Africa and southern Botswana. Forced out of their ancestral territories in the 1930s when the Kalahari Gemsbok Park was established, the ?Khomani and other San dispersed, some moving to farms, others to small towns, and still others to urban areas and

mining communities. The Kalahari Gemsbok National Park was proclaimed in 1931 to conserve what the South African government felt was a unique set of habitats and resources in the southern Kalahari Desert. In 1999, the Kalahari Gemsbok Park became southern Africa's first transfrontier Park (or Peace Park, as they are sometimes known). The !Khomani made a land claim submission to the government of South Africa under the Restitution of Land Rights Act of 1994, but ended up settling out of court. The settlement was a good one for the !Khomani, who received some land and cash compensation and who will have extensive resource use rights in the southern portion of the Kalahari Gemsbok Park.

There are a number of examples in various parts of the world where indigenous peoples have been able to benefit either directly or indirectly from national parks and other kinds of conservation areas (Weber, Butler, and Larson 2000; Wyckoff-Baird et al 2000). It is not fair to say, therefore, that the establishment of protected land areas necessarily has led to dispossession of the residential and resource use rights of indigenous peoples. In fact, there are a number of parks, reserves, and monuments in various places where indigenous peoples are allowed to reside in or use resources inside of the protected areas. In a number of cases, indigenous peoples have co-management rights and participate extensively in decision-making about park planning and management (see Table 2 for some examples). Indigenous peoples in various parts of the world are pressing the governments of the countries in which they live for even greater rights than they have at present, and in some cases they are making some headway. One of the most effective strategies that indigenous peoples have employed in this effort is to establish efficient community-based organizations and institutions that are well-managed, flexible, and financially and legally responsible (Wyckoff-Baird et al 2000).

There are controversies and conflicts between conservation and development in southern Africa, with some policy makers favoring strict preservation of habitats and wildlife and other natural resources and people at the grassroots level favoring a community-based conservation that allows local people to benefit from natural resources. Such conflicts can perhaps best be seen in the arguments over the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, where the Government of Botswana decided to resettle the resident populations outside of the reserve in order to "promote development" and to "protect the environment" (Hitchcock in press). Local people (G/wi, G//ana, and Bokoongwe Bakgalagadi) argued that they should be allowed to reside in the Central Kalahari and be allowed to continue using natural resources. The Botswana government position prevailed, and in February, 2002 the residents of the Central Kalahari – barring a few individuals – were trucked out of the reserve and resettled in large government-sponsored settlements.

On the one hand, there are those in Botswana who take a strict protectionist stance, those who would like to see people removed from areas, such as national parks and game reserves, so that there is no interference between resident populations and wild animals. Some of these same people have pushed hard for the cessation of hunting and gathering altogether. In Botswana, subsistence hunters had had legal the right to hunt for specified numbers and types of animals from 1979 until the end of the millennium, when the laws were changed (Hitchcock 2000, 2001). Those people in possession of what were known as Special Game Licenses (SGLs) were allowed to hunt in the various controlled hunting areas of the country. It is interesting to note that historically people were allowed to hunt in the Central Kalahari even though it was officially a game reserve, as long as they used traditional weapons (bows, arrows, spears, and traps).

It has been argued by some in Botswana, including a number of high government officials, that allowing San and other people to continue to hunt and gather is tantamount to keeping people 'traditional' and 'preserving them in a kind of 'plastic Stone Age' for purposes of tourism. Local people, for their part, often say that they wish to maintain the option to hunt and gather as a means of providing subsistence and income

as a buffer in case their other strategies (employment, farming, herding) do not pay off sufficiently.

By 2002, the government of Botswana had withdrawn the subsistence hunting licenses, and people were not allowed to hunt for subsistence purposes unless they lived in a community-controlled hunting area where there was an officially recognized community trust with a constitution and a management plan for the area. While efforts were made to provide a diversified conservation and tourism development plan for the central Kalahari that allowed for continued community residence and resource use rights, the Botswana government chose instead to truck the last holdout residents from Central Kalahari Game Reserve. The people were dropped off in resettlement camps on the edges of the vast game reserve where they are now attempting to eke out an existence and get some of their food and water from government relief operations.

This is not the only place where the Botswana government chose to put protection of the environment over the rights of local people. Similar decisions were made concerning the Tsodilo Hills in northwestern Botswana, a unique geological area that contains granite hills that jut out of the Kalahari Desert landscape. Tsodilo contain a vast treasure trove of rock art and archaeological sites that have been studied for over two decades. These hills have been occupied for tens of thousands of years. Today, a small group of Ju/'hoansi San, approximately 40 in number, reside near the hills along with 120 or so Mbukushu, a Bantu-speaking group whose origins are from the riverine regions of southern Angola.

In 1995, the Ju/'hoansi community was resettled several away from the hills by the Botswana National Museum as a means of protecting the hills and their environmental and cultural resources. This move had impacts on the economic well-being of the Ju/'hoansi, whose incomes reportedly declined substantially. Their health also suffered; the well that had been dug for them broke down, and people from the Ju/'hoan community had to walk several miles to a borehole near the new museum where they get water. Tsodilo was declared a World Heritage Site by the United Nations Education, Cultural, and Scientific Organization (UNESCO) in 2001. The San and Mbukushu and the district and governmental authorities want to conserve the hills and at the same time benefit from the attraction that they have for visitors. In other words, local people want to be able to integrate conservation and development.

There have been some efforts by San and their neighbors to establish community-based natural resource management projects that enable people to benefit from conservation and development activities. The /Xai/Xai Tlhabololo Trust was established in 1997 in the western part of Northwest District (Ngamiland), Botswana. /Xai/Xai is found in the Wildlife Management Area (WMA) known as NG 4, which is 9,293 sq km in size. The community trust also has rights to NG 5 (7,673 sq km). The population of /Xai/Xai consists of Ju/'hoansi San and Herero (Mbanderu) (N=400). The activities in the area include leasing out of portion of hunting quota to a safari operator, gathering, subsistence hunting, crafts, and community tourism (Hitchcock *et al* 1996). In order to get an accurate understanding of the returns from safari and tourism operations, one has to count the various production factors, including inputs from wages, food provision to people, health benefits (medicines), plus the individual benefits obtained from craft sales, e.g. ostrich eggshell bead necklaces, glass bead necklaces, beaded leather bags and from engaging in activities for tourists (e.g. taking them out on gathering trips, or performing dances in exchange for payment).

The funds generated over time for community members from the CBNRM activities at /Xai/Xai were as follows: 1995-96 (Edwin Ruigrok, personal communication, 1997): hunting: 4 large antelopes (no sales), crafts: P13,500, tourism P8,000 (20 people taking part, consumer goods sales: P600, for a total of P22,100

(the Pula at that time was worth about US \$0.46). In 1998-99, according to Charlie Motshubi of SNV Botswana (personal communication, 1999), the Netherlands Development Organization, the returns for /Xai/Xai were: hunting P40,000 (20% women, 80% men, of whom most were Ju/'hoansi,) phototourism: P20,000 (60% going to women, and 40% to men, 90% of the women being Ju/'hoansi, and 10% Herero; craft production: P20,000 (60% women, 40% men (all of them Ju/'hoansi women). The total take for 1998-99 was P80,000.

In 2000 the /Xai/Xai Tlhabololo Trust made arrangements with a new safari operator who was able to get a portion of the wildlife quota (30%), the rest being set aside by the community trust board for subsistence hunting and phototourism. The community trust anticipated getting P2.5 million in hunting returns in the next two years. According to data provided by the safari operator (Bernard Horton, personal communication, 2000) 24 people were employed in 2000. One of the issues that arose related to who was able to benefit from the employment, with some concerns expressed at the local level that there was a preponderance of people from one ethnic group that got jobs.

Interethnic competition for jobs, income, and community trust management positions arose in a number of cases in Botswana, something that became especially intense in the late 1990s and early part of the new millennium. One of the outgrowths of this competition and conflict was an effort on the part of San community trust members to opt to withdraw from the trusts and attempt to set up their own community-based organizations. The community trusts in some parts of Botswana have sometimes had low levels of participation by San, especially in cases where the community trust management committees were dominated by people from other ethnic groups besides San. There have been indications that San in some community trusts want to withdraw from the existing community trusts and set up their own operations or alternatively give up on the community-based natural resource management program altogether and return to a system in which local people were able to get Special Game Licenses, the subsistence hunting licenses that were done away with when the community trusts were formed under Botswana's community-based natural resource management legislation.

Some of the most profitable community trusts in Botswana are those in Khwaai and Mababe near the northern part of Moremi Game Reserve in the Okavango Delta. The Khwaai Community Trust was established in 2000. It covers two community-controlled Wildlife Management Areas: NG 18, 1,815 sq km and NG 19, 180 sq km. The occupants of the region are Bugakwe San, Tawana, and Subiya (N=360 people). Activities include ecotourism, craft sales, work at safari lodges, and the auctioning off of a portion of the hunting quota to safari operators. The Mababe Zukutsame Community Trust was established in 1998. It is located in the Mababe WMA (NG 41, 2,045 sq km). The Mababe population is made up of Tsegakhwe San (N=400 people). Activities include ecotourism, some craft sales, and leasing out of some of the hunting quota to a safari company.

In 1999-2000 these community trusts held auctions and now each one is making one million Pula or more from their leases in which safari companies were involved. It is anticipated that Khwaai, at north gate of the Moremi Game Reserve could make as much as P4 million over the next 4 5 years if things go as anticipated. In addition to safari company returns, some of the funds generated are for guided walks, crafts, and other tourism related activities.

Not all of the community trusts are on communal (tribal) land in Botswana. Dqae Qare is a game farm and

commercial tourism operation on a plot 6,338 hectares in size 11 km north of Ghanzi Township in western Botswana. The farm is owned and managed by D=Kar community and Kuru Development Trust. Income came from the farm operation itself, plus gratuities were paid to the guides for hunting and wildlife viewing trips. There were 24 people employed on the game farm in 1999 (Bollig et al 2000). The members of the game farm did work around the farm, and some of them did traditional dances, usually at night, for the tourists, for around P200.00 per event. This game farm is a capital-intensive and management-intensive operation that requires substantial inputs by both San and other people.

The Huiku Community Trust was established in Ghanzi District in 1999. It consists of two communities, Qabo and Groot Laagte, which lie in the Groot Laagte Wildlife Management Area of Ghanzi District (GH 1, 3908, sq km) . The people who reside in this area are Nharo San, //au//ei San, Bakgalagadi, and Herero (N=1,013 people). They take part in ecotourism; they make and sell crafts, and they are planning a campsite and lodge in a nearby fossil river valley.

In the case of Kgalagadi District, the communities in the western part of the district have economic returns from hunting safari operations, which is given to family groups. The Nqwaa Khobee Xeya Trust was established on June 10, 1998 in western Kgalagadi District. The trust includes members from three communities: Ukhwi, Ncaang, and Ngwattle. The area over which the communities have control include the Wildlife Management Area known as KD 1 (12,255 sq km). The people in the communities consist of !Xo San, Bakgalagadi, and Balala (N= 800 people). The Board of the trust consists of 12 members who are elected annually, 4 from each community. The estimated direct community benefits in 2000 were P286,000 and 75 jobs (Rozemeijer 2001).

An important aspect of tourism around the Okavango Delta region of Botswana (e.g. in the Jakotsha and Ncwaagom areas on the west side of the Swamps) includes tourist trips in wooden canoes known as makoros. The polers are paid P60 P120/day person or more. There are two professional tourism groups that engage in work along these lines.

The Trust for Okavango Cultural and Development Initiatives (TOCaDI) has been working on cultural mapping and tourism development in the western Okavango region, especially along the Panhandle and on the west side of the Okavango Delta. There are plans for a cultural trail along the Panhandle as well as campsites in various communities that will provide income to local people, including G//anikwe San. In addition, crafts are sold to raise income, and there will be small scale camping places and craft outlets along the walking tour routes along the Okavango River.

The Botswana Government decided in January, 2000, not to allow communities to keep the benefits that they get from safari and tourism operations in the community-controlled hunting areas. It remains to be seen whether the San will continue to be able to benefit from the activities that are on-going in their areas, or whether the government of Botswana and the district councils will become the main beneficiaries.

Conservancies in Namibia

In Namibia, more than 20% of the communal land in the country now has conservancy status,, covering some 60,000 square km. Conservancies are locally planned and managed multipurpose areas that have been granted rights under an amendment to the Nature Conservation Ordinance (1996). The first conservancy in Namibia was that in Nyae Nyae, founded in 1998 and operated by a conservancy council consisting entirely of Ju/'hoan-speaking San members who have established community-based conservation and development programs and who collaborate in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy Council and its activities (see Wyckoff-Baird 2000; Bieseke and Hitchcock 2000; Hitchcock 2000).

For Nyae Nyae, Namibia, in the mid 1990s N\$17,400 was generated through photographic safari operations (the Namibian dollar represented about 1/8 of the US dollar in 2001). N\$5,000 were generated through game ranching, which had a component of tourism associated with it. Some private operators have assisted the Ju/'hoansi San as well. Namibia Adventure Safaris and Tours have a lodge in Eastern Otjozondjupa that charges some N\$350 per day for traditional hunting. Reportedly, N\$40 is shared among the two three or more hunters who take part. Traditional dancing is valued at N\$25 per person. People also sell crafts, from which they generate a fair amount of income, although the marketing of crafts is not easy unless people are able to make it to Tjum'kui or they can sell directly to tourists who come in to the Nyae Nyae area in four-wheel drive vehicles. In 2001, the Nyae Nyae conservancy made some N\$275,000 from a safari operator who got the lease over the area. The conservancy council decided to divide the dividends among conservancy members, and each household received N\$75. The !Kung, Khwe, and Vasekele San in what is now the Tsumkwe West area (formerly West Bushmanland) have been able to benefit from the Omatako Rest Camp which they established with the assistance of WIMSA, the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa. The people of Tsumkwe District West have attempted to establish their own conservancy council, the N/a Jaqna Conservancy, but as of Imid-2002 the government of Namibia had not ruled on whether or not the conservancy could be legalized and gazetted.

Namibia has a community-based tourism association, NACOBTA, which was founded in 1997 and now has over 30 organizations as members. In 1999, CAN, the Community-Based Association of Namibia, was formed. There currently are over a dozen non-government organizations and government agencies involved as community-based natural resource management practitioners. As of 2002, there were 14 conservancies gazetted in Namibia, and another 15-20 was in the process of being established.

In the Caprivi Strip, 10,393 sq km or 14% of the region is now made up of conservancies (e.g. Salambala in East Caprivi). Together, these conservancies cover more territory than the national parks in Caprivi. By late 1999, there were 3 community owned campsites and 2 cultural villages in the Caprivi, but tourism collapsed in 2000 with rising insecurity in the region, thus affecting the viability of the community trusts. Fortunately, this situation has abated somewhat, and the peace accords in Angola in 2002 may mean a more positive political and economic situation in northern Namibia in coming years.

Conclusions

Conservation efforts have had a number of impacts among the San of the Kalahari, some of them positive and some negative. Conservation efforts have led to people being dispossessed of their land and resources in sizable portions of the Kalahari Desert from Kaudum game Reserve in northern Namibia in the west to Hwange National Park in the east. San and other peoples were removed from their lands and had to seek new places to live and new ways to support themselves in the more densely occupied communal areas of southern Africa.

Conservation efforts have led to a substantial reduction in hunting by local people, which is now illegal in most areas in the Kalahari, with the notable exception of the Nyae Nyae region of Namibia, where Ju.'hoansi San are allowed to continue to hunt as long as they use traditional weapons and do not use horses and donkeys as hunting aids. In only a few areas in Botswana are San and others allowed to hunt for subsistence purposes – those areas defined as community controlled hunting areas where the members of the community trusts have opted to keep a portion of the wildlife quota for their own use rather than leasing all of it out to a safari operator. Local people are not allowed to hunt in Zambia or Zimbabwe, though they do get some returns from safari hunting and phototourism activities in areas that are designated as being ones where community-based natural resource management activities are allowed to take place.

It appears that the argument by some ecologists and spokespersons of environmental organizations that tourism employment and benefits are greatest in national parks and game reserves is inaccurate, although there is one major exception: the Kalahari Gemsbok Park, which has seen sizable economic returns to the ?Khomani San community in the vicinity of the park. In the case of the largest conservation area in southern Africa, the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, local people have had their rights to the region abrogated by Botswana government action, and the legal appeals that have been sought have yet to have an impact.

Overall, tourism does provide benefits to San, though the greatest benefits appear to go to those

communities where there a community trust exists and where the trust has a form lease over the wildlife resources in the community controlled hunting area or conservancy. Other communities and individuals make some money from tourism, but not as much, and it generally is dissipated much more quickly. The funds generated are used for (1) community projects, (2) individual dividends (e.g. distribution systems to individuals). There are also some trusts such as the one at /Xai/Xai that have specialized operations (e.g. a safari operation, a craft producers association). It is possible to conclude that the returns to the community members tend to be lowest inside of game reserves and national parks in Botswana (e.g. Moremi Game Reserve), although some funds do trickle out to buffer zone communities such as New !Xade and Kaudwane in the case of the areas near the Central Kalahari Game Reserve. In those areas where people have been resettled involuntarily, it appears that there are greater problems with conservation, and environmental degradation and resource depletion rates are relatively high.

While community-based conservation is considered to be some of the most difficult kinds of development programs to implement, it is apparent that a number of San community-based organizations in southern Africa have been able to undertake community-based natural resource management activities and to generate at least some income for their memberships. At the same time, it appears that the protectionist approach to conservation in southern Africa is having more negative than positive effects on local people.

Based on the data collected on southern African community-based natural resource management projects, the most effective means of promoting conservation and development is one that allows local people to benefit from natural resources. Such a strategy gives local people greater incentives to conserve the wild animal, plant, fish, and other species in their areas. There are a number of instances in which people have opted not to hunt or have pressed others not to do so when they saw the numbers of specific species declining. In other cases, overexploitation of resources has taken place, sometimes as a result of individuals making decisions that do not take group interests into account. This is especially true in those places where community trusts have not been formed and where local people have few or no rights to participate in Decision-making about management and sustainable use of resources. In the face of globalization of trade and increasing human pressures on the environment in southern Africa, it may well be time to employ a diversified approach to conservation and development, one that is not based on keeping local people from exploiting and benefiting from nature.

References Cited

Anaya, S. James (1996) Indigenous Peoples in International Law. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bieseke, Megan (1994) Human Rights and Democratization in Namibia: Some Grassroots Political Perspectives. African Rural and Urban Studies 1(2):49-72.

Bieseke, Megan and Robert K. Hitchcock (2000) The Ju/'hoansi San Under Two States: Impacts of the South West African Administration and the Government of the Republic of Namibia. In Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-Determination, Peter S. Schweitzer, Megan Bieseke, and Robert K. Hitchcock, eds. Pp. 305-326. Providence, Rhode Island and London: Berghahn Books.

Bodley, John H. (1999) Victims of Progress. Fourth Edition. Mountain View, California: Mayfield Publishing Company.

Bollig, Michael, Robert K. Hitchcock, Cordelia Nduku, and Jan Reynders (2000) At the Crossroads: The Future of A Development Initiative. Evaluation of KDT, Kuru Development Trust, Ghanzi and Ngamiland Districts of Botswana. The Hague, The Netherlands: Hivos.

Child, Graham (1995) Wildlife and People: The Zimbabwean Success. Harare and New York: Wisdom Foundation.

Cohen, Cynthia Price, ed. (1998) The Human Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Ardsley, New York: Transnational Publishers.

Gibson, Clark C. (2000) Politicians and Poachers: The Political Economy of Wildlife Policy in Africa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1995) Centralization, Resource Depletion, and Coercive Conservation among the Tyua of the Northeastern Kalahari. Human Ecology 23(2):169-198.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (1997) African Wildlife: Conservation and Conflict. In Life and Death Matters: Human Rights and the Environment at the End of the Millennium, Barbara Rose Johnston, ed. Pp. 146-166. Thousand Oaks, California: AltaMira Press.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (2000) Traditional African Wildlife Utilization: Subsistence Hunting, Poaching, and Sustainable Use. In Wildlife Conservation by Sustainable Use, Herbert H.T. Prins, Jan G. Grootenhuys, and Thomas T. Dolan, eds. Pp. 389-415. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (2001) 'Hunting Is Our Heritage': The Struggle for Hunting and Gathering Rights among the San of Southern Africa. In Parks, Property, and Power: Managing Hunting Practice and Identity Within State Policy Regimes, David G. Anderson and Kazunobu Ikeya, eds. Pp. 139-158. Osaka, Japan: National Museum of Ethnology.

Hitchcock, Robert K. (in press) 'We Are the First People': Land, Natural Resources, and identity in the Central Kalahari, Botswana. Journal of Southern African Studies 28(4):

Hitchcock, Robert K., John E. Yellen, Diane J. Gelburd, Alan J. Osborn, and Aron L. Crowell (1996) Subsistence Hunting and Resource Management among the Ju/'hoansi of Northwestern Botswana. African Study Monographs 17(4):153-220.

Marks, Stuart A. (1984) The Imperial Lion: Human Dimensions of Wildlife Management in Central Africa. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Maybury-Lewis, David (1997) Indigenous Peoples, Ethnic Groups, and the State. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Musters, C.J.M., H.J. de Graaf, and W.J. ter Keurs (2000) Can Protected Areas Be Expanded in Africa? Science 287:1759-1760.

Perry, Richard J. (1996) ... From Time Immemorial: Indigenous Peoples and State Systems. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press.

Rozemeijer, Nico, ed. (2001) Community-Based Tourism in Botswana: The SNV Experience in Three Community Tourism Projects. Gaborone, Botswana: SNV (Netherlands Development Organization).

Saugestad, Sidsel (2001) The Inconvenient Indigenous: Remote Area Development in Botswana, Donor Assistance, and the First People of the Kalahari Uppsala, Sweden: The Nordic Africa Institute.

Schweitzer, Peter S, Megan Biesele, and Robert K. Hitchcock, eds. (2000) Hunters and Gatherers in the Modern World: Conflict, Resistance, and Self-Determination. Providence, Rhode Island and London: Berghahn Books.

Smith, Eric Alden and Marc Wishnie (2000) Conservation and Subsistence in Small-Scale Societies. Annual Review of Anthropology 29:493-524.

Sutton, Imre, ed. (1985) Irredeemable America: The Indians' Estate and Land Claims. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press.

Totten, Samuel, William S. Parsons, and Robert K. Hitchcock (2002) Confronting Genocide and Ethnocide of Indigenous Peoples: An Interdisciplinary Approach to Definition, Intervention, Prevention, and Advocacy. In Annihilating Difference: The Anthropology of Genocide, Alexander Laban Hinton, ed. Pp. 54-91. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Weber, Ron, John Butler, and Patty Larson, eds. (2000) Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Organizations: Experiences in Collaboration. Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program.

Widlok, Thomas (1999) Living on Mangetti: 'Bushman' Autonomy and Namibian Independence. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilmer, Franke (1993) The Indigenous Voice in World Politics: Since Time Immemorial. Newbury Park, California and London: Sage Publications.

Wyckoff-Baird, Barbara (2000) Environmental Governance: Lessons from the Ju/'hoan Bushmen in Northeastern Namibia. In Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Organizations: Experiences in Collaboration, Ron Weber, John Butler, and Patty Larson, eds. Pp. 113-135. Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program.

Wyckoff-Baird, Barbara, Andrea Kaus, Catherine A. Christen, and Margaret Keck (2000) Shifting the Power: Decentralization and Biodiversity Conservation. Washington, D.C.: Biodiversity Support Program.

Young, Elspeth (1995) Third World in the First: Indigenous Peoples and Development. London: Routledge.

Table 1. National Parks, Game Reserves, and Conservation Areas in Southern Africa That Resulted in the Involuntary Resettlement of Local Populations

Park or Reserve Area, Establishment Date, Size	Country	Comments
Central Kalahari Game Reserve (1961), 52,730 sq km	Botswana	over 1,100 G//ui, G//ana, and Boolongwe Bakgalagadi were resettled outside the reserve in 1997 and 2002
Chobe National Park (1961), 9,980 sq km	Botswana	hundreds of Subiya were resettled in the Chobe Enclave, where 5 villages are in 3,060 sq km area
Etosha National Park (1907), 22,175 sq km	Namibia	Hai//om San were resettled outside of the park and sent to freehold farms in 1954
Gemsbok National Park (1931), made a transfrontier park in April, 1999, 37,991 sq km	South Africa, Botswana	?Khomani and N/amani San were resettled out of the park in the 1930s, some of whom remained on the peripheries
Hwange (Wankie) National Park (1927), 14,620 sq km, declared a national park on January 29, 1950	Zimbabwe	Batwa (Tyua, Amasili) were rounded up and resettled south of Hwange Game Reserve in the late 1920s
Moremi Game Reserve (1964), 3,880 sq km	Botswana	Bugakwe (//Ani-kxoe) San were relocated out of Moremi, one of the first tribal game reserves in Africa, in the 1960s
Tsodilo Hills National Monument, (1992), 225 sq km, declared a World Heritage Site in 2001	Botswana	Ju/=hoansi San were resettled away from the hills in 1995 but continue to use resources there

West Caprivi Game Park (1963), 5,715 sq km	Namibia	Kxoe and Mbukushu were resettled in the early 1960s and some San in the 1980s
---	---------	---

Table 2. Conservation Areas Where Local People Receive Benefits and/or Are Involved in Co-Management Activities

Conservation Area	Country	Comments
Amboseli National Park	Kenya	Maasai got economic benefits from the park beginning in 1978
Annapurna Conservation Area	Nepal	Nepali farmers benefit from hunting, forest product collection, and use of visitor fees for local development
Gates of the Arctic National Park	Alaska, USA	Inuit corporation members get benefits from the park
Gir National Park	India	Maldhari pastoralists graze livestock and use forest resources in adjacent management area
Kafue National Park	Zambia	local fishermen exploit resources near the park
Kalahari Transfrontier Park (KTP)	South Africa	?Khomani San receive direct benefits, have rights to cultural use of park lands
Ngorongoro Conservation Area	Tanzania	Maasai get benefits from the park and have grazing options
Richtersveld National Park	South Africa	Nama are co-managers and can use resources in the park

Uluru National Park	Australia	Aboriginals and the National Parks and Wildlife Service co-manage the park
Volcanoes National Park	Rwanda	Twa and other local people work as guides, get gate receipts
Wood Buffalo National Park	Canada	Indians can hunt and trap in the park and are involved in park planning, management

Table 3. San Community-Based Natural Resource Management Projects in Western Botswana

CBNRM Project	District	Description
Huiku Trust, Groot Laagte Wildlife Management Area (3,908 sq km)	Ghanzi District	Established in May, 1999, the Huiku Trust members come from two communities, Groot Laagte and Qabo. Planning is ongoing for a community campsite and a tourist lodge
Ukhwi, in KD 1 (12,255 sq km)	Kgalagadi District	The Nqwaa Khobee Yeya Trust was formed of !Xo San and Bakgalagadi community residents to oversee hunting, craft marketing, and tourism
Zutshwa, in KD 2 (7,148 sq km)	Kgalagadi District	The Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust (MTDT) is running a multifaceted development program that ranges from salt production to handicraft purchasing and from local-level training to institution strengthening in

Dobe, NG 3 (5,760 sq km)	North West (Ngamiland) District	A set of San cattle syndicates, each with its own water right, exists in the Dobe-Mahopa-!Goshe area; they are collaborating with TOCaDI
/Xai/Xai Tlhabololo Trust, in NG 4, a community-controlled hunting area (9,293 sq km) and NG 5 (7,673 sq km) (total: 16,966 sq km)	North West (Ngamiland) District	the /Xai/Xai (Cgae Cgae) Tlhabololo Trust, established in October, 1997 to oversee conservation, safari hunting, tourism, craft production, and development activities

Note: TOCaDI = Trust for Okavango Cultural and Development Initiatives, based in Shakawe.

Table 4. Community Trusts in Botswana's North West District and Namibia's Tsumkwe District Involved in Conservation and Development Activities

Name of Trust and Controlled Hunting Founding Date			Composition of Project Activities Population, Size	
		Area, Size (sq km)		
Jakotsha Trust, 1999	Community	NG 24, 530 sq km	Mbukushu, Herero and G//anikwe San, 10,000 people	community tourism, makoro (canoe) poling, basketry and other craft sales
Khwaai Trust, 2000	Community	NG 18, 1,815 sq km and NG 19, 180 sq km	Bugakwe San, Tawana, and Subiya, 360 people	ecotourism, craft sales, work at safari lodges, auctioning off of a portion of the hunting quota
Mababe Trust, 1998	Community	NG 41, 2,045 sq km	Tsegakhwe San, 400 people	ecotourism, leased out some of the hunting quota to a safari company
N=a Jaqna (proposed 2002)	Conservancy	Tsumkwe District West, 8,457 sq km	!Xun, Mpungu, and Vasekela San, 4,500 people	ecotourism, community-based campsite at Omatako Valley
Nyae Nyae 1998	Conservancy,	Nyae Nyae area, Tsumkwe District East, 9,003 sq km	Ju/'hoansi San, 2,200 people	community-based tourism and safari hunting
Sankuyo Management Trust (STMT), 1995	Tshwaragano	NG 34, 870 sq km	Bayeei and Basubiya, 345 people	ecotourism, safari hunting concession, craft sales
Teemashane Trust, 1999	Community	NG 10 and NG 11, ca. 800 sq km	Mbukushu, Bayei, Bugakwe San, G//anikwe	community tourism, campsite, cultural trail,

/Xai/Xai Trust, 1997	Tlhabololo NG 4, 9,293 sq km, NG 5, 7,623 sq km (16,966 sq km total)	San, 5,000 people Ju/'hoansi San, Mbanderu, 400 people	craft sales leasing out of portion of quota, crafts, community
----------------------	--	---	---

Table 5. Ju/'hoansi San Communities in Western Ngamiland (North West District), Botswana

Name of Community	Controlled Hunting Area Number, Size (square kilometers)	San Population and Activities Total Population and Composition
Tsodilo Hills	NG 6, 225 sq km	70 (of 140, 50%) Mbukushu tourism, farming, small stock, crafts, foraging
Nxau Nxau	NG 2, 7,448 sq km	488 (of 813, 66%) Herero foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
Dobe	NG 3, 5,760 sq km	100 at Dobe, 350 (of 550, 63%) in Dobe localities, Herero foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
Goshe (Qoshe)	NG 3, 5,760 sq km	107 (of 153, 70%) Herero foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
!Xangwa (Qangwa)	NG 3, 5,760 sq km	416 (of 833, 50%), Herero, Tawana foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
/Xai/Xai (Cgae Cgae)	NG 4, 9,293 sq km and access to NG 5, 7,673 sq km (16,966 sq km total)	345 (of 431, 80%), Herero (Mbanderu) foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
Chuchumuchu	NG 1, 2,970 sq km	29 (of 289, 10%), Mbukushu, Herero foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
//Kaudum (Xaudum)	NG 1, 2,970 sq km	40 (of 162, 25%), Mbukushu, Herero foraging, farming, crafts, livestock
8 communities	33,369 sq km (6 CCHAs)	1,845 Ju/'hoansi, 3,371 total (55%)

Note: Data obtained from the Remote Area Development Program, government of Botswana and from Cassidy *et al* (2001:A-38, Table A.30). Three of these villages are gazetted (i.e. recognized by the Botswana government as official settlements): Nxau Nxau, !Xangwa, and /Xai/Xai, CCHA = Community Controlled Hunting Area

Table 6. Population Data for the Community of Dobe, Western Ngamiland, Botswana

Year	1964	1968	1973	1981	1987	1991	1999
------	------	------	------	------	------	------	------

Population Size	35	48	45	81	148	127	100
------------------------	----	----	----	----	-----	-----	-----

Note: Data obtained from Lee (1979:54, Table 3.8), the 1981 (p. 70-292) and 1991 Botswana National Censuses (p. 171), Richard Lee (personal communication, 1987), and field interviews by Hitchcock in 1999

Table 7. Population Data for the Community in the Tsodilo Hills, North West District, Botswana

Year	1964	1976	1978	1981	1991	1995-96	1999
Population Size	11 Ju/'hoan-si	36 Ju/'hoan-si	40 Ju/'hoan-si	81 total	110 total	40 Ju/'hoan 110 Mbukushu	70 Ju/'hoan-si (50% of total of 140)

Note: Data obtained from Lee (1979:11-12), fieldwork (1976, 1978), the 1981 Botswana National Census (p. 70-298) and the 1991 Botswana National Census (p. 177), Michael Taylor (personal communication), and Cassidy et al (2001:A-38, Table A.30)

1Paper prepared for presentation at the Ninth International Conference on Hunting and Gathering Societies (CHAGS-9), University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland, 9-13 September, 2002.

