

25. Saugestad, S., 'Setting History Straight - Bushmen Encounters in Cape Town', *Indigenous Affairs* 5 (1996b): 4-11.
26. Saugestad, S., *The Inconvenient Indigenous. Remote Area Development, Donor Assistance and the First People of the Kalahari*. (Tromsø: Institute of Social Science, University of Tromsø, in press).
27. Skotnes, P., (ed.), *Miscast. Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen* (Cape Town: University of Cape Town Press, 1996).
28. Thornberry, P., *International Law and the Rights of Minorities* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991).
29. Thuen, T., *Quest for Equity. Norway and the Saami Challenge. Social and Economic Studies No. 55*. (Newfoundland: Memorial University of Newfoundland, 1995).
30. Tlou, T. and Campbell, A., *History of Botswana* (Gaborone: Macmillan Botswana, 1984).
31. Veber, Hanne, Dahl, J., Wilson, F. and Wæhle, E., eds., "...Never Drink from the Same Cup". Proceedings of the Conference on Indigenous Peoples in Africa. Tune, Denmark 1993. IWGIA Document No. 74, (Copenhagen: IWGIA, 1993).

The Proceedings of the
Khosan Identity and
Cultural Heritage
Conference (1998)

ed. A. Bank,
H. Heese,
C. Loff

Cape Town: Infosource

pp 303-

313

The Politics and Economics of Bureaucratic and Ethnic Identity among Remote Area Populations in Botswana

Robert Hitchcock

Department of Anthropology
University of Nebraska

Since 1977 the Botswana government has used the term "Remote Area Dwellers" (RADs) to cover all of those people living outside of *tengyanateng*, which, according to some analysts, means "people from deep within the deep", a description that is not necessarily appreciated by the people to whom it is applied. The Remote Area Development Program (RADP) in the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing (MLGLH) has concentrated its development efforts on a target group defined on the basis of its spatial location (remote areas outside of villages), socio-political status (marginalised), and socio-economic status (impoverished). Changes have occurred over time in the coverage of the Remote Area Development Program as rural people have moved into settlements established by district councils. Some of these settlements have been turned into officially gazetted (recognized) villages and no longer are served by Remote Area Development Program personnel. Some Remote Area Dwellers have been redefined as "destitutes", people without sufficient means of support, who receive assistance from the Department of Community Development in the Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs. Thus what is happening in Botswana, in effect, is that remote area populations are being redefined in such a way that they no longer receive the same levels of development assistance as they did in the past, and this has significant implications for their social and economic well-being.

The San (Basarwa, Khwe) and other remote area populations of the Republic of Botswana face some serious problems in terms of their social, economic and cultural rights in spite of some gains made in political participation over the past two decades. Some of the major areas of concern are: (1) the degree to which San and other minority peoples' rights are recognized in a context in which bureaucratic and ethnic identity issues are both complex and contentious; (2) decisions of the central government and district councils on land use and land rights, rights to the use and management of natural resources by both communities and individuals, and the special case of livestock disease control impacts in Ngamiland; (3) the future of people in areas set aside as parks, reserves, and national monuments, particularly those residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR); and (4) the implications of elimination of Special Game Licenses (subsistence hunting licenses) and cutbacks in various livelihood supports for Remote Area Dwellers. This paper deals with each of these topics in some detail, and draws general conclusions concerning the contemporary socio-economic status and the politics and economics of bureaucratic and ethnic identity of San and other remote area populations in Botswana.

Terminology

The terms "Basarwa," "Bushmen," "San," and "Khwe" have all been used to refer to click-speaking peoples of hunting and gathering origin in Botswana. Various terms have been put forth at national and international meetings to refer collectively to these populations. In April 1992 it was suggested by representatives of a newly formed indigenous advocacy organization, Kgeikani Kweni, at a Botswana Society workshop on sustainable rural development that the term "Noakhwe" should be used, while it was noted by speakers at a Conference on Basarwa Research held at the National Institute of Research (NIR) in Gaborone in August 1995 that the term "Basarwa" should be employed. Yet another term used by researchers and development workers in Botswana is "Khwe" (Kwe) which means "people" in Central Bush languages. The term employed most often in Botswana is "Basarwa" (singular, "Mosarwa"). This term is said to be derived from a word signifying "people of the south". In the past, the term "Masarwa" was used, but this word was seen as pejorative because it did not signify the status of being a person.

The government of Botswana has made efforts to avoid identifying people on the basis of their ethnicity. Such a strategy, in the Botswana government's opinion, is reminiscent of the kinds of terminology used by those espousing *apartheid*. Since 1977 the Botswana government has used the term "Remote Area Dwellers" (RADs) to cover all of those people living outside of villages in rural areas. A Setswana term for this appellation is *tengyanateng*, which, according to some analysts, means "people from deep within the deep", a description that is not necessarily appreciated by the people to whom it is applied.

It is preferable, according to linguists and to local people, to use the word(s) in their language that they use to refer to themselves. The people of north-western Botswana (in Ngamiland and north-eastern Namibia (in what was known as Eastern Bushmanland, now Eastern Otjozondjupa) call themselves Ju/'hoansi, which means real, genuine, or "true" people, while those in the central Kalahari region of Botswana call themselves G/wi and G/fana. Adopting terms of self-appellation acknowledges the new sense of empowerment of indigenous southern Africans.

The Remote Area Development Program (RADP) in the Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing (MLGLH) of the Botswana government has concentrated its development efforts on a target group defined on the basis of its spatial location (remote areas outside of villages), sociopolitical status (marginalised), and socio-economic status (impoverished). Changes have occurred over time in the coverage of the Remote Area Development Program as rural people have moved into settlements established by district councils. Some of these settlements have been turned into officially gazetted (recognized) villages and as a result no longer are served by Remote Area Development Program personnel.

A major issue in the Republic of Botswana is the degree to which people living in remote areas have the legal right to engage in subsistence-oriented hunting and gathering activities. While there are few, if any, people in Botswana who continue to depend totally on hunting and gathering for their subsistence and income, there is a sizeable number of people who forage as a means of supplementing their diet and who obtain wild resources to meet their material needs.

One of the problems with some of the earlier faunal conservation legislation (e.g. the Unified Hunting Regulations of 1979) was that the regulations did not, in fact, lay out the criteria for who would qualify for a Special Game License, the license which allowed those people who depended on subsistence hunting to continue to hunt legally. These criteria were supposed to have been described in Section 4[2] of the Unified Hunting Regulations but were inadvertently left out of the law. What this means is that criteria have to be outlined which define exactly who qualifies and under what conditions.

The first set of criteria should relate to who is a bona fide Remote Area Dweller (RAD) and what qualifications were necessary for that individual to qualify for a hunting license. The new legislation on hunting should therefore include a definition of (1) what a Remote Area Dweller is, (2) what subsistence hunting consists of, and (3) what kinds of weapons are considered "traditional", and (4) what kinds hunting activities of allowable under the law.

Definition of Remote Area Dweller

There are major problems in defining clearly what exactly a Remote Area Dweller (RAD) is in Botswana. A number of different definitions have been presented, some of them by the Remote Area Development Program (see, for example, RADP 1978:4) and some by researchers and development workers (Gulbrandsen, Karlisen, and Lexow 1986:4-6; Hitchcock 1988:2-23; Kann, Hitchcock, and Mbere 1990:14-18; Campbell 1992:213-215; Saugestad: 1993:38-39, 1994:303-306, 1995a, 1995b, in press). Below I outline eight criteria for defining a RAD and for defining a subsistence producer who should, under the law and Botswana government policy, qualify for the right to hunt using a Special Game License and who should be afforded assistance through the Remote Area Development Program.

a. Criterion 1

One criterion for defining who is and is not a RAD is place of residence. If the person lives full-time or most of the time outside of a gazetted village in a remote rural area, then he or she is a RAD. Related to this criterion is allegiance to a village. One must distinguish clearly between (1) those people who live permanently in remote areas outside villages and who have no allegiance to a village, and (2) those people who may reside temporarily in remote areas but who have allegiance and/or ties to a village. Thus, RADs are those people who have no ties to a village (Campbell and Main 1991).

As Campbell and Main (1991) have noted, however, RADs can also be people whose ties to a village have become tenuous. If these people returned to a place where they were born, they would have no kinship or social links with the people there. Generally, people who fit this category are individuals who have married into RAD families, or people who are second or third generation settlers whose parents left their home villages before they were born.

b. Criterion 2

A second criterion is self-identification: RADs are those people who consider themselves to be RADs (tengyanateng). The problem with this criterion is that sometimes people call themselves RADs so that they can receive assistance through the Remote Area Development Program. This occurred, for example, in the Ghanzi District and in parts of Central and Kweneng Districts during the droughts of the early 1980s and again in the early 1990s when cattle owners moved out to cattle posts and claimed to the district council and the government of Botswana that they were RADs so that they could get drought relief rations.

c. Criterion 3

A third criterion for being a RAD is government (or bureaucratic) identification. In Botswana, those individuals who reside in Remote Area Dweller settlements and who receive assistance from the Remote Area Development Program of the Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing (MLGLH) or the district councils are considered RADs. A RAD, therefore, is a person who is classified as such by Government of Botswana ministries or district councils (Gulbrandsen, Karlisen, and Lexow 1986; Kann, Hitchcock, and Mbere

1990; Hitchcock and Holm 1993). The advantage of being a RAD is that it qualifies an individual for government assistance. At the same time, it should be stressed that there is a fairly sizeable number of people living in remote areas who do not like the designation *tengyanateng* because they feel that it indicates low status in Botswana (Mogwe 1992).

d. Criterion 4

A fourth criterion for being a Remote Area Dweller is whether or not that person has a water right in an area. The reason for this criterion is that most if not all RADs do not have water rights allocated to them as individuals by Land Boards in Botswana. Building on a definition provided by Alec Campbell and Michael Main in their work on the Western Sandveld region of Central District (1991), a Remote Area Dweller can be defined as follows:

"A Remote Area Dweller is person who has no home in a village where there is a recognized kgotla, who has no claim to land which is recognized by the District Land Board, and who has no claim to the use of water without the expectation of conditions being imposed on its use by a person or persons who hold generally-recognized rights to the water source (Campbell and Main 1991:16-17)."

The lack of a water right means that under the Tribal Grazing Land Policy (1975), the National Policy on Agricultural Development (1991), and the new stipulations of the amended Tribal Land Act (1993), individuals who are told to leave their present places of residence close to a water point owned by another person must do so. The problem for RADs is that since they lack village affiliation they must of necessity find a place to live on another cattle post, farm, ranch, or lands area (Campbell and Main 1991). The lack of security of tenure is a major constraint for Remote Area Dwellers.

e. Criterion 5

A fifth criterion for a RAD is the land category within which a person resides. In general, people who live in Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), commercial cattle post areas (grazing areas), or lands areas (agricultural areas away from villages) and who fulfil the above conditions, irrespective of whether or not they are employed, are considered Remote Area Dwellers. A RAD may also be a person living in a Community-Controlled Hunting Area (CCHA). This raises the question of whether or not all of those people residing in a Community Controlled Hunting Area should potentially have access to a free single game license if they meet the other criteria. Those RADs living in commercial leasehold areas such as Tribal Grazing Land Policy ranches, freehold farms, and, recently, Controlled Hunting Areas that are leased out to private operators, tend to have fewer rights than those in the communal (tribal) areas of the country. The majority of RADs live in the communal areas of Botswana rather than state or freehold areas.

f. Criterion 6

A sixth criterion is source of subsistence. In the early 1980s, arguments were put forth by ecologists like Mark and Delia Owens and some environmental non-government organizations that the people of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve should be removed from the area because they were "no longer living traditional lives". Traditional lifestyles in this context are tied directly to hunting and gathering. The question remains, to what extent is it necessary for a person to depend on hunting and gathering in order to be considered qualified for a Special Game License (SGL) or a free single game license and to live in an area defined as a game reserve or national monument.

g. Criterion 7

A seventh criterion for defining a RAD who is also an individual who depends upon subsistence hunting is the type of hunting methods and weapons employed. The Department of Wildlife and National Parks has grappled with the issue of what is to be considered "traditional" in terms of the kinds of hunting done by individuals, since "traditional" hunting in the past has been allowed under Botswana fauna conservation, whereas "modern" hunting has not been considered legal for subsistence hunters except in certain cases (e.g. around the Okavango Delta in North West District). Some of the people that were interviewed by Robert Hitchcock, Rosinah Masilo, and Poppy Monyatse (1995) in the course of a study of Special Game Licenses suggested that people should be disqualified from receiving subsistence hunting licenses if they use "non-traditional" hunting methods. When asked what these non-traditional methods of hunting were, they said that they included (1) use of modern weapons (rifles, shotguns), (2) use of hunting aids (horses, donkeys, dogs), (3) use of commercially manufactured traps (e.g. gin traps, steel traps), and (4) use of vehicles in hunting. Some of these methods are already disallowed in existing faunal conservation legislation (e.g. use of steel traps, hunting from vehicles).

As far as the use of weapons is concerned, gun-hunting is done by Remote Area Dwellers in the Okavango Delta region but it is done much less frequently by RADs elsewhere (1) because they lack these kinds of weapons, and (2) because it is considered to be illegal by the district's Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) officers. Local people sometimes gain access to guns through borrowing. One means of

reducing the use of guns by subsistence hunters would be to disallow the borrowing of guns from other people in new wildlife legislation.

This raises the issue of other kinds of weaponry. Bow and arrow hunting, which was a common strategy of Remote Area Dwellers in the past, is on the decline throughout Botswana, replaced by alternative methods of hunting which are more effective on the one hand and riskier in terms of people being arrested for their use on the other. Some people have been arrested for hunting with bows and arrows because, according to the DWP officers involved, RADs were not supposed to be using these weapons under Botswana wildlife laws. Presumably this situation could change with the new legislation on bow hunting in Botswana, depending on how it is interpreted in the field.

A third issue relating to hunting methods relates to the use of horses and donkeys in hunting. Some people have been arrested for engaging in mounted hunting, although we were told that it was considered a legal and "traditional" method of hunting by some DWP officials. Horse-hunting has been done in the remotest parts of Botswana since at least the middle of the nineteenth century. The question that arises, then, is how long a strategy has to be in existence before it is considered "traditional". Gun hunting has been done in Botswana since at least the 1840s (Allec Campbell, personal communication).

It will be necessary to define specifically in the new law the kinds of hunting methods that are considered "traditional". The stipulations could be that people are allowed to use certain specified weapons (e.g. spears, bows and poisoned arrows), and that these weapons can be used not only by hunters on foot but also ones who are mounted on horseback or donkeyback.

h. Criterion 8

An eighth criterion for a RAD and subsistence producer in Botswana is whether or not the person obtains wild animal products for domestic use (home consumption), exchange, or sale. The concept "subsistence" is sometimes defined as "resource dependence that is primarily outside the cash sector of the economy." This economic definition is, in many ways, inadequate in the context of modern Botswana. Virtually all RADs are involved at least to a certain degree in the cash economy in Botswana. A significant percentage of RAD households receives transfers in the form of cash or goods from government or other sources (Gulbrandsen, Karlsen, and Lexow 1986; Hitchcock and Holm 1993; Chr. Michelsen Institute 1995). It has to be recognized that subsistence activities link people into a complex network of interactions, reciprocity, and exchanges, some of which are others are kinship-related, others are ideological or culturally based, and still others are predominantly economic in nature.

A classic example of this linkage is in the manufacture, exchange, and sale of ostrich eggshell bead necklaces and bracelets which occurs in the Kalahari. This exchange links people together in a complex system of mutual reciprocity; at the same time, the manufacture and sale of ostrich eggshell items is an important source of income for a sizeable number of RAD households, especially in western Botswana. It may be necessary, therefore, to define a "subsistence hunter" as a person who obtains wildlife primarily for domestic use and for generating household income.

Subsistence in Botswana is far more than simply a means of making a living for a segment of the country's population. It is also a complex system of obligation, distribution, and exchange which is crucial to the well-being of both subsistence producers and market-oriented producers.

Livestock Disease Impacts

The social, economic and health impacts of livestock diseases have become important topics of discussion among policy-makers, governments and scientists, in part because of the outbreak of mad cow disease (bovine spongiform encephalopathy, or BSE) in England which was first diagnosed in November 1986. Africa has had to contend with an array of livestock diseases; these diseases range from rinderpest, which wiped out a sizeable proportion of eastern and southern African livestock and wildlife in the late 1890s and again at various points in the twentieth century, to Hoof-and-Mouth Disease (Foot-and Mouth Disease, FMD). In the 1950s and 1960s a vaccine was developed to deal with rinderpest; similar efforts to develop a vaccine for foot-and-mouth disease were successful for South African Type (SAT) I, II, and III. The impacts of these diseases were reduced somewhat in Botswana through the use of a combination of immunisation, eradication, and relief measures (Falconer 1972, 1980).

The cattle lung disease Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia (CBPP) was first reported in the !Kandam (Xaudum) Valley in north-western Ngamiland (North West District), Botswana in February, 1995 (Ministry of Agriculture 1996:2; for a discussion of this lung disease, see Gibbons 1970:179-181; Hungerford 1990:317-320). The government of Botswana moved quickly to cope with the crisis, mounting efforts to eradicate infected livestock in the district and implementing a disaster relief and livestock owner compensation program. Botswana Veterinary Department officials and other government of Botswana personnel as well as private corporations and soldiers from the Botswana Defence Force (BDF) killed over 400,000 head of cattle in order to eradicate the disease and prevent it from spreading.

The losses of livestock result in significant socio-economic impacts on local people in Ngamiland and Botswana generally. The construction of fences to prevent the spread of the disease are also having effects, especially on wildlife populations and on the economies of those people who depend in part upon wildlife. Already there are indications that the new fences have had a number of effects, including the stopping of game movements and the clearing of vegetation, including prime stands of trees, shrubs, and grasses. Some animals have been found dead along the fence. A major effect of the northern fence in the future will be the prevention of movements of elephants and other game into the West Caprivi Game Reserve, something which will have both environmental and socio-economic impacts. The West Caprivi Game Reserve supports a population of 5,000 people, some of whom depend to a significant degree upon wildlife-related tourism and income from handicraft production.

The Botswana government established a cash compensation program for those people whose livestock were eradicated, paying some 500 Pula per animal for 70% of their animals, with the other 30% given in kind in order to facilitate restocking of livestock once the disease has been declared eradicated completely. Remote Area Development Program (RADP) personnel and others working in North West District (e.g. Assistant Community Development Officers, ACDOs) initiated efforts to provide the neediest members of affected communities with livelihood supports. The destruction of the cattle not only affected livestock owners but also those who depended on them for jobs, food, and gifts of milk, meat, and other goods. A program resembling the successful drought relief efforts of the Botswana Government was implemented in Ngamiland, with some 44 million Pula budgeted for the efforts (Daily News, Monday, 18 November, 1996, No. 218, p.1). Some of these funds were devoted to labour-based relief and development projects (LBRDPs). The Botswana government hoped that these actions would ensure that the North West District's farmers would be able to re-establish themselves socially and economically. The reintroduction of livestock into the district began in early April, 1997, and the process was continuing at the time of this report.

The Central Kalahari Game Reserve Situation

Resettlement in the name of wildlife conservation and tourism promotion has been advocated by a number of African governments and environmental NGOs. This was seen most recently in the case of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, the third largest game reserve in Africa. In February, 1996, Botswana government ministers announced at a community meeting in the central Kalahari that the residents of the reserve would be required to leave the area. Local people reacted strongly to this request, arguing that they should be allowed to stay where they are. They pointed out that the Central Kalahari Game Reserve was established originally as a means of protecting the land and resource use rights of local people. They also suggested that the resettlement of people out of the central Kalahari could have a whole series of negative effects on both the people who are moved as well as those people who reside in the areas where resettlement occurs.

In the late 1980s and early 1990s the Botswana government had pursued 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. Even drought relief feeding programs were slower in the central Kalahari than elsewhere in Botswana, a situation which threatened the well-being of people in several parts of the reserve.

Pressures were also brought to bear on people in the central Kalahari through selective enforcement of wildlife laws and what some local people perceived to be intimidation. Data collected on households in the central Kalahari and adjacent areas reveal that up to two thirds of the resident adult males of some communities had been arrested at one time or another by game scouts from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, police officers, or Botswana Defence Force (BDF) personnel. One of the impacts of high rates of arrest was that there was withdrawal of much-needed labour from households and communities. This was especially problematic if the person arrested and jailed was a bread-winner or a hunter. Families who had a member arrested often faced both economic and nutritional difficulties. In some cases, people who formerly had been self-sufficient economically had to seek government assistance as destitutes. Local people claim that people in remote areas like the central Kalahari tend to be arrested more frequently and receive higher fines and jail sentences than do people who reside in towns and villages, some of whom actually engage in greater amounts of hunting than do remote area residents (Hitchcock 1988; Hitchcock, Masilo, and Monyatse 1995).

Even more disturbing than the high rates of arrest were the charges that people have been mistreated by game scouts and other officials. There were a number of incidents where people claimed that they were tortured or received inhumane or degrading punishment when suspected of poaching or when being questioned about other people who might be engaged in illegal hunting. According to one report, the most common form of torture included the use of a 'rubber ring' placed tightly around the testicles and a plastic bag placed over the face of a person (Mogwe 1992:12). There were cases where people died of injuries inflicted upon them by game scouts, as occurred at !Xade in August 1993, when a 40-year-old man died after being questioned by game scouts. Community leaders in the central Kalahari have argued that authorities have stepped over the line from anti-poaching to persecution.

The central Kalahari case provides an excellent example of some of the kinds of responses that Africans are employing to deal with the situations they are facing as a result of wildlife preservation and management efforts. The San and Bakgalagadi in the Central began to organize at the grassroots level to protest the ways that they were being treated. They formed indigenous advocacy organizations, one example being Kgeikani Kweni (First People of the Kalahari) which was established in 1992. The first action of Kgeikani Kweni was to attend a national-level workshop on Sustainable Rural Development held by the Botswana Society in April 1992. There they spoke out on issues ranging from poverty to cultural preservation. They stressed that they wished to be treated with greater respect by officials of the Department of Wildlife and National Parks and other agencies of the Botswana government (for a discussion of the various San NGOs and those groups advocating San rights, see Hitchcock and Holm 1995; Hitchcock 1996; Saugestad 1995a, b, 1996, in press).

San spokespersons also attended a series of international meetings, including the Working Group on Indigenous Peoples (WGIP) of the United Nations in Geneva, where they argued forcefully that they should have land and resource rights, the right to practice their own culture and learn their own languages, and to have a say in decision-making about development planning. They pointed out that the kinds of treatment that some San had received were potentially in violation of international human rights law, especially the severe forms of torture employed and what they felt were tantamount to extrajudicial executions. Human rights organizations such as Amnesty International and Survival International took note of these allegations, as did the United States Department of State (1993:13-14). The defense that some people offered when charged with crimes such as violations of the fauna conservation laws was that they committed these acts "because they were hungry." Poverty and hunger, however, are not considered to be extenuating circumstances under Botswana law. As a result, people are jailed or fined for what in essence is an "economic crime" (Mogwe 1992:13).

San and other indigenous groups in Africa have sought to use the media to positive effect, and they have requested the help of intergovernmental organizations such as the United Nations as well as NGOs, including environmental ones. In their discussions, they have stressed how much damage forced relocation does to local communities. Extensive research by social and natural scientists and by development workers has shown that involuntary community relocation of people with strong ties to the land has nearly always resulted in a reduction in the standards of living of those who were moved (Hansen and Oliver-Smith 1982; Scudder 1996). While some of the people moved may temporarily be better off, over the longer term conditions can be expected to worsen, in part because of increased competition for natural resources and employment opportunities.

The Botswana government has continued to urge the residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve to relocate to places outside of the reserve. It is doing this in part by telling people that they will not receive development assistance in the future should they choose to remain in the reserve; the justification that they use for this position is that it is too expensive to provide services to such a remote and scattered population. The government is also offering individuals cash compensation for relocating outside of the reserve. While there are widespread rumors concerning the large amounts of compensation that will be provided (including, some believe, "enough for a new four wheel drive vehicle"), it is likely that the payments will be at most a few thousand Pula (around US \$1,000). Given the resources that people will have to give up if they move out of the reserve, this amount is, according to local people, far below what would be required to re-establish themselves at a socio-economic level (an equivalent standard of living) that is at least equivalent to what they had while living in the reserve. It should also be pointed out that there are very few instances in the world where cash compensation has served to restore the income and standard of living of those people who were required to resettle.

The settlement of New !Xade, where people from !Xade and elsewhere in the reserve are supposed to move, was not ready for occupation by resettled people in the early part of 1997. There was no borehole there, and the land had yet to be surveyed in detail. The only evidence of development there in early 1997 was a still-empty water tank. The settlement is on the borders of a Tribal Grazing Land Policy commercial ranching area, so it can be anticipated that there will be problems involving cattle coming in to the New !Xade area, something that will have impact on local range and veld food resources. Some people from the Game Reserve were shown the area where they are supposed to move to and they were told that it will be developed in time for their arrival. One of the issues which is of concern to the people of the central Kalahari is how many people will have to move to the New !Xade settlement. The overall population of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in 1996 was 1,482 people in at least six communities (Applied Research Unit 1997:22, 24, Table 5). If all of the people in the CKGR are moved, the settlement at New !Xade will become the largest RAD settlement in Botswana. Given the potentially high population density, lack of existing infrastructure, and the relatively low density of wild game animals and wild food plants in the Okwa Wildlife Management Area in which New !Xade is located, it is likely that the people who are moved there will end up living under conditions that are very stressful. The government of Botswana will need to move quickly to ensure that there is sufficient food, water, and other basic goods for the population, and efforts will need to be made to promote agricultural employment, and income generating opportunities so that they can begin to rebuild their lives.

According to some of the human rights and development workers who have been in the reserve (e.g. those from Ditshwano, the Botswana Center for Human Rights, and Kgeikani Kweni), the majority of the people in the Central Kalahari did not want to move out of the reserve (see the report by Ditshwano, April, 1996). The problem that the people still in the CKGR are facing is that the government could well stop the various programs and development assistance, including provision of water, food, and development aid. This would make the situation for the residents of the CKGR nearly untenable.

The Botswana Government maintains that it will not force people out of the reserve and that it will not stop the basic livelihood supports that are provided to those people who are in need of assistance generally in Botswana. The real key here is the possibility that all kinds of livelihood supports and development assistance programs that exist in the CKGR will be reduced, phased out, or discontinued completely if people there do not agree to being moved. It remains to be seen whether or not the government of Botswana will observe basic human rights standards in their handling of the situation in the central Kalahari.

The Contemporary Socio-economic Status of San in Botswana

The current socio-economic situation of San and other remote area populations in Botswana is quite complicated. The economic and cultural systems among San and other groups are heterogeneous and diversified. People residing in extremely remote areas face constraints in terms of gaining access to markets and development assistance. Because of physical distances and lower numbers of people, there are fewer schools, health posts, and other social facilities than in more heavily populated areas. Prices for goods tend to be higher in rural areas while wages paid to people for work tend to be lower. Although employment opportunities in Botswana's urban and peri-urban areas grew, the same was not true for remote rural areas (Harvey and Lewis 1990).

In Botswana, there is a sizeable number of people in remote areas living at or below the Poverty Datum Line (PDL). This figure is equivalent to the "minimum income needed for a basic standard of living", and is used by some economists as a means of determining household socio-economic status relative to other households (for a discussion of economic assessment in Botswana, see Central Statistics Office 1976; Watanabe and Mueller 1984; Harvey and Lewis 1990; for a discussion of poverty in Africa, see International Fund for Agricultural Development 1993). A fairly substantial number of the households in the remote areas of Botswana lack some or all of the necessary means of production. Some households have too little land to provide for their needs; others lack livestock, which are crucial to making up a plowing team and which provide at least a certain amount of subsistence and, in some cases, income. Still other households do not have sufficient cash to pay for inputs such as seeds and fertilizers. The lack of male labour is also an important variable in some of the households lowest on the income scale (Chr. Michelsen Institute 1995).

Freehold farm workers and cattle post labourers in Botswana tend to have relatively low incomes, uncertain access to land, small numbers of domestic stock, low levels of literacy and education, low to moderate health standards, and limited access to development assistance. Many of these people are at least partially and sometimes totally dependent on livestock owners for their subsistence and income. Some people in grazing areas attempt to generate income through foraging, doing temporary work, and selling handicrafts, meat, thatching grass, and firewood.

While the average wages paid to farm and cattle post workers have increased somewhat, they generally have not kept pace with inflation. The average monthly wage in 1997 is considerably below that which would be required to ensure that individuals were making enough to support themselves and their families. The result is that a fairly sizeable proportion of the freehold farm, cattle post, and RAD settlement population is having to supplement their diet and income through a combination of foraging, food production, wage employment, selling goods such as crafts, firewood or beer, and depending on a variety of government and district council development and assistance programs. These programs include the Arable Lands Development Program (ALDEP), the Financial Assistance Program (FAP), the Economic Promotion Fund (EPF) of the Remote Area Development Program, and various supplementary feeding programs (e.g. those for school children, pregnant and lactating mothers, and children under five years of age) (Kossoudji and Mueller 1983).

The government of Botswana has attempted to assist Remote Area Dwellers in part by establishing settlements in the rural areas where water, social services such as schools and health posts, and extension assistance are provided. The people in the settlements are supported by the district councils assistance from Remote Area Development Officers (RADOs) who work for the various district councils in the Remote Area Development Program. The proportion of people defined as destitutes who receive assistance in the form of food and other goods from the District Councils is higher among RADs than it is among most if not all other groups in Botswana.

Special efforts were made not only to provide food for people in need but also to assist them through replacement of lost income by enabling them to engage in Labour Based Public Works Programs (LBPWPs), for which they received cash in exchange for their work. These programs provided people with income that they could use to meet household requirements. At the same time, the LBPWPs and supplementary feeding

programs sometimes led to a certain amount of dependency on the part of rural people on food and jobs from the government. It is these programs that are now at risk because of governmental cutbacks and reduction in aid to remote areas.

The tenure rights of Remote Area Dwellers in the various RAD settlements remain uncertain (Moeletsi 1993, Saugestad 1993; Wily 1994; Hitchcock 1996). While individuals have been allocated residential rights and rights to arable land (fields) by Land Boards and Sub-Land Boards, the rights over water and grazing in the RAD settlements remain in the hands of the government. RADs lack the right to control who enters the settlements. As a result, many RAD settlements have seen in-migration of people from outside, many of them with their livestock. Efforts to get the immigrants and their domestic animals to leave the settlements have generally been unsuccessful, in part because people to whom local residents must appeal (those on the Land Boards and District Councils) are sometimes the ones who have moved into the settlements to take advantage of the grazing, water, and labour available there.

One strategy that some remote area communities have engaged in as a means of generating income and employment and enhancing the degree to which they have control over their land and resources is to engage in community-based natural resource management programs (CBNRMPs) in Community-Controlled Hunting Areas in line with the government of Botswana's Wildlife Conservation Policy (1986), Tourism Policy (1990), and Wildlife Conservation and National Parks Act (1992). As outlined in a Savingram from the Permanent Secretary (PS) of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry and the PS of the Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing (Ref. WP/SAF 2 V, DC/ONO/1, 20 November, 1995), those communities wishing to receive a quota for wildlife utilization from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks or a resource use lease for any tourism or natural resource development activity from a district land board in Botswana, that community must form a representative legal entity (e.g. a Quota Management Committee, QMC, or a local trust). Thus far, there are two community organizations formed in which San are a significant portion of the population: (1) /Xai/Xai in western Ngamiland (North West District), which has a Quota Management Committee and a community-based organization, /Kokoro Crafts, and (2) the Maiteko Tshwaragano Development Trust (MTDT), based at Zutshwa in the Kgalagadi District. In the latter case, the MTDT applied to the Kgalagadi District Council (KDC) and the DWNP for a quota for the wildlife in the KD 2 Wildlife Management Area (WMA) in 1997 but has yet to be granted the right to the quota in spite of the fact that they have formed a representative and accountable management group or entity, as required under Botswana government policy. Thus, it is clear that at least some district councils in Botswana are not supportive of the idea of giving quotas to communities, in part, apparently, because they wish to retain control over the resources at the district level. One district, Ngamiland, has stopped giving out Special Game Licenses to Remote Area Dwellers. As of early June 1997, Kgalagadi District was still issuing SGLs to people who had them in the past, but it is anticipated that by 1998 there will no longer be any Special Game Licenses being issued to RADs in Botswana.

Remote Area Development Program personnel and other people working in rural Botswana (e.g. those in district councils and non-government organizations) realize that efforts will have to be made to continue providing the neediest members of remote area communities with livelihood support and assistance programs. From the perspective of Remote Area Dwellers, ensuring access to wildlife through provision of licenses to continue to carry out subsistence hunting is even more crucial now than ever since it would give them a means of avoiding having to depend totally or to a significant degree on aid from the Botswana government or relief agencies.

Conclusions

Being identified as a Remote Area Dweller in the past in Botswana meant that one would have access to RAD programs, which ranged from livestock loan schemes to small-scale loans under an Economic Promotion Fund. The RAD settlements contained water points, primary schools, health posts, and housing for teachers, nurses, and extension workers. Remote Area Development Officers would pay periodic visits to the places where RADs resided and would assist them in a variety of ways, including giving advice on income generating projects, agriculture, and the formation and running of community-based organizations such as Village Development Committees. There were a number of instances where RAD Officers worked hard on behalf of their clients; in Ghanzi District, for example, RAD staff argued vociferously for the removal of non-RAD livestock herds from such settlements as West Hanahai and Ka/Gae, and in Kgalagadi District RAD staff attempted to get sipwells recognized as water points in order to enable RAD communities to apply for a water right under existing Botswana legislation.

There is no question that being identified as a Remote Area Dweller had its down side. Numerous complaints were heard from people in remote areas to the effect that Land Boards and Sub-Land Boards refused to give them water and grazing rights as members of a group, whereas non-RADs were allowed to form groups and apply for leasehold land (e.g. Agricultural Management Associations, AMAs). There were also instances in which RADs were mistreated by government officials, as was the case when people were suspected of having violated faunal conservation laws (Mogwe 1992). Some RADs said that their children were sometimes denied

the right to attend school, and there were instances in which health officials at clinics and hospitals refused to attend to the needs of injured or ill RADs. Some RADs said that the differential treatment was a product of racial discrimination not so much because they were RADs as because they were Basarwa. As one woman put it, "We Basarwa are at the bottom of the socio-economic ladder in Botswana, and everyone above us tries to take advantage of us". In spite of significant progress in development and democracy in Botswana, there are still problems relating to equity and participation as it relates to ethnic minorities. Locally-based socio-economic systems have been undermined, and the degree to which outside agencies (e.g. government ministries, private sector businesses) affect local populations has increased.

There are some other trends among San and their neighbours which hold the promise of increasing their influence in the events affecting them. One of these trends is the rise in the number of San advocacy groups, non-government organizations and various kinds of community-level organizations (for a discussion of this trend, see Saugestad 1995a, this volume; Hitchcock 1996; Hitchcock and Holm 1993, 1995). Another is an expansion in the efforts of San themselves to make their voices heard, not only at the local and district levels but at the international level as well. A third trend is the effort of San groups to take part in community-based natural resource management projects. These projects have the potential of increasing incomes and employment: in /Xai/Xai, for example, there will be at least six Community Escort Guides (CEGs) who will accompany tourism groups on their trips around western Ngamiland. The formation of Quota Management Committees and community trusts, combined with training efforts carried out by government officials, NGOs, and project personnel (e.g. those in the Institutional Reinforcement and Community Empowerment [IRCE] program of the Natural Resource Management Project [NRM], a joint effort of the government of Botswana and the U.S. Agency for International Development, Project 690-0251.33), will serve to empower local people and expand their capacity to implement development projects. In spite of these trends, however, San and other Remote Area Dwellers point out that they still lack the ability to make claims for land and resources. This is evident in the inability of various San organizations and advocacy groups to prevent the resettlement of sizeable numbers of people outside of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve by the government of Botswana in mid-1997.

The issue of bureaucratic and ethnic identity looms large in the area of academic research on San and other people residing in remote areas. Since the mid-1970s, it has been difficult for researchers from outside of Botswana to get permission to conduct investigations of San or of Remote Area Dwellers. If researchers noted on their permit requests that they wished to work specifically with San, it was likely that permission would be denied. A heartening trend in Botswana is the establishment of the Basarwa Research Committee at the University of Botswana, which is conducting important research on a number of topics relating to San (Saugestad 1995b, in press). Research has played a significant role in helping identify some of the problems San are facing, and has helped frame some of the approaches to remote area development in Botswana. A number of San have noted that they want to make the research process much more participatory than it has been in the past, and it is likely that research and development initiatives will be much more integrated in the future.

As is occurring in many countries, not only in Africa but around the world, there are budgetary reductions being made in the area of social welfare programs in Botswana. The amounts of funds available for Remote Area Development have been reduced. A significant percentage of RAD Program money in the past was devoted to the expansion of infrastructure (e.g. water points, schools, and health posts). Less emphasis was placed on programs that would enhance the standards of living, incomes, and employment of RADs. While the degree to which RADs have access to social services has increased over time, their overall social and economic status has declined, in the opinions both of RADs themselves and those working with them. In order to cope with this situation, some Remote Area Dwellers have been redefined as "desistutes": people without sufficient means of support, who receive assistance from the Department of Community Development in the Ministry of Labour and Home Affairs. Others have been given food and other goods under drought relief programs. Many of these programs have been cut back over time. When added to the cutbacks in access to wildlife due to changes in hunting legislation and declines in wildlife numbers, it is apparent that RADs are faced with a whole set of challenges. If, as has been suggested in some quarters, the Remote Area Development Program is done away with, then even those people in RAD settlements will have fewer human and economic resources available to them. Thus, what is happening in Botswana, in effect, is that remote area populations are being redefined in such a way that they no longer receive the same levels of development assistance as they did in the past, and this has significant implications for their social and economic well-being.

It is naive to believe that economic growth automatically results in a trickle-down of benefits to the poor. In fact, there is growing evidence in Africa that countries characterised by smaller disparities between the poor and wealthier social strata are the ones that have the best potential for sustainable, economic progress. It would be in the best interest not only of Remote Area Dwellers but of all the citizens of Botswana if greater efforts were made to provide enhanced development programs and to promote the flow of benefits to the poorer segments of the country's population.

An adjudication system should be worked out in which local people have the chance to put forth their claims to land and resources. This will be particularly important if it is decided to limit the access of people to places such as the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, blocks of land leased out to private individuals or companies in Wildlife Management Areas, and regions where commercial livestock development is slated to be expanded. If this is done, then a comprehensive system of assessment of assets will be required, as will a fair and just system of compensation of people for losses that they might suffer. At the same time, greater efforts will need to be expended in the promotion of equitable development and participatory decision-making. Only in this way will social justice be ensured in the Republic of Botswana.

References

1. Applied Research Unit, *Report of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve: A Socio-economic, Population, and Needs Assessment* (Gaborone: Ministry of Local Government, Lands, and Housing, 1997).
2. Botswana Ministry of Agriculture, *Contagious Bovine Pleuropneumonia in Botswana: Information Document* (Gaborone, Government of Botswana, 1996).
3. Campbell, A. C., 'Some Thoughts on Remote Area Dwellers (RADs)' in D.Nteta and J.Hermans, (eds.), *Sustainable Rural Development* (Gaborone: The Botswana Society, 1992): 213-215.
4. Campbell, A. and Main, M., *Western Sandveld Region Remote Area Dwellers* (Gaborone: Ministry of Local Government and Lands and Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, 1991).
5. Central Statistics Office, *The Rural Income Distribution Survey in Botswana 1974/75* (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1976).
6. Chr. Michelsen Institute, *NORAD's Support of the Remote Area Development Program (RADP) in Botswana: An Evaluation Report* (Bergen: Chr. Michelsen Institute Development Studies and Human Rights, 1995).
7. Ditshwanelo, *When Will This Moving Stop? Report on a Fact-finding Mission of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, April 10-14, 1996* (Gaborone: Ditshwanelo - the Botswana Center for Human Rights, 1996).
8. Falconer, J., 'The Epizootiology and Control of Foot and Mouth Disease in Botswana', *Veterinary Record* 91 (1972):354-359.
9. Falconer, J., 'Disease Situation Report - Food and Mouth Disease - Botswana', *Bulletin de l'Office International des Epizooties* 92 (1980):655-657.
10. Gibbons, W.J., 'Contagious Pleuropneumonia' in W.J.Gibbons, E.J.Catcott and J.F.Smithcoors, (eds.), *Bovine Medicine and Surgery: A Text and Reference Work* (Wheaton, Illinois: American Veterinary Publications, 1970): 179-181.
11. Gulbrandsen, Ornulf, Karlens, M. and Lexow, J., *Remote Area Development Programme* (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1986).
12. Hansen, A. and Oliver-Smith, A., (eds.), *Involuntary Migration and Resettlement: The Problems and Responses of Dislocated People* (Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1982).
13. Harvey, C. and Lewis, S.R., *Policy Choice and Development Performance in Botswana* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1990).
14. Hitchcock, R.K., *Monitoring, Research, and Development in the Remote Areas of Botswana* (Gaborone: Ministry of Local Government and Lands and Norwegian Agency for International Development, 1988).
15. Hitchcock, R.K., *Kalahari Communities: Bushmen and the Politics of the Environment in Southern Africa* (Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs, 1996).
16. Hitchcock, R.K. and Holm, J.D., 'Bureaucratic Domination of African Hunter-Gatherer Societies: A Study of the San in Botswana', *Development and Change* 24,1 (1993):1-35.
17. Hitchcock, R.K. and Holm, J.D., 'Grassroots Political Organizing among Kalahari Bushmen', *Indigenous Affairs* 1995/3:4-10.
18. Hitchcock, R.K., Masilo, R.R.B. and Monyatsi, P., *Subsistence Hunting and Resource Rights in Botswana: An Assessment of Special Game Licenses and their Impacts on Remote Area Dwellers and Wildlife Populations* (Gaborone: Natural Resource Management Project and Department of Wildlife and National Parks, 1995).
19. Huntingford, T.G.H., 'Pleuropneumonia Contagiosa' in *Diseases of Livestock*, 9th Edition. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1990):317-320.
20. International Fund for Agricultural Development, *The State of World Rural Poverty: A Profile of Africa* (Rome: International Fund for Agricultural Development, 1993).
21. Kann, U., Hitchcock, R. and Mbere, N., *Let Them Talk: A Review of the Accelerated Remote Area Development Program* (Gaborone: Ministry of Local Government and Lands, 1990).

22. Kossoudji, S. and Mueller, E., 'The Economic and Demographic Status of Female-Headed Households in Rural Botswana', *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 31 (1983):831-859.
23. Moeletsi, B., 'The San of Botswana: Legal Status, Access to Land, Development, and Natural Resources', *Indigenous Affairs* 1993/4:45-49.
24. Mogwe, A., *Who Was (T)here First? An Assessment of the Human Rights Situation of Basarwa in Selected Communities in the Gantsi District*. Occasional
25. Paper No. 10 (Gaborone: Botswana Christian Council, 1992). Republic of Botswana, *National Policy on Tribal Grazing Land*. Government
26. Paper No. 2 (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1992). Republic of Botswana, *Unified Hunting Regulations* (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1979).
27. Republic of Botswana, *National Policy on Agricultural Development*. Government Paper No. 1 of 1991 (Gaborone: Government Printer, 1991).
28. Saugestad, S., 'Botswana: the Inconvenient Indigenous Peoples', *IWGIA Newsletter* 1993/2:36-41.
29. Saugestad, S., 'To Corner the Bushman Market': Research Paradigms and Use of Research on the Indigenous Peoples of Botswana' in I.Amundsen, (ed.), *Knowledge and Development: Proceedings of the NFU Annual Conference 1994* (Tromsø: Center for Environment and Development Studies, University of Tromsø, 1994): 295-312.
30. Saugestad, S., 'The Position of Basarwa Organizations in Contemporary Botswana', Annex 7 of *NORAD's Support of the Remote Area Development Program (RADP) in Botswana* (Bergen: Chr. Michael Institute, Development Studies and Human Rights, 1995a).
31. Saugestad, S., 'Research and Its Relevance: Notes on the History of Research on the Bushmen-San-Basarwa-N'okwe of Botswana', Paper Presented at the Basarwa Research Workshop, University of Botswana, August 24-25, 1995b.
32. Saugestad, S., 'Setting History Straight: Bushmen Encounters in Cape Town', *Indigenous Affairs* 1996/4:4-11.
33. Saugestad, S., 'Background to the Basarwa Research Program' in P.Lane, C.Molebatsi, and J. Tsonope, eds., *Proceedings of the Basarwa Research Workshop, 24-25 August, 1995* (Gaborone: University of Botswana/NIR, in press).
34. Scudder, T., 'Resettlement' in A.K.Biswas, (ed.), *Handbook for Water Resources and Environment* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1996).
35. Watanabe, B. and Mueller, E., 'A Poverty Profile for Rural Botswana', *World Development* 12(2) (1984):115-127.
36. Willy, E., 'Hunter-Gatherers in Botswana & the Land Issue', *Indigenous Affairs* 1994/2:6-19.