



universität
wien

DIPLOMARBEIT

Titel der Diplomarbeit

‘If Tradition and Development Could Walk Together’.

The Changing of the Socio-Economic Space of the ≠Khomani San and
the Implications Thereof for the Organisation of Productive and
Reproductive Effort

Verfasser

Stephan Hochleithner

angestrebter akademischer Grad

Magister der Philosophie (Mag. phil.)

Wien, Mai 2012

Studienkennzahl lt. Studienblatt: A 307

Studienrichtung lt. Studienblatt: Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie

Betreuer: ao. Univ.-Prof. DDr. Werner Zips

We can't solve problems by using the same kind of thinking we used when we created them.

Albert Einstein

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my parents, Waltraud and Johann Hochleithner, as well as my brothers Andreas and Christian, for supporting me throughout my whole study in all ways possible: Thank you so much for being there for me in all the years. I also wish to thank Stephanie Arzberger: Thank you for your patience and your support, especially during the time of my fieldwork and while I was writing this thesis.

I am also very grateful to Dr.ⁱⁿ Manuela Zips-Mairitsch, who advised and supported me with great expertise and patience, in a friendly and benevolent manner, that has certainly become seldom in these days, as well as to my advisor during this thesis, ao. Univ.-Prof. DDr. Werner Zips, for supporting me in my doings and for opening up chances to me at the university, also aside from this thesis. Particular thanks is owed to Robert Konrad, for helping me to get started and for establishing many useful contacts to “the Kalahari”, as well as to David Mathews for his effort in proofreading my thesis.

Finally, I would like to thank all the people I met during my fieldwork, who supported me, who shared their daily lives, their experiences and their concerns with me. Especially Dawid and Maria Kariseb, Hendrik Kruiper and first and foremost Sus: this thesis owes a lot to you.

Eidesstattliche Erklärung

Ich erkläre hiermit an Eides Statt, dass ich die vorliegende Arbeit selbständig und ohne Benutzung anderer als der angegebenen Hilfsmittel angefertigt habe. Die aus fremden Quellen direkt oder indirekt übernommenen Gedanken sind als solche kenntlich gemacht.

Die Arbeit wurde bisher in gleicher oder ähnlicher Form keiner anderen Prüfungsbehörde vorgelegt und auch noch nicht veröffentlicht.

Wien, im Mai 2012

Stephan Hochleithner

Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Methodology	3
<i>2.1 A Personal Account of Planning the Trip to the Field</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>2.2 Gathering Data in the Field.....</i>	<i>5</i>
Participant Observation	6
Forms of Interviews and Conversations	7
Semistructured Interview	8
Narrative Biographical Interview	8
Ero-Epic Conversation.....	9
<i>2.3 The Translation Issue</i>	<i>10</i>
<i>2.4 Analysis.....</i>	<i>12</i>
3. Development, Capitalism & Work	13
<i>3.1 Development of Development – A Time-lapse of Theories and Practices</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>3.2 Micro- and Macro-Realities – Contextualising Approaches</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>3.3 Work and Anthropology</i>	<i>20</i>
Approaching the Concept of Work.....	20
The Anthropology of Work.....	23
The Theoretical Basis – Approaching the Field.....	25
4. San, “Bushmen”, ≠Khomani: A Brief Account on Terms and Naming	26
<i>4.1 San or “Bushmen”?.....</i>	<i>26</i>
<i>4.2 ≠Khomani.....</i>	<i>27</i>
5. Approaching the Present through the Past: An Ethnohistory of the ≠Khomani	28
<i>5.1 “Indigenous Peoples” of Southern Africa?</i>	<i>29</i>
<i>5.2 The “Kalahari Debate”</i>	<i>30</i>
<i>5.3 Migrations and Connections</i>	<i>32</i>

5.4 Colonialism and Apartheid	33
5.5 The //Sa! Makai.....	35
6. The Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park.....	38
6.1 Peace Parks – A Concept of Sustainable Development	39
What it’s all about: Three Main Goals.....	41
The Peace Park Foundation – Four Pillars to Guide Them All.....	43
6.2 Becoming Africa’s First Peace Park.....	45
7. The ≠Khomani San Land Claim	47
7.1 The Ae!Hai! Heritage Park Agreement.....	49
Rights to Land inside and outside the KTP	50
Commercial Rights, Cultural and Symbolic Use Rights	51
The Klein Skrij Lodge	52
8. Where Micro Meets Macro – The Socio-Economic Space of the ≠Khomani San	53
9. Infrastructure	54
9.1 Mobility.....	55
9.2 Communication.....	57
9.3 Food Supply.....	57
9.4 Water Supply	58
9.5 Alcoholism and Crime	59
9.6 School.....	62
10. Traditional vs. Western – Knowledge and Ways of Living	62
10.1 A Visible Effect	63
10.2 Two Different Approaches.....	64
11. Decision-making.....	67
11.1 Structures – Communal Property Association and the Interim Committee ..	67
11.2 The “Other People”	68
11.3 The Joint Management Board.....	69

11.4 Traditional Leadership.....	70
12. Jobs, Economic Opportunities and Conceptualisation of Work.....	72
12.1 “Bushmen” Heritage as Cash Crop.....	73
12.2 Craft-making	75
12.3 Entrepreneurs and Farmers.....	77
12.4 Heritage Park Project.....	78
13. The !Xaus Lodge	81
13.1 History and Organisation of the Lodge	82
13.2 Financial Benefits and Revenue Dispersal	84
13.3 Employment & Training.....	86
13.4 Craft Village	92
14. Conceptualisation of Work	95
15. Conclusion	98
15.1 Future Research	102
16. References	103
16.1 Literature	103
16.2 Internet.....	117
16.3 Interviews.....	120
16.4 Conversations	121
16.5 Legislative Texts.....	122
16.5 Fieldnotes	123
16.6 Correspondence	123
17. Appendix	124
17.1 Abbreviations	124
17.2 Abstract / Zusammenfassung	125
Abstract	125
Zusammenfassung.....	125
17.3 Curriculum Vitae – Stephan Hochleithner.....	127

1. Introduction

In 2002, the #Khomani San land claim against South African National Parks (SANParks), operator of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park in the Southern Kalahari, reached its final settlement. The #Khomani San were granted sizeable areas of land at the borders of the park, as well as inside the park itself. Ownership and rights regarding economical, cultural and symbolic use, were written down in the !Ae!Hai Heritage Park Agreement. Since then, a variety of projects relating to sustainable development have been implemented in the region, to assist the San community economically in their endeavour to meet the omnipresent challenges of globalisation, and to help them to preserve and live their culture at the same time. A joint-managed lodge was built, to symbolise the cooperation between the local communities (SANParks, Mier and #Khomani San) and to serve the two aims of development projects. Donors and NGOs raised and donated a large amount of money to sustain these various plans.

However, a closer look at the present-day reality draws a strikingly different picture. High unemployment rates, alcoholism, increasing criminality and a general atmosphere of decay are the circumstances accompanying much of the scientific research undertaken in the area. Land rights, cultural projects and support from government, NGOs and donors – all these circumstances tend to indicate ideal conditions for an indigenous community to successfully meet the challenges of globalisation. But why did millions of Rand, invested in local projects, seemingly have no positive impact on the situation? What are the criteria for development projects to be successful?

My initial motivation to engage with the region arose during a seminar held by Manuela Zips-Mairitsch at the Department for Social and Cultural Anthropology at the University of Vienna in 2011. The topic of the seminar was indigenous land rights, and the case of the #Khomani San land claim was given as an example. After talking to Manuela Zips-Mairitsch about the topic, I began consulting relevant literature on the area and the #Khomani San, as well as on development as such. It soon became apparent that the socio-economic space of the #Khomani San might be subject to

extreme tensions, accruing from a macro-reality of broader economic genesis and a micro-reality, constructed by the local situation.

Theoretical literature on the topics of capitalism, development and indigenous modernities suggest that *work*, i.e. the organisation of productive and reproductive effort, is a crucial element to both the macro- as well as the micro-reality. On the basis of this assumption, two questions arose, which were to guide me throughout the research project:

Q 1: In which way did the socio-economic space of the #Khomani San change after the settlement of their land claim?

Q 2: What are the consequences for the organisation of productive and reproductive effort among the #Khomani San, and, subsequently, for their livelihoods?

To answer these questions, I conducted anthropological fieldwork in the Andriesvale-Welkom area in the Southern Kalahari from July to September 2011. The data resulting from this research will be presented within this thesis. At the beginning of the discussion, the methods which have been used to obtain the data will be presented. The theoretical framework, consisting of a presentation and critical discussion of development theories, economic approaches and finally, the Anthropology of Work, follow subsequently. Amended by ethnohistoric data from the field, I will then present the history of the #Khomani, the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and the land claim which was officially settled in 2002 C.E. This presentation is followed by embedding and discussing the findings of the fieldwork, which are finally summed up with the theoretical account in the conclusion of this thesis.

2. Methodology

2.1 A Personal Account of Planning the Trip to the Field

The field is a term often used without clearly establishing its meaning. But as Akhil Gupta and James Ferguson (1997: 7) or Vered Amit (2000: 1ff) have shown, it is also subject to discussion, ever since Bronisław Malinowski brought up the term by shifting research methodology. In this thesis I use the term *field* to refer to the space I was researching in, and that consists of an array of dynamic geographical and societal elements and variables, which are defined and redefined throughout the thesis. In many cases I simply refer to it as *the Andriesvale-Welkom area* instead of *the field*. Thus, I am using a geographical term for a multidimensional, non-closed space, that is an analytical image on the one hand and an open, dynamic and constantly changing social reality on the other hand.

After reviewing vast amounts of literature in Austria, I spent three months in the Republic of South Africa, from July to September 2011¹. The modes in which I collected data during my research varied according to situations and sources: I gathered information via e-mail and phone calls, through participant observation, interviews, conversations and, last but not least, through personal reflections while keeping field notes. All these results constitute the pool of data, which I evaluated using a logical grid to organise the information and by applying the method of qualitative content analysis as established by Gläser and Laudel (Gläser / Laudel 2009: 197ff).

A big part of planning my fieldwork was made easy for me through the expertise and contacts of Robert Konrad, a former student at the Department of Cultural and Social Anthropology at the University of Vienna, who conducted research for his final thesis on the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park in 2005 (Konrad 2008), and from my advisor Werner Zips and his colleague and wife Manuela Zips-Mairitsch, who have been researching and filming in Southern Africa for several

¹ In Social Anthropology, conducting research in the field is indispensable for gathering meaningful data (Hammersley / Atkinson 2007: 1), but it also is very expensive. Without the support of my family and a *Förderungsstipendium* granted by the University of Vienna, this project would not have been possible.

years. Robert Konrad arranged the contact to *the interpreter*², who he had met during his time in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. I got in touch with Steven Robins, Professor at the Department of Sociology and Social Anthropology at the University of Stellenbosch, RSA, who also granted me access to the university's library as a visitor, and Roger Chennells, who had been the #Khomani's attorney during their land claim, and arranged appointments with them. I contacted *South African National Parks (SANParks)* via e-mail, as well as *Transfrontier Parks Destinations (TFPD)*, a company that runs tourism-business-projects in Transfrontier Parks in Southern Africa (URL 3), like the !Xaus Lodge, which I focused on during my fieldwork; this served the purpose of gathering information and permissions to conduct interviews with their employees.

SANParks rejected my proposal for conducting interviews among the staff of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park when I was already in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, as they required "a much fuller proposal" (E-Mail Annecke 02.08.2011), and also due to time-related issues. Nevertheless, SANParks were very cooperative and informed the management staff of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park that I would be in the area. Due to the fact that I planned to work primarily outside the park's borders, the rejection of my proposal did not hinder my research plans.

TFPD was very cooperative as well. Eleanor Muller from TFPD's Cape Town office got in touch after being informed by SANParks and put me in touch with Anel de Klerk, manager at !Xaus Lodge. I also received a two-thirds-discount on the fare for staying at the lodge, which amounted to 1,000 ZAR (98 €) per night. The message from TFPD stated that "!Xaus Lodge staff and management are always happy to accommodate requests for interviews" (E-Mail Muller 02.08.2011).

I had reserved a few days for researching in the library of the University of Cape Town (UCT) and for meetings after my arrival in Cape Town, and then made my way to the Andriesvale-Welkom area with a rental car. The trip to a farm near Welkom, where I had arranged to stay for the first night, took me three days and I arrived without any major inconvenience. After a few nights, which I spent at the farm, I moved camp to Welkom, where many of the individuals I focused on lived. This made it much easier to perform participant observation and to conduct interviews and conversations, since I then spent day and night among members of

² *The interpreter* and the problems accruing from working with her are discussed in chapter 2.3 of this thesis, *The Translation Issue*.

the #Khomani³. The stay in the Andriesvale-Welkom area was adjourned by a trip to Upington (the nearest major city, about 250 km from Welkom), to conduct an interview and to access the internet, as well as by my stay at the !Xaus Lodge, where I conducted interviews, conversations and participant observation. After returning to Cape Town in September 2011 I met Roger Chennells at Stellenbosch; the appointment with Steven Robins did not take place.

2.2 Gathering Data in the Field

To obtain meaningful information from a chosen setting, information that is useful for answering the research questions, that stands in context to the problem that is to be investigated, but is not manipulated by others or by the researcher's unconscious desire for suitable results, and to gather this information in an ethical way – this is the goal I set for myself before I went into the field; this might be the most challenging part of a research project in Social Anthropology for me.

Before going into the field the question of methods used has to be asked. Which methods are suitable for answering the research questions, which methods are combinable? How far can a generalisation go, when it is derived from the data that was obtained through a specific method? What mistakes can emerge from a certain method and how can these mistakes and distortions be compensated (Gläser / Laudel 2009: 29)? Answering these questions and trying to keep up with the goal I set for myself, I decided on a mixture of methods, which I would like to discuss shortly at this point in the thesis: participant observation, and different types of interviews and conversations. Some of the methods, such as participant observation and ero-epic conversation, cannot be conducted separately in practice (Girtler 2001: 59), but are treated separately in this chapter for the sake of lucidity.

To some it might seem pedantic to spend so much space within a thesis on the question of methods used during fieldwork. But to me it seems very important to reveal the way in which I gathered the data on which my argumentation is based. It makes the work done here traceable – from its beginnings to the conclusions drawn, and the implications derived from it.

³ The usage of the terms “Bushmen”, San, #Khomani and so forth is discussed in chapter 4.

Participant Observation

Participant observation is not merely a method deployed by social anthropologists, it is considered to be *the* method that constitutes the uniqueness of the discipline, distinguishing it from others. It is “the foundation of cultural anthropology” (Bernard 2011: 256), or, as the anthropologists Gupta and Ferguson (1997) put it:

“The difference between anthropology and [...] other disciplines, it would be widely agreed, lies less in the topics studied (which, after all, overlap substantially) than in the distinctive method anthropologists employ, namely fieldwork based on participant observation“ (Gupta / Ferguson 1997: 2).

Apart from its role as an identity marker for social and cultural anthropologists, it is also one of the most useful methods in the toolbox of the social sciences. According to the Austrian Sociologist and Ethnologist Roland Girtler (2001: 61), the method of observation can be seen as a procedure, during which the observing person tries to capture sensuously perceivable action.

Of the four types of observation Girtler defines, only two appeared to be useful for my purposes; these are the *structured participant observation* and the *unstructured participant observation*.⁴ Common to both these variants of participant observation is the fact that the observing person takes part in the action that is to be observed. When conducting structured participant observation, the researcher tries to standardise his/her actions, and therefore make them checkable, by applying observation-schemes. In opposition to this stands the unstructured participant observation, which is not standardised. Girtler argues that the advantage of unstructured participant observation lies in the freedom which it allows the researcher. When not bound to schemes, complex actions can be observed and described almost entirely without restrictions, newly emerging arrays can be integrated and the researcher’s expanding knowledge and perspectives can be

⁴ Roland Girtler’s exact words are “teilnehmend strukturierte Beobachtung” and “teilnehmend unstrukturierte Beobachtung“ (Girtler 2001: 62) – as I do not consider it to be incompatible with Girtler’s definitions, in my translation of the phrases I changed the order of the adjectives placed before “Beobachtung“ (observation) to emphasise the role of *participation* within the method.

utilised. Certainly, the researcher's observations are more controllable within the framework of structured participant observation, but as Girtler argues, in unstructured (or *free*) participant observation, the controlling institution is the researcher him-/herself in his/her ambition to avoid distortion where possible (ibid.: 62).

Since I was embedded into the setting, I mostly conducted unstructured participant observation and took notes either concurrently or immediately after from memory. In some cases, such as my visit to !Xaus Lodge or meetings, I started with structured participant observation and then switched to an unstructured mode. This helped me in getting started, and was planned in this manner.

Forms of Interviews and Conversations

When conducting interviews and conversations during my fieldwork, I always observed the setting in which it took place, as well as the roles and positions that all the participants – including myself – had. The most crucial elements in the interview or conversation situations I experienced can be reduced to three main factors, which are all interconnected: power, strategical considerations and the fact that my partners knew that I was recording / going to write down what they said.

The factor of power had the most significant impact. When I had conversations with employees at the !Xaus Lodge, many of them tried to spot everyone who might be listening. Some, on the other hand, spoke freely. But one employee even refused to talk about the situation at the lodge when we met outside the park, knowing that I was going to write down what had been said, and obviously anxious to stay out of any possible trouble with their employer.

In one case, while speaking to a #Khomani woman, I even had to cancel the interview, because the recording machine made her too nervous. Others spoke overblown English while being recorded, what led to a point where the interview no longer had any informational content. In some cases I used a video camera to record an interview, but most of the times I used an unobtrusive voice recorder, whose existence was usually forgotten a few minutes into the interview process. Although problems did occur in conjunction with the recording of interviews, in most cases I stuck to recording. Firstly, as already mentioned, most interviewees forgot about the recording device during the interview and secondly, it is far more efficient to record,

transcribe and then analyse what was said, as opposed to only keeping records from memory (Gläser / Laudel 2009: 157f; Bernard 2011: 170).

Strategical considerations played a big role in many of my conversations and even more so in interviews. Interviewees thought of alliances within the group, tried to *get a message out there* through what they told me and so forth. I did not find a satisfying method to prevent my partners from doing so, but I learned how to identify statements that were related to strategical considerations.

Semistructured Interview

According to Gläser and Laudel (2009: 111), semistructured interviews are especially useful if several different topics are to be covered within the space of one interview, which are not to (solely) be determined by the interviewees' answers but by the objectives of the research, and/or if the interview aims at gathering specific, determinable information. Certainly, using a general guideline during an interview can make the situation even more difficult, and generate results which have nothing to do with the social reality in which the interviewee lives (Girtler 2001: 157). Thus, as will be explained further down in this chapter, I also used other methods of interviewing respectively of conversation whenever suitable.

I chose the semistructured interview for most of the formal interviews I conducted on the basis of an appointment where all the participants were prepared to encounter an interview situation. In some cases, when the interviewees spontaneously agreed to being interviewed, I also used a standardised guideline. These interviews were always recorded.

Narrative Biographical Interview

I used the narrative biographical interview especially in cases where I wanted to find out about historical processes. Specifically, when talking to elders I soon found out that they were quite unwilling to answer questions that I used in the semistructured interviews. Therefore I started by asking an open question at the beginning, such as "How are your days?". The method of narrative biographical interviewing opens up the opportunity for the interviewee to structure the story they are telling in their own way and, perhaps most crucially, to emphasise the parts that

are important to *them* (Schlehe 2008: 125f). Conducting interviews in this manner certainly takes more time, but at the same time, generates confidence and a relaxed atmosphere and thus, extraordinarily useful data, in my experience.

Ero-Epic Conversation

During my e-mail correspondence with SANParks authorities I was told that the communities at the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park have already been over-researched (E-Mail Annecke 18.07.2011). This was when I decided to include the method of ero-epic conversation in my fieldwork-toolbox. The ero-epic conversation allows the researcher and the persons whose lives are the objects of the research to meet on a different level – it makes both become *learners*. During an ero-epic conversation, it is not only the researcher who asks questions, but also the one who is being interviewed. Both learn about their respective *Lebenswelten*, their interests and their motives (Girtler 2001: 147).

I consider the ero-epic conversation to be a very useful method – in combination with the free participant interview – when researching in the field. A back and forth of questions and narrations, both interweaved into a conversation, generated the most interesting information. Some might say that the researcher biases his/her conversation partner simply by answering questions, by bringing his/her own opinions into a discussion. But – and here I agree with Girtler (ibid.: 159) – I think that opening the researcher's person to the conversation partner has more positive than negative effects; that the trust which is necessary for obtaining crucial information can only be attained in this way.

Especially while conducting research at !Xaus Lodge, I was very often asked for my opinion on things. In some cases I replied that we could talk about this at the end of my fieldwork, in other cases I answered immediately and openly. The latter always, without exception, led to an atmosphere of comfort and my conversation partners opened up, even if their opinion was in opposition to mine.

Ero-epic conversations were usually not recorded and I took notes from my memory as soon as possible. This worked out better than I had imagined. The information was clearer to me when it was obtained through a *real* conversation and not during an interview, during which I asked questions and was served complex clusters of information.

2.3 The Translation Issue

The issue of translation had a two-fold importance for this thesis. (1) Firstly, I was neither capable of speaking Afrikaans, which is spoken by all San of the Andriesvale-Welkom area, nor of speaking Nama (which the San themselves considered to be their *actual* language) when I started my fieldwork. Therefore it was necessary to depend on the help of an interpreter for most of the formal interviews. *The interpreter* did not speak Nama herself, but was fluent Afrikaans and English. (2) Secondly, since the #Khomani communicate in Nama whenever possible, the information given to me was first translated into Afrikaans, and then into English. Even when my Afrikaans had developed enough to have a conversation or at least to understand what a conversation was about, information was undergoing a translation process. This problem was not as important as the first one, since my research did not depend on exact wording and phrasing, except when it came to *work / labor*. But even then, as we shall see, it was not so much about the actual terms, but rather about connotations. This problem was solvable by applying sufficient time and patience. Although it is of course important to note that better results can be achieved by actually learning the native language, by being able to speak and understand it, since grammatical and semantical differences make *actual* differences in some cases – a fact well-established since Bronisław Malinowski systematised fieldwork methods (Rubel / Rosman 2003: 3; Sökefeld 2008: 153; Schlehe 2008: 131).

Involving an interpreter in my research sometimes made things more difficult, sometimes it made them easier. It is possible to conduct efficient fieldwork by using an interpreter, but the fact that a lot of anthropologists do so is rarely treated in anthropological writings. Axel Borchgrevink argues that there is “a general disapproval of this approach within anthropology” (Borchgrevink 2003: 97), but it is common among anthropologists to make use of an interpreter, however, this is seldom addressed (ibid.; Schlehe 2008: 131).

When I arrived in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, my Afrikaans was at a stage where I was not able to have a conversation that went beyond the initial phase of greetings, personal introductions and complaints about the weather. Since most of the individuals whom I intended to interview and spend time with only spoke Nama and Afrikaans, I had to rely entirely on the fluency of *the interpreter* – a woman who asked me to not mention her name in this thesis – for the time being, until my

language skills had become good enough to at least understand what people were telling me.

The interpreter has been living with part of the #Khomani for about ten years and is not only highly integrated, but also communicates within a huge network among local protagonists. She had already been translating for two other social researchers⁵ and spoke English as well as Afrikaans. All those qualities made her the perfect gatekeeper for my research.

Of course I was aware of the fact that translation – especially when conducting qualitative research – and *the interpreter's* position within the community have its perils. Although the problem of translation became less severe as my Afrikaans improved, after my return to Vienna I contacted a friend whose first language is Afrikaans, and asked him to double-check the translation. It turned out that almost all of the material had been translated correctly, that there were only a few mistakes at not especially important points and that my intuition, relating to parts of the interviews where I assumed *the interpreter* was choosing her wording to suit her own opinion on a topic more than what the interviewee said, was correct. With a clear conscience I can say that, after all the double-checking, there are (almost) no translation related mistakes in my interview data. Before beginning an interview I also discussed the translation of the questions with *the interpreter*, and, as many authors suggest, after they had been translated into Afrikaans, I asked her to translate them back into English, to be sure that the meaning was retained (Sökefeld 2008: 153).

The problem that emerged from *the interpreter's* position within the field and the fact that I had to rely on her when I started to move around in the region and among the people living there, was harder to solve. Especially during the first week of my research, I was dependant on her for information about people and on her knowledge about their whereabouts. But as time passed I got to know several other people in the area, who were able to speak English, to translate and to provide geographical information. Day by day I was increasingly integrated into the local community, and with the growing degree of integration, my ability to move on my own grew.

In some situations I encountered problems that stemmed from me being associated with *the interpreter*, from the fact that people knew I was traveling around

⁵ One of them was Robert Konrad, who conducted research for his final thesis in the area in 2005 (Konrad 2008). He established contact with *the interpreter* for me.

in her company. Even though she was not with me in these situations, people then talked to me as if to an opposing party. I tried hard to convince them of my objectivity, but in some cases I was unsuccessful. However, the information I got while conducting interviews, conversations and observations in my temporary position as an associate of *the interpreter*, also gave me valuable insights into the every-day-world of the local communities. And maybe it is especially this data that made the picture become relatively complete.

As Axel Borchgrevink argues, “[...] the problems connected with interpreter use may to some extent be overcome or reduced through an awareness of them” (Borchgrevink 2003: 113). I made great efforts to identify and to balance possible problems, mistakes and distortions through the use of an interpreter and, considering the relatively short period of time I spent in the field, I certainly gathered more meaningful data than if I had attempted to get along solely on the basis of my own Afrikaans skills.

Nevertheless, *the interpreter's* open-mindedness, her honesty and her will to support me in my aim to gather objective data made her the perfect person for this task.

Another aspect concerning the translation issue regards the citation of interviews, especially with San, in this thesis. All quotes are in English, which is neither my mother-tongue nor that of most of the San I was speaking to. *The interpreter* also spoke a very broken English at times. However, I transcribed the interviews word for word – including grammar and vocabulary mistakes – and will be quoting them verbatim. I do so not in order to evoke any connotation with “primitives”, but to keep the originality of the spoken word as much as possible to make my data traceable. The “quality” of the English in the quotes is my responsibility and not the San's, it is a result of the courtesy they extended to me.

2.4 Analysis

To analyse the huge amounts of data which I brought back from South Africa, I used a method that was brought up by Gläser and Laudel in their book „Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse“ (2009). I used it, wherever suitable, for qualitative content analysis, instead of the common method as it has

been established since the 1980s, particularly by the German psychologist Philipp Mayring, who is also eponymous with the concept.

As Mayring himself says, the results derived from data by using his method are, in most cases, still processed quantitatively (Mayring 2003: 8). This is what Gläser and Laudel take issue with when they say that Mayring's method produces more quantitative than qualitative results, which is actually counterproductive when trying to extract qualitative results from data (Gläser / Laudel 2009: 197). Gläser's and Laudel's method is indeed based on Mayring's approach, but after forming categories based on theoretical assumptions, the system stays open for forming new categories or enlarging existing ones while analysing the data, thus combining deductive and inductive approaches. The integration of *Kausaldimensionen* (causal dimensions) allows us to consider information about relations between variables, and about influences that are not captured by variables (ibid.: 208). In this manner, maintenance of content and information is improved, and therefore the diversity of results produced is increased.

To analyse my field notes I followed the same approach of qualitative content analysis (despite using them as a general guideline in building my argumentation), after coding them, as H. Russel Bernard suggests in his introduction to anthropological fieldwork methods (Bernard 2011: 304f).

3. Development, Capitalism & Work

As we shall see, the concept of community involvement in the field unfolding around the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park is strongly connected to the concept of development, specifically to concepts of sustainable development (Chapter 6.1). As a result, I consider it necessary to discuss the genesis of development concepts as well as to sketch the implications and consequences of their practices, which I intend to situate within the context of western economic hegemony, partly following the argumentation by Escobar (1991: 675), but also by considering the criticism that has been passed on post-developmental approaches (Stockmann 2010: 2; Robins 2003: 270f). Connecting development and capitalism will subsequently lead to a brief examination of capitalist characteristics, and thus, to identifying the western notion of *work* as a core concept of capitalism as well as (or, and subsequently) of many development concepts. Finally, I will discuss anthropological approaches towards

work, especially the one advocated by Gerd Spittler (2008), by following the argumentation of an article I published in 2011 (Hochleithner 2011).

This account on development, capitalism and *work* will create the theoretical foundation for the presentation of the findings from my fieldwork, and thus, for a critical analysis of the situation of the ≠Khomani San, which is subject to consequences from applied development theory through involvement in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park.

3.1 Development of Development – A Time-lapse of Theories and Practices

The concept of development is closely connected with the paradigm of *progress*, which came up in the 18th century C.E., when competitive capitalism arose in Europe (Gardner / Lewis 1996: 3f). Originally a concept of biology, development became a part of social evolutionism, i.e. seeing societies as developing along a unilinear sequence of stages, whereby European society – or Western – is argued as representing the highest stage. Other societies – like the San – are seen as survivors of an earlier stage (Lévi-Strauss 1974: 3ff).

This point of view also featured the possibility of developing something (respectively *someone*, or a whole society), from primitive to higher. An approach that found favour with many of the 18th and 19th century C.E. scholars, such as Comte, Marx, Spencer or Toynbee (Stockmann 2010: 1; Faschingeder 2001: 26). US President Truman gave the official starting signal for practical implementations of this evolutionist paradigm in a speech in 1949 C.E., assigning the task of developing all countries – that were considered at a lower stage than the West – to the developed states of the Global North. “A new problem was created, and with it the solutions” (Gardner / Lewis 1996: 3): Development.

During the 1950s C.E., development was considered a necessity, and the concept and its implementations had been reduced to mere economic (capitalistic) growth (Stockmann 2010: 2). This was the time when the *Third World* was invented, as was *orientalism*, Arturo Escobar (1991: 662) argues, as an instrument that allows its inventors – the West – to legitimise its doings and to control those involved (ibid.: 676). Escobar states, that

“[...], a]fter World War II, countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America started to be seen, and to see themselves, as ‘underdeveloped’, and to be treated accordingly“ (ibid.: 675).

In the 1960s C.E., dependency theories came up, drafting a different point of view by presenting development as dependent on underdevelopment. The latter, in this view, is not considered as preceding the first: instead, both are perceived as being part of the same process, i.e. capitalism. From this point of view, underdevelopment can only be resolved by bringing an end to the influence of the centre, the West, on the periphery, the underdeveloped countries (Menzel 2010: 106). Therefore, development was being seen as autochthonous and emancipative, and as a necessity to empower the underdeveloped periphery (Stockmann 2010: 2).

Two decades after the start of broad development initiatives, Escobar argues, development experts began to be disappointed with the “poor results of technology and capital-intensive top-down interventions” (Escobar 1991: 663). Therefore, Escobar continues his argumentation, the experts started applying “new sensitivity toward the social and cultural factors in their programs” (ibid.). In the late 1970s C.E. development projects started to change direction and focus on the improvement of livelihoods of *the poor*, by addressing the domains of nutrition, health, employment, housing, family-planning and education (ibid.; Stockmann 2010: 2). Thus, shifting from the Third World to the poor as target group:

“Projects had to be socially relevant, to be culturally appropriate, and to involve their direct beneficiaries in a significant fashion” (Escobar 1991: 663).

In 1973, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), applied this approach to their new policy by continuing to extensively promote economic growth. This new policy was presented by the World Bank in 1975. Modernisation was still named a central point, as well as monetization, although the focus had been shifted to mainly rural areas. The task was to transform rural societies, to make them undertake the “transition from traditional isolation [sic!] to integration with the national economy” (ibid.).

During the 1980s C.E. it became obvious that the Earth's resources are finite, and that the western concept of development therefore eventually leads to ruin. Subsequently, the

“model of catch-up development was being increasingly (if not replaced, then at least) amended by the concept of sustainable development in the 90s” (Stockmann 2010: 2).⁶

The concept of Sustainable Development⁷ has its roots in the IUCN's World Conservation Strategy, published in 1980 C.E., which aimed at combining socio-economic and environmental issues within one development strategy, to sustain nutritional and industrial resources on the planet (IUCN / UNEP / WWF 1980: VI). This approach, together with the new focus on the poor instead of the Third World, resulted in concepts such as Community Based Development in the 1990s C.E., trying to involve local communities in development projects (Büscher / Dietz 2005: 2f).

As a reaction to these developments, critics accused the new concepts of wrongly claiming to be altruistic, of only superficially addressing improvements of the livelihoods of the poor. These post-modern approaches constitute post-development theory (e.g. Robins 2003: 267), aiming at abrogating not only development, but the *idea* of development as such (Stockmann 2010: 2) and, therefore, the necessity of development as it was commonly accepted. Post-development scholars attempt this by applying Michel Foucault's methods, seeing development situated in a field that is ruled by power and the struggle for it, identifying development as a fictive construct (Robins 2003: 269; Faschingeder 2001: 135). In this light, development appears as a strategy to implement Western structures, and therefore post-development scholars, such as Arturo Escobar or Gustavo Esteva, see even scarcity, poverty, and help to cope with it as inventions of the West (Faschingeder 2001: 130). The necessity of development is therefore not a given, or, as Escobar argues, development is only to be considered a necessity

⁶ Quote originally in German and translated by the author: “Modell der nachholenden Entwicklung wurde in den 90er Jahren zunehmend durch das Konzept der nachhaltigen Entwicklung, wenn auch nicht ersetzt, so doch ergänzt” (Stockmann 2010: 2).

⁷ The concept of Sustainable Development will be discussed in detail in chapter 6, when situating the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park within this context.

“[...] if one continues to adhere to a vision of history propagated by politicians, multinational corporations, and mainstream scientific discourses, for which knowledge is what Western science knows, progress what the West’s dominant groups have achieved, and the only kind of life worth living what the knowledge and achievements define” (Escobar 1991: 676).

Escobar concludes his argument by stating that development as political practice is “a politics of a Western-biased, patriarchal, scientific, economic and cultural project” (ibid.: 677).

In the light of these accusations against development, new concepts were constructed to approach the issue in a non-Eurocentric way. As Steven Robins explains, these concepts include initiatives such as “ethnodevelopment, indigenous technical knowledge (ITK), and more recently alternative development and post-development” (Robins 2003: 268). As one would expect, the post-development point of view was heavily criticised, and at the beginning of the 21st century C.E., development theories, modernisation, dependency theory and post-development theories of the past century were considered outdated and unable to give structure to development discourses any longer (Faschingeder 2001: 136).

As Steven Robins points out, the post-development point of view obscures the fact that those who are subject to development are just not subjects of, but actors in development, that

“[...] postmodernist critiques of ‘development’ draws attention away from [...] material realities, and what these may mean for actual human beings” (Robins 2003: 270).

Stockmann agrees with this point, arguing that Western pictures of culture and consumerism reach almost every corner of the world and thus, generate desire for Western ideational and material goods, such as bigger residential properties, increased mobility and means for consuming, using education and training as vehicles to satisfy their desires (Stockmann 2010: 3). This is what Stockmann calls

the “radiance of the Western model of consumption and wealth” (ibid.)⁸ and what evokes strategies to reach the aim of meeting this model.

In his article on “Indigenous Modernities” (2003), Steven Robins argues that reality – especially in South Africa, as he found out in his case studies – appears to contest the theory of modernisation, dependency theories, as well as the post-development approach. He found that the need for housing, electricity, clean water and so on leaves no space for the categorical refusal of development, and that locals were neither challenging development and the state in a revolutionary fashion, nor completely taken in by Western ways of living. Actually, Robins concludes, people tend to construct hybrids of traditional and modern approaches (Robins 2003: 280ff).

3.2 Micro- and Macro-Realities – Contextualising Approaches

As for example Steven Robins (2003: 270) or Reinhard Stockmann (2010: 2) argue, development happens not only by Western instigation, but also by demand of the resource-poor, not least due to needs generated by everyday reality. The situation that led to this reality was created by colonialism, and thus, by western imperialism in the first place, and still stands under Western (economic) primacy today. Although blinding out reality-generated-demands, “the post-development critics map out global relations of power and subordination in broad brushstrokes” (Robins 2003: 283f). Therefore, categorical refusal of the post-development approach misses out the *macro-reality* of capitalism’s need for expansion and the associated mechanisms.

The macro side of reality in this context is characterised by an attribute inherent to capitalism: Global expansion, which is closely linked to globalisation (Novy / Parnreiter / Fischer 1999: 12), is a phenomenon, or a process, that is subject to an interdisciplinary as well as an interfaculty discourse. Many scientists, such as the historian Gerhard Schulz (2004), consider globalisation to be a phenomenon of the 20th century. E.C. Schulz considers the regulations of the 1940 E.C. Tripartite Pact, between Germany, Italy and Japan, as leading the way for globalised processes (Schulz 2004: 61), and marks the beginning of what we call globalisation

⁸ Originally in German, translated by the author: “Strahlkraft des westlichen Konsum- und Wohlstandsmodells” (Stockmann 2010: 3).

today with World War II, more precisely with the USA entering the war and thereby making it a global one (ibid.: 51ff).

This point of view is opposed by a broader approach, for which Eric Wolf created an example in his book with the ironic title “Europe and the People without History” (1997). He argues that there have *always* been connections between humans, which form a global network amongst them. To see groups as isolated or at the periphery is therefore an unsupportable presumption, because “[...] the world of humankind constitutes a manifold, a totality of interconnected processes [...]” (Wolf 1997: 3). Nevertheless, to assume that globalisation is a phenomenon that has been accompanying humankind from its beginnings, goes too far. But Wolf’s approach shows that perspectives on globalisation, such as the one presented by Schulz, are not comprehensive enough, leaving out the social, cultural and structural aspects of globalisation.

For Novy, Parnreiter and Fischer (1999), globalisation accrues in the 15th and 16th century C.E., when the European and the Americas’ trade networks were connected, creating a global trade system of a european kind of capitalism (Novy / Parnreiter / Fischer 1999: 10ff). This view is supported by the arguments of the Austrian anthropologist Andre Gingrich. He identifies different phases of globalisation and sees a new phase of globalisation in the global generalisation of european structures through colonialism (Gingrich 1999: 10f). This generalisation subsequently includes economic structures, for example trade networks and subsequently capitalism.

The premise of growth, which resulted from the detachment of the european economic system from society and nature (Altvater / Geiger 2011: 8), is significantly relevant for the need for expansion that is inherent to capitalism. This detachment from society and nature correlates in timely fashion with the emergence of the concept of development in the 18th century C.E. (Gardner / Lewis 1996: 3f).

Economic growth in capitalism is possible either by increasing the volume of labour, increasing productivity of labour, or by spatial expansion (Altvater / Geiger 2011: 8). In this context, development appears to be part of the global expansion of capitalism, in the sense of being a part of, or at least contributing to the structures which presuppose economic growth. The generalisation of european structures during colonialism shows strong similarities. Development today has (largely) overcome cruel practices, such as were used during colonialism, and now features

approaches such as Community Based Development (Büscher / Dietz 2005: 2f). However, it still aims at the implementation of european structures, i.e. capitalism. Only the methods of this generalisation have changed, but not the endeavour itself (Novy / Parnreiter / Fischer 1999: 12).

However – to conclude this chapter – as the criticism that has been passed on post-development shows: To infer from these facts that development features hegemonic characteristics and therefore should be refused, misses out great parts of material reality, of *micro-reality*. Macro- and micro-reality construct a field of discourses and practices, that underlies praxeological tensions, which constantly and dynamically define and redefine the structures of this field. This field constitutes the *socio-economic space* of people's everyday lives. An approach that combines parts of the macro-analysis of post-development critics with anthropological micro-analysis is highly likely to draw a very appropriate picture of the socio-economic space of people, in which development projects play a crucial role.

3.3 Work and Anthropology

In the course of the intention to examine a socio-economic space in the stress ratio of macro and micro aspects of development, it appears useful to address a sub-discipline of Social Anthropology that has been rather neglected so far: The Anthropology of Work. As I already mentioned briefly, *work* is a key element to capitalism and, thus, to development. Therefore it is necessary to turn toward the conceptualisation of *work* and its place in capitalism.

Approaching the Concept of Work

As I have argued elsewhere (Hochleithner 2011), it is important to distinguish the term *work* from the term *labour*, when approaching the european concept of organising productive and reproductive effort. The term labour derives from latin *labor*, *laboris*, and is close to the verb *labare*, which originally refers to staggering (under a heavy load) or being close to falling. Evolving from this meaning, the verb *laborare* later stands for working, straining oneself and for being in pain. In this sense it later also describes the strain or the pain during birth (URL 27). In his 1776 “An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations”, Adam Smith uses

labour for the first time in its economic sense, as effort to satisfy material needs (Smith 2005: 8; URL 27). The genesis of the term *work* can be traced back to Indo-European *uerg-*, which refers to doing, making or acting (URL 27). Although *work* is in the meanwhile very often used synonymical for labour, it originally stands in contrast to the latter, creating a dichotomy of straining activities (labour) and other, thus not-straining activities (*work*), of labour and non-labour (Hochleithner 2011: 44). As we shall see, these two terms, *work* and labour, symbolically stand for how productive and reproductive effort is organised in Europe.

John Holloway (2011) states, that abstract *work* (in marxist terms) was brought up and established as a concept in course of a historical process (Holloway 2011: 4). As I argued elsewhere (Hochleithner 2011: 50ff), this historical process was the change from tributary to capitalistic mode of production in Europe from the 15th century C.E. on. The massive growth of trade networks within Europe at the time, driven by increasing military expansion and mobility of merchants, soon reached its limits, which were set by the feudal structures of property. The end of exclusive rights to means of production of the feudal seigniors gave way to the genesis of capitalist structures, which were catalysed by the combination of natural resources with manufacture. Through this combination, monetary wealth was transformed into capital, a procedure for which the English textile industry of the 18th century C.E. is the most famous example. Therefore, although wage-labour relations had been existing prior these developments, they now became constitutive for most people's way of living in Europe (Wolf 1997: 267).

These changes induced a shift in european economy, from trade to production, making labour the crucial element. This was only possible because incredible masses of former bondsmen and -women were set free in course of the end of feudalism. They were expropriated of all means to make their subsistence except their work-force. This process of dispossession is commonly known as Primitive Accumulation (*ursprüngliche Akkumulation*), the origin of capitalism (Polanyi 1957: 88).

As previously mentioned, the combination of two elements – natural resources with manufacture – is the key concept for understanding the process of transformation of the European economy towards a capitalistic system. It is also the key to understanding the role of labour in capitalism: Labour constitutes the third element that brings together natural resources and manufacture, it is crucial to

production and therefore central to capitalism. Adam Smith' as well as Karl Marx's theories of value evolved around this fact: No production without labour, no economic value without labour (Spittler 2008: 32).

Labour-force, therefore, became a commodity just like raw materials, sold in units (of time or accomplishment) by those who had been expropriated during Primitive Accumulation. As concerning all commodities, Karl Marx distinguishes *use value* from *exchange value* also in regard to labour. The use value results from the use which an individual can make of a certain object. It does not depend on the amount of labour necessary to produce the object, but solely on the use or benefit an individual can gain from it through consumption (Marx 1963: 50). The exchange value derives from a given case, in which an object has no use value for the individual who possesses it, but does for another individual, who does not possess it. If a process of exchange is then procured by money, the object is thereby being abstracted from its original purpose (ibid.: 100). This leads to the well-known distinction between abstract and particular labour: The latter becomes abstract when its exchange is procured by money. Labour is the use value of labour power, which is realised by its consumption, i.e. by producing something (ibid.: 192). From this point of view, the dichotomy between productive and non-productive activities is derived, classifying not only labour, but any kind of *work*. It is important to note that *work*, as Marx states, always serves production. Non-productive activities therefore are not *work* and certainly accordingly in reverse: Something that is not productive, is not *work* (Hochleithner 2011: 56). And, as Marx continues his argumentation, only activities that (trans)form nature are to be considered productive (Marx 1963: 198).

All this constitutes the way in which productive and reproductive effort are organised in the West. As I argued in this chapter, the terms *work* and labour are very often used as synonyms, but the latter refers to wage-activities, thus, to paid *work* in many cases, and is almost always used to describe productive activities which are exhausting or straining. *Work*, on the contrary, is mostly used to refer to productive activities in general, as its etymology already indicates. Labour can therefore be seen as a special form of *work*. Concluding this section, it can be said that on the basis of these attributions the term *work* constitutes a certain group of activities that are societally distinguished from other activities by means of the dichotomic connotations of productive/unproductive. Thus, labour stands for the form in which productive labour is organised in capitalism, other standard forms are tributary and kinship-

ordered modes (Durrenberger 2005: 126; Wolf 1997: 73ff). Housework, thus, is in the capitalist form of organising effort not included as *work* and so it is only recently and as a result of feminist struggles, that reproductive effort is also seen as *work*, and subsequently as labour.

The Anthropology of Work

For scholars who stand in marxist tradition, *work* played a crucial role in Economic Anthropology. E. Paul Durrenberger, for example, discusses the role of labour in economic classification. According to the different modes of the organisation of labour, Social Anthropologists have created a model of different modes of production, following Karl Marx (Durrenberger 2005: 138): capitalist, tributary and kinship-ordered (Wolf 1997: 73ff). But apart from this use in a universal model of modes of production, there is a striking lack of interest in *work* among Social Anthropologists (Spittler 2008: 272). Most handbooks do not mention *work* itself or anthropological approaches towards *work*, or do so in a very undifferentiated way (Hochleithner 2011: 44ff).

The most explicit approach towards an Anthropology of Work has been undertaken by the German Ethnologist Gerd Spittler. As I have argued elsewhere (ibid.: 57ff), he concerns himself with the phenomenon of *work* on many different levels and recommends a more significant and above all more differentiated focus on *work* in Cultural and Social Anthropology. Spittler's criticism is that the concept of *work* is very often adopted unconsidered from every-day-discourse or the elocution of the dominant (socio-)economic system. He identified three reductionist approaches, which result from the fact that *work* is very often seen as derivable from a certain system and therefore banal.

The first reductionism concerns economy. Focuses of researches in this context tend to reduce *work* to being derivable from a goal (e.g. the satisfaction of a certain need), for whose achievement *work* is applied. This includes the presumption of the universality of the *principle of least effort*, thus, the presumption of *work* always being organised along the aim of efficiency (Spittler 2008: 13). Ecological reductionism sees *work* as derivable from natural surroundings, i.e. the environment people live in. The precondition to *work* in this case is the environmental space, offering certain possibilities to people for acting. Livestock, for example, has to be

treated in certain ways within certain environmental circumstances. Still, as Spittler argues, “the concrete performance of work is much more complex than these ecological conditions suggest and cannot easily be deduced from these facts” (ibid.). Finally, Spittler identified a technological reductionism, that sees *work* as being derivable from properties of available tools.

Spittler notes that each of these approaches is fundamentally important when turning towards the phenomenon of *work* scientifically (Hochleithner 2011: 59). Reductionism only comes into play as soon as *work* is derived as an element of one of those systems. What is missing here, Spittler points out, is the reference to human activities. Furthermore, he concludes as the core idea of his approach that “work should be analysed not only within the framework of a system but as human action” (Spittler 2008: 13). Therefore, Spittler argues, *work* should not to be comprehended as a pure effort of strength, following a rational purpose and being controlled by mechanical logic, but as only meaningful when embedded into a context (ibid.: 14). Spittler goes on to name four areas of interest which might be suitable to guide an Anthropology of Work.

(1) The rationality problem sees *work* embedded in the stress field between the Western concept of efficiency, following the principle of least effort, and the concept of effectiveness. A *work* needs to be effective to achieve the desired outcome, while it does not need to be efficient, thus, not following a rational choice of least effort. Opposing Marx’s conception of *work* being reduced to activities which transform nature (Marx 1963: 198), Spittler argues that a dichotomy between humans and nature is not universal. Thus, while european efficiency sometimes includes the destruction of nature, this premise is challenged by effectiveness (Spittler 2008: 14f).

(2) Another possible field for the Anthropology of Work is the institutional problem, i.e. issues deriving from the institutional organisation of *work*, such as *domestic* economy. The institutional framework also includes the working environment, that is, the spatial as well as the time-based difference between *work* place/time and *non-work* place/time (ibid.: 15).

(3) Spittler sees a difference between the knowledge that is necessary to carry out a certain *work*, and the actual execution. He uses the term performance to distinguish the latter from the former. The performance of a *work* very much depends on the knowledge of the individual, which can differ from the cultural knowledge of the area (ibid.: 17).

(4) The anthropological problem, finally, leads Spittler into Philosophical Anthropology and to the question “What is the significance of work for human beings?” (ibid.: 14). He argues that it is necessary to expand the focus from examining the significance of *work* for the individual to its significance for humanity as a whole, for its constitution (ibid.: 18).

The Theoretical Basis – Approaching the Field

The conclusion of this chapter shows development as part of the global expansion of capitalism. This point of view was already brought up by post-development theories and has been heavily criticised since, due to its lack of consideration for the material reality of those concerned by development. When taking this critique into account, development can be located in a stress field between macro-reality (the aspect of expansion inherent to capitalism) and micro-reality (indigenous modernities), creating the socio-economic space as a locus for everyday activities and interactions. Development, as part of capitalism, features *work* (or, in capitalist terms: labour) as its core element. Therefore, I agree with Gerd Spittler when he argues that seeing *work* as an unproblematic element, that *comes with the whole package*, denies the micro-reality of those encountering issues of development.

To address these concerns, I intend to analyse the aspects of development, which result from my fieldwork’s data, by considering the role of *work* as an element of the socio-economic space, where macro- and micro-realities meet.

4. San, “Bushmen”, ≠Khomani: A Brief Account on Terms and Naming

4.1 San or “Bushmen”?

The official terms used to refer to “Bushmen” are *San* in South Africa and Namibia and *Basarwa* in Botswana (Barnard 1992: 8f). Since my focus lies on South Africa, the term San is the most important to look at. It sometimes appears in combination with Khoe, another ethnic group living in Southern Africa, as “Khoisan”, a word that was, according to Alan Barnard, professor of anthropology at the University of Edinburgh, coined by Leonhard Schultze in a biometric study 1928 as a biological label (ibid.: 7) and is therefore not tenable. According to Barnard (ibid.: 8), the term San itself derives from Khoekhoe language and means foragers; Tomaselli (2005: 1) refers to a work from 1881, stating that San comes from the Nama word for *bandit*. This connotation, and therefore the term San, is deeply disapproved of among the individuals I met in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. However, the term is widely used as the political correct appellation and also very frequently in legal contexts. The South African San Institute (SASI), founded in 1996, also uses the term San (URL 4).

In all of my interviews and conversations, as well as during observation, the term “Bushmen” was used by the people themselves to describe themselves. Petrus Vaalbooi even spelled out his desire to be called “Bushman” during an interview: “I see in the land law [The !Ae!Hai Heritage Agreement], they call us San. We’re not San, we’re Bushmen”⁹ (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011). As Zips-Mairitsch argues, this term is very contestable already without its historical genesis, since it expresses an essentialist reductionism of the identity of the San with their “natural environment”. It was introduced by Dutch settlers from the Cape Colony to describe the San as living a “primitive” life, like “animals” (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 163).

However, as has been mentioned, the term is used by most of the individuals I met in the Andriesvale-Welkom area to describe themselves, perhaps exactly because of the connotation with the “bush”, thus, to emphasise their identification with the land. Therefore, I will, as both Tomaselli (2005: 1) and Barnard (1992: xxiii) suggest, use self-appellations, thus, mostly the term “Bushmen” (“Bushman”),

⁹ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

although it is still used snidely by White farmers and managers in the area. Following Werner Zips in his usage of the term Schwarz (Black), I will also use “Bushman” as an adjective, capitalising it to emphasise its meaning as a “‘Signifier’ for a historical and cultural experience” (Zips 2007: 35, footnote 11, translation by the author).

Finally, it is important to note that none of the appellations which I use are intended imply a homogeneity of “*the San*”, “*the Bushmen*”, etc. or to present them as an entity. All the terms have an emic as well as an etic connotation and are to be understood within their respective context. The term *San* in particular serves as a very rough descriptive term to speak about a variety of diverse groups – such as ≠Khomani, Ju I ’hoansi, Khwe, Il Ani, G I wi, Naro, Hai Il om, Il Gana, Tshua, etc. (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 165) – and to refer to legal contexts, where it is commonly used. “Bushmen” (“Bushman”) will be used in respective contexts to refer to members of the ≠Khomani, who explicitly wish to be called by this term.

4.2 ≠Khomani

As Hammersley and Atkinson point out, “the search for an appropriate setting can take unpredictable turns” (Hammersley / Atkinson 2007: 30). And so it soon turned out during my fieldwork that it was impossible to examine the situation of *all* ≠Khomani, not least due to the fractal character of the group. In fact, the ≠Khomani are divided into several (mostly kinship-ordered) groups, who form alliances among or against each other and with or against outsiders (e.g. Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011; Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011a) and the divide between the so-called *Traditionalists* and *Western* “Bushmen” constitutes a major breach (Robins 2001a: 838). The ≠Khomani San Communal Property Association, formed as a juridical corpus in the course of the land claim, is the juridical manifestation of an only superficially homogeneous group which has, since then, been challenged by the mentioned competition between clans and groups (Robins 2003: 277)¹⁰. The conclusion to be drawn from these facts is that the issue of terms and naming is one of identity, alliances, opposition and juridical conjunctions and context, of self-attribution and attributions by others – and of the research setting.

¹⁰ This topic will be discussed in detail in the chapters 7 and 10.

For my study I focussed neither on the ≠Khomani as a whole, nor on single groups, clans or families. However, it bears mentioning that many of the women, men, and children I interacted with on a daily basis were from, or somehow associated with, the Kruiper clan, i.e. the //Sa! Makai¹¹. The head of this family is the ≠Khomani's *traditional leader*, Dawid Kruiper¹² (ibid.).

5. Approaching the Present through the Past: An Ethnohistory of the ≠Khomani

On one of the hottest days of my stay in Welkom I was happy to flee into the cooling shade of Abraham Malgas' house. The blind old man, one of the eldest "Bushmen" of the ≠Khomani, sat in a chair in the kitchen, his wife Gruit next to him. Among the community members he is addressed as *Oom*, what means uncle and is commonly used to refer to an elder man of authority (Interview Abraham Malgas 2011). During the course of the interview Oom Abraham told me stories of his life and was very eager to emphasise how happy he was about any help from the park authorities and the state. They, Oom Abraham said, made it possible for him to live in the stone house in which we were sitting, conducting the interview:

"Now I'm telling you: [... We came] down to Twee Rivieren. [...] We lived in grass houses there. And just the head of the park lived in a stone house at Twee Rivieren at that time. He was the only one that had a kraal around his house. So we were and so the farmers took us and the farmers made us clever. And these White people bought us stone houses so that we could sleep in this stone houses"¹³ (ibid.).

To understand these snippets of narrative that Abraham Malgas gave to me, it is necessary to draw attention to the history of those San who are now living in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. This approach also serves to describe the origin of many

¹¹ See chapter 5.5 *The //Sa! Makai*.

¹² See chapter 11.4 for further information on traditional leadership and Dawid Kruiper.

¹³ The "quality" of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

of the presumptions and to clarify some aspects of the San's situation today. I intend to do so in an ethnohistorical manner, by applying a critical eye to sources of all kinds, but especially to those that stem from a colonial context, and by including personal narratives from "Bushmen" themselves.

5.1 "Indigenous Peoples" of Southern Africa?

Approaching San history holds many traps. Not only have centuries of violence – physical, psychological and structural – and clearly wrong assumptions had impacts on the lives and the representation of the San; they have also been subject to theoretical discussions in the fields of Social Anthropology, History, Physical Anthropology and even Biology. These circumstances make it necessary to choose one's sources even more critically than usually. Two reasons can be given here: (1) As the Austrian jurist and anthropologist Werner Zips points out, the history of those who had been conquered, occupied and oppressed during European colonialism, dramatically lacks representation in the (european) historical accounts of the time (Zips 2007: 29f), which subsequently influences those of today's works which are based on them. (2) The debate about the term "indigenous people", unleashed by Adam Kuper with his article "The Return of the Native" (2003), is strongly connected to the San of Southern Africa and especially to the #Khomani, because of the legal course of their land claim¹⁴.

Kuper claims that by using the term "indigenous peoples", essentialism is taking place again. The term, he goes on, serves the construction of the image of "the primitive" to suit the needs of certain groups, namely "the Greens and the anti-globalization movement" (Kuper 2003: 395). He certainly has a point there, especially because, as we shall see in course of this thesis, "authenticity" – and its relation to essentialism – is a very crucial factor for #Khomani San, since it is demanded by donors, NGOs and tourists and, reflecting these demands, also contributes to the fragmentation of the group (Robins 2001a: 844f; Chapter 10). But as the Austrian jurist and expert on land rights, Manuela Zips-Mairitsch, argued, Kuper's account lacks consideration for the complex use of "indigenous peoples" in legal contexts, especially within the milestones – but not the *final* milestones – of indigenous rights,

¹⁴ Although land restitution, according to the *Restitution of Land Rights Act* (No. 22) of 1994 C.E. of South Africa, has nothing to do with the term "indigenous" or similar ones, but with expropriation or forced removal due to racist legislation (Lee 2003: 93).

the 1989 C.E. ILO convention Nr. 169 and the 2008 C.E. United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIPS). The documents do not foster an “authenticism”, as Kuper objected. The ILO 169, for example, includes a strong emphasis on the aspect of self-identification of “indigenous peoples” and generally a great deal of attention has been given to the adequate use of formulation and naming in these documents (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 38f).

Furthermore, the term “indigenous peoples” is very important to (legally) distinguish indigenous communities from (ethnic) minorities. For example, as Zips-Mairitsch argues, minority rights are “phrased as individual rights, while indigenous rights are a clear example for collective rights”¹⁵ (ibid.: 41).

It is clear that essentialist concepts should have no place in anthropological concepts today, but firstly, the term “indigenous peoples” is a legal term, and, secondly, even in that instance it is not used as Kuper accusingly suggests. Alan Barnard, anthropologist at the University of Edinburgh, relativises the debate with a banal, but important fact: The use of a term is strongly connected to its context.

“To reject ‘indigenous people’ as an anthropological concept is not the same thing as rejecting it as a legal concept, or rejecting it as a useful tool for political persuasion. If the United Nations and governments accept it, then it can have utility” (Barnard 2006: 7).

5.2 The “Kalahari Debate”

Another aspect that emerges in connection with the “Kalahari San” concerns a general positioning within the theoretical spectrum of anthropological approaches. To break it down: It’s all about isolation or not, a question that has widely been discussed in the “Kalahari San debate”¹⁶ (Wilmsen / Denbow 1990: 490). While “Traditionalist” anthropologists showed the San under an evolutionist scope and, thus, “as exponents of a hunting-and-gathering culture” (Barnard 2006: 2), the “Revisionists” regarded them as historically integrated into a larger network, and, thus, “part of larger social formations” (ibid.). In the course of the “Kalahari debate”,

¹⁵ Quote originally in German, translated by the author: “[...] als Individualrechte formuliert, während indigene Rechte ein klares Beispiel für Kollektivrechte darstellen“ (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 41).

¹⁶ For detailed accounts on the course of the debate see, for example, Wilmsen / Denbow 1990 or Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 172f.

the “Traditionalist” theory that the San have been isolated, and are thus “stone-age remains” of an early stage of human society, has been proven wrong, first and foremost by Edward Wilmsen, who traced early trading routes and connections by archeological findings (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 174). In his detailed account on connections and trade routes, with the ironic title “Europe and the People without History”, the anthropologist Eric Wolf renders the assumption of isolation wrong:

“If social and cultural distinctiveness and mutual separation were a hallmark of humankind, one would expect to find it most easily among the so-called primitives, people ‘without history,’ supposedly isolated from the external world and from one another” (Wolf 1997: 4).

The fact is, as Wolf points out, that connections have accompanied humankind since its commencement and that no group was isolated for a long time (ibid.: 4ff).

To conclude this section: Today’s San, “Bushmen” or Basarwa are contemporary, very diverse ethnic communities, in legal terms they are “indigenous peoples”. Some have attempted to argue that the San’s culture did not change for the last 30,000 to 40,000 years, that they are remnants from an early stage in the evolutionist concept of unilinear human development – it can not be emphasised often enough that this assumption has been proven wrong. While there might be some form of regional continuity between San families and their ancestors, San today are contemporary. They are contemporary in the sense that they are equal to any other group in the world and as far away from *first humans* as any other ethnic community (Barnard 2007: 4).

5.3 Migrations and Connections

How and when the ancestors of present-day San came to Southern Africa is not clear. While some archaeologists connect findings from 40,000 years ago with ancestors of non-Khoe-speaking¹⁷ San, others suppose a migration from the middle east approximately 10,000 or 12,000 B.P., whereby the latter is very unlikely (Barnard 1992: 28). Others state the evidence of archaeological findings as being indicative of a population in the region as far back as 120,000 years, and that no other populations migrated into the area south of the Congo-Zambezi watershed for thousands of generations. During this time, it is believed that Ancestral San numbered up to 300,000 individuals, living in groups scattered over a vast region. While archaeological findings suggest that those groups were hunter-gatherers by economy, the herding of sheep and cattle in the region became evident for a time between around 8,000 and 2,000 B.P. (Hitchcock et al. 2006: 3; Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 168). Some suggest that it was at this point in time that Khoe-speaking groups migrated into the region. However, it is very unlikely that a clear distinction between “hunter-gatherers” and “herders” was part of social practice and therefore it is much more probable, that, as Hitchcock et al. phrase it, “some of the San foragers began to herd goats and sheep and later cattle, some of them becoming in time the Khoe peoples” (Hitchcock et al. 2006: 3). These approaches suggest an origin of modes of herding not in the migration of groups, but in the dispersal of goods, namely from the Near East, since archaeological findings indicate a biological relationship of sheep bones found in Southern Africa with those found in the region of today’s Egypt (Barnard 1992: 30ff). This theory is based on the findings of Edward Wilmsen, who argues that archaeological sites featured “cane glass beads manufactured in Indic or Arabic-Asia and cowrie and conus shells” (Wilmsen 1989: 68). These findings are also clear evidence for the inclusion of Southern Africa’s population at the time into large networks of trade, thus, evidence against any theory of isolation (Wolf 1997: 41).

¹⁷ In the terminological description of groups that existed in the past and therefore do not exist in this form today, I follow the argumentation of Alan Barnard, who sees linguistic classification as more appropriate than any form of genetic classification (Barnard 1992: 20). Although Barnard also rejects economic classification, I intend to use it partly along with linguistic classification, because archaeological findings feature a lot of material culture, which often refers to economy and, thus, can help to trace migration and trade.

Around 1,600 years B.P. Bantu-speaking groups crossed the Limpopo river as part of a big wave of migration from the north (ibid.). This migration had already begun earlier, between 3,000 to 2,000 years ago. Bantu-speaking populations migrated into Southern Africa, mainly living from herding cattle. Linguistic data supports the assumption that it was not these groups that brought herding to the region, since some Bantu-speakers on the western coast “obtained cattle, or at least a cattle-keeping vocabulary, from Khoisan herders in this region” (Wilmsen 1989: 71).

“In the east and southeast they [Khoisan and Bantu speakers] coexisted, intermarried, and were eventually assimilated to powerful Bantu-speaking chiefdoms which now form the bulk of South Africa’s population [...]” (Lee / Hitchcock 2001: 264).

Concluding this section, I consider it important to note that interconnections and trade relations included the ancestors of the San into a large network, that defeats every evolutionist or essentialist argument. Also, as I have sketched out, not all of the groups have lived as hunter-gatherers; some of them adapted to herding and it is therefore very likely that some of those who had taken up herding returned to a hunter-gatherer lifestyle for certain reasons, for example when their animals had been killed. While San had been living in partly scattered, but always very diverse groups, they have never been isolated. That such a diverse population should be summed up under the term *San* is due to colonialism (Wilmsen 1989: 27).

5.4 Colonialism and Apartheid

In 1652, members of the Dutch East India Company founded the first European settlement in South Africa, near the Cape of Good Hope, which was to become Cape Town. From this moment on, they began colonising the land, thus, occupying it, and forcibly removing or slaughtering the people that lived there. It was in the time of colonialism, when the placement of the San at the bottom of the evolutionist ladder began to have serious consequences for their lives and deaths. While european scientists argued whether the San “may or may not be part of the human family” (Lee / Hitchcock 2001: 259), they were shot under legal conditions by European settlers in South Africa. This nearly led to complete genocide (Zips-

Mairitsch 2009: 170f). Waves of settlers drove San, who had been living at the Cape upon the arrival of the Europeans, further and further north into the desert regions. While San sometimes guided Europeans traveling inland at the beginning of colonisation in Southern Africa, they then had to fight for their land.

“In retaliation, they raided the invaders’ cattle, provoking further armed assaults by notorious Boer ‘Commandos’ of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries“ (Lee 2003: 83).

Punishments against those San who were caught contravening the oppressors rules were dire:

“Bushmen also occasionally preyed on sheep and hunted on newly declared farms. For these intrusions they were brutally beaten, or shot, and on occasion had their ears sliced off by bounty hunters” (Schrire 1995: 210).

But many San at the time were not willing- and helpless victims, whose culture vanished due to the incredibly brutal oppression. Raids against settler’s cattle and other forms of guerrilla resistance (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 183), that culminated in the so-called “Bushmen Wars”, show that reactions of the San were more complex than just panicky thrashing around (Marks 1972: 80).

For those of the San and Khoi who survived the brutal persecution, epidemics and poverty in the course of the 18th and 19th centuries C.E., the terrible situation carried on into the era of Apartheid, covering most of the 20th century C.E. until the year 1990 C.E. (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 183). While San were hunted down since the arrival of the first European settlers, Apartheid brought a new challenge to San culture. The racist regime summed up the San together with other groups under the

term *Coloured*¹⁸, generalising them by this way into a faceless mass. It was believed that San identity (and thus, culture) had by the 1950s dissolved in the course of this generalisation into a faceless mass, apart from some more or less isolated groups. But as Lee (2003) argues, the end of apartheid showed the contrary: groups “claiming the Khoisan mantle appeared rapidly”¹⁹ (Lee 2003: 91).

5.5 The //Sa! Makai

Those of the San who are most relevant to my fieldwork, many of whom are now living in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, are one of the communities which survived the genocidal physical and structural violence of the colonial time preceding the 20th century C.E. This community mainly consists of members of the Kruiper clan, grouping around the #Khomani’s traditional leader, Dawid Kruiper. He is the grandson of Ou²⁰ Makai, who was the traditional leader when the community formed in the 19th century C.E., as Robert Konrad depicts narratives which he took from his fieldwork in 2005. The attribution to their ancestral origin entails their self-appellation, which is hardly mentioned within scientific literature: //Sa! Makai (Konrad 2008: 106f). But during my time in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, as it appears to have been during the fieldworks of many others, the //Sa! Makai did not mention this self-appellation very often. This might be attributed to the fact that they are mostly referred to as #Khomani San, the *Traditionalists* or simply the Kruiper clan. But since they do not insist on being called //Sa! Makai, I will also use the other terms, according to the relative context of use.

At the beginning of the 20th century C.E., the //Sa! Makai lived on a huge area of the region where the South African part of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park is

¹⁸ From 1903 C.E. a series of racist laws were enacted as a result of politics in South Africa, culminating in the Apartheid regime in 1948 C.E., that ended only in 1994 C.E. In the course of these events, the population was divided into “racial” groups. For individuals, the belonging to a specific group had great importance, since legal and political rights as well as economic opportunities depended on this classification. The groups named in the *Population Registration Act* (No. 30) of 1950 C.E. (Repealed by the *Population Registration Act Repeal Act*, No. 114 of 1991) were “Black”, “White” and “Coloured”. This act was already preceded by other laws, which already segregated the population, e.g. *Natives’ Land Act* (No. 27) of 1913 C.E. (Repealed by the *Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act*, No. 108 of 1991), which limited the land rights of “Black” and “Coloured” people and led to the creation of “settlement areas”, designated for specific groups and forbidden for others.

¹⁹ For the term “Khoisan” see chapter 4.1.

²⁰ The term “Ou” is an honorary appellation for the eldest men in communities all over South Africa and approx. means “grandfather”.

situated today. This was the time which Abraham Malgas referred to during an interview. He told me about his childhood and the ease of life, at the time “when the Auob [river] had water and we were catching fish”²¹ (Interview Abraham Malgas 2011). Although he paints a very colourful picture of his childhood in his narration, it shows that the group was living relatively safely in the region from hunting and gathering. This continued until 1930 C.E., when the Apartheid government designated the area as a racial reservation for the *Coloured* Mier Community²² (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 21), and the first conflicts arose when the designated settlers arrived. In the following year the *Kalahari Gemsbok National Park* was established and the San were driven from the land between the Nossob and the Auob Rivers, where they were living in the meanwhile, as they had to avoid Mier settlements and White farms (Chennells 2006: 2). This was actually nothing new to the group of the ≠Khomani. As Alan Barnard notes in his detailed account on the state of available data on hunters and herders of Southern Africa (1992), regarding the ≠Khomani:

“Their way of life was already subject to pressure of warfare and assimilation at the time their existence was first recorded” (Barnard 1992: 77).

In 1936 C.E., a hunter named Donald Bain met the San and heard of their situation. He took 77²³ of them and brought them to Johannesburg, where the Empire Exhibition took place 1936/37 C.E. There, he made them perform a “Bushmen Show” for the gazing masses of visitors. Bain presented them as *the last original “Bushmen”*, bringing into play the whole arsenal of essentialism and evolutionism (Gordon 1999: 266). Bain subsequently tried to *save* the San, by applying to authorities to grant them certain rights. One of the options being discussed was to declare the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park a “*Bushmen*” reserve. But most of

²¹ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

²² The Mier Community’s ancestors came to the region in the 19th century C.E., led by Captain Dirk Vilander, fleeing the Cape Colony. They mainly lived as farmers, but were expropriated from their land at the beginning of the 20th century C.E. by the Apartheid government (Thondhlana / Shackleton / Muchapondwa 2011: 4).

²³ The correlation of the number of people and the year strongly suggests that it was the same group as was studied by Raymond Dart in 1937 C.E. He visited 77 people living in 11 huts at a settlement in the Auob-Nossob confluence area (Barnard 1992: 88). Therefore, it can be assumed that Bain took the whole population of the settlement with him.

Bain's efforts were in vain (ibid.: 274ff). In 1940 C.E., a campaign led to the assignment of a farm, named Struis Zyn Dam in the Mier reservation, to the //Sa! Makai, and the Ranger of the Park, Joep Le Riche²⁴, was appointed to supervise them. But due to opposition from White settlers and part of the Mier community, the farm was sold before the //Sa! Makai could move there. Some stayed on at the park and worked as labourers on farms, trackers, game wardens or as assistants to research teams. In return, they were supplied with clothing, a little money and some provisions (Konrad 2008: 111; Holden 2007: 60).

Over the years, the territory which they were able to use for living, hunting and gathering was increasingly reduced, until the remaining 50-60 //Sa! Makai were forcibly displaced from the park in 1976, by order of the South African Game Department for reasons of protecting wildlife stock (Lee 2003: 91). Most of them fled to the town of Welkom, 8 km south of Twee Rivieren, where many live again today (Ellis 2010: 182). In the years following, the //Sa! Makai lived dispersed on White farms in the Northern Cape, doing a little labour, herding a few goats and gathering a few fruits from the veld. In this way, they did not differ from many other rural *Coloureds* in Apartheid South Africa (Lee 2003: 91). Although a few appear to have remained in the area near the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park, as Barnard notes regarding data collected by H.P. Steyn in 1982 and 1983 C.E. The latter encountered a small group, who identified themselves as ≠Khomani, still hunting and gathering in the area near the Nossob river at that time (Barnard 1992: 90).

Nevertheless, most of the ≠Khomani, and especially the //Sa! Makai, lived in diaspora in the Northern Cape. In 1991 C.E. local newspapers' attention was brought to the situation of the //Sa! Makai, when they were once again driven away from a farm as squatters. This news reached a White farmer and businessman, Pieter de Waal, who brought the group to his newly opened "*Bushmen*" Theme Park, some kilometres north of Cape Town, at Kagga Kamma²⁵, where he presented them as living exhibits of "stone-age Bushmen" (Lee 2003: 92). Dawid Kruiper, today traditional leader of the ≠Khomani²⁶, saw the situation ambivalently: On the one hand, he thought the San traditions could be best "preserved" when he and his group

²⁴ Joep Le Riche was responsible for the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park from 1934 to 1970 C.E. (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 25).

²⁵ See e.g. SASI 2010: 6f; Robins 2001b: 7f.

²⁶ See chapter 11.4 on traditional leadership.

performed it in front of tourists, so that they could watch and remember (Comaroff / Comaroff 2009: 10). On the other hand, Kruiper stated, he felt uncomfortable at Kagga Kamma, and wished to live in the veld again. (Lee 2003: 92). These points of view are not only very ambivalent as such, but also in regard to their possible consequences. While the essentialist presentation of themselves as “stone-age Bushmen” might lead to denial of *modern* citizens’ rights to them, the revisionist depiction of them as *underclass victims* of social repression might prove to be dangerous for their construction of identity and their claim for land rights.

Although “*bushmen-ness*” at Kagga Kamma was constructed by means of essentialist *authenticity*, the //Sa! Makai strengthened their own identity through identification with language and their land at the Andriesvale-Welkom area. The public desire to construct a “South African nation” and the desire of the San not to remain living in diaspora came together at Kagga Kamma, when Dawid Kruiper met Roger Chennells, their attorney-to-be, in 1992 C.E.

6. The Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park

Before going into detail on the ≠Khomani San land claim, that followed the issuing of the South African *Restitution of Land Rights Act* (No. 22) of 1994 and eventually led to today’s situation, it is useful to look into the concept and the history of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (KTP), which stood in close connection to the success of the claim. As Southern Africa’s first Peace Park, the KTP is closely connected to the concept of Peace Parks and, thus, to a certain approach towards *development*.

In his 2003 C.E. paper William Wolmer reduces the different terms that define border-crossing parks – Peace Parks, Transfrontier Conservation Areas and Transboundary National Resource Management – to their core idea: The conservation of nature by creating designated areas that exceed national territories (Wolmer 2003: 2). Essentially, he is right in doing so and his formulation describes the basic idea of all these concepts very well. But as we are about to see, the differences between approaches, which find expression in naming, serve to identify possible gaps in their application. Thus, before tracing the event history of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, it is useful to examine the concept of Peace Parks, for which the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park was the pilot project in Africa.

6.1 Peace Parks – A Concept of Sustainable Development

Peace Parks are part of a relatively young concept, although the coinage of the term exists since the Waterton Lakes Glacier International Peace Park was established between the USA and Canada in 1932 C.E. This name for the park was chosen to express the ongoing peaceful relationship between the two states rather than to resolve a conflict (Ali 2007: 2; McNeil 1990:25). While the first mention of the term points to a merely symbolic use, the peace researcher Lothar Brock (1991) emphasised the environmental aspect of an international park and its linkages to peace. While the environment with its resources can be subject to war, it can also be the reason for peace. *Environmental security* is the normative – and therefore neutral – linkage between causal, instrumental and definitional linkages, which can be positive or negative, between environmental conservation and peace (Brock 1991: 408f). Brock argues that joint care for the environment might be a chance to achieve and maintain peace, although, as he admits, threats of one-sided depletion still remain (ibid.: 420).

This argumentation follows the idea of *sustainable development*, a concept that resulted from increasing awareness of decreasing resources. It was first mentioned in the World Conservation Strategy, brought up by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) in 1980 C.E. While the decisions until then followed the capitalistic priority of economic growth, and thus, depletion of natural resources and ignoring questions of socio-economic connections, sustainable development opposes this traditional understanding of development by bringing together (socio-)economic and environmental issues (Hopwood et al. 2005: 38f). Still, the socio-economic part of the concept remains reduced to the general relevance of resources for human society and to legislative changes in order to sustain the supply of food and industrial resources (IUCN / UNEP / WWF 1980: VI).

Nevertheless, the World Conservation Strategy marks a changing point. The new objectives in nature conservation resulted in different approaches to the concept of sustainable development, one of which is the idea of establishing Peace Parks, to bring together socio-economic issues and nature conservation strategies by combining border crossing cooperation and involving local communities to care for and benefit from nature conservation. This approach developed since the 1970s C.E.

and found its implementation as Community Based Development almost two decades later (Büscher / Dietz 2005: 2f).

Parks for Peace are to be understood as nature conservation areas that cover a territory that exceeds national boundaries and where the objectives of the management-agreement “explicitly recognise both a protected area [in terms of nature] and a peace purpose” (Sandwith et al. 2001: 4). The specific characteristic of Peace Parks becomes obvious through the definitions of (1) Transboundary Protected Areas and (2) Protected Areas. While the latter is

“[...] especially dedicated to the protection and maintenance of biological diversity [...], and of natural and associated cultural resources” (ibid.: 3),

Transboundary Protected Areas are characterised by border crossing dimensions and a joint management by all states involved (Sandwith et al. 2001: 3). Thus, the peace purpose is crucial.

The idea was developed at the 1988 C.E. “First Global Conference on Tourism – A Vital Force for Peace”, hosted by the IUCN in Vancouver, Canada. The topic of the conference already suggests identifying two central aims of the Peace Parks concept: Tourism and promotion/maintaining the peace, besides, of course, the conservation of biodiversity. In a book presenting papers from the workshop on “Parks on the Borderline”, which took place during the conference, the IUCN’s Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas presents the summary “Promoting Effective Management of Transfrontier Parks and Reserves: Guidelines” (Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas 1990: 95f). These guidelines include advice for legal and conservational actions as well as one guideline concerning tourism, the latter aiming at “enhancing their [border park administration’s] role in regional development” (ibid.: 98) through influence created by cooperation. The combination of environmental conservation, peace building and economic benefits appears to mark a significant step forward in the process of gaining interest in the concept of Parks for Peace, at least among the states potentially involved.

In 1996, Anton Rupert, President of World Wildlife Fund South Africa at the time, emphasised the significant economic benefits that would accompany the

implementation of a Peace Park and one year later, in 1997, the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) was formed. It can be understood as a kind of lobbying-organisation, with the aims of promoting the concept of Peace Parks and to assist during the process of implementation (URL 2). The economic focus was also central to the PPF, as a sentence visible on the PPF's website in the section "Why the idea is great" showed, but has been removed in the meantime, as was the entire section:

"The objective of peace parks is to bring about sustainable economic development by way of eco-tourism, which is the fastest growing industry in the world" (URL 1).

Both the IUCN's and the PPF's position can be situated in the "reform"-field on a map of approaches to sustainable development, created by Hopwood et al. (2005). The ideas, which mainly stem from the outcomes of the IUCN's conference in Vancouver 1988 C.E., are based on the assumption that existing structures in society, and thus in economy and legislation, need to be adjusted to meet the challenges of decreasing natural resources and socio-economic issues at the same time. Fundamental change is not considered necessary and sustainable economic development is seen as positive (Hopwood et al. 2005: 43f).

What it's all about: Three Main Goals

The idea of Peace Parks is to create situations that reduce international (and national) tensions that somehow relate to land and/or resources. Every step towards the establishment of a Peace Park is considered as a step closer to peace and stability. Three (possible) main functions of international parks, presented in the paper following the 1988 C.E. IUCN conference workshop on parks on transfrontier conservation, serve to reveal the goals of the idea:

"[1] the promotion of peace; [2] protection and management of resources and environments; and [3] preservation and enhancement of cultural values, especially the protection of transboundary people" (McNeil 1990: 25).

(1) Promotion of Peace

The bi- or multilateral cooperation of at least two states in line with a Peace Park project fosters understanding and exchange between the states involved and hinders unilateral depletion of resources (Egger-Büssing 2006: 15). Situations where Peace Parks could be applied are split into four possible scenarios: The first is the one of states with a relatively stable relationship, who decide to establish a park dedicated to (ongoing) peace, such as the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park between the USA and Canada, which has already been mentioned here. The second scenario features the establishment of a cross-border conservation project that fosters friendship and peace between two states, that are not in conflict but can move closer still. An example for such parks can be found between Panama and Costa Rica (McNeil 1990: 26). Thirdly, Peace Parks may contribute to establishing peaceful interactions again after war, and, in the fourth case, joint natural resource programmes can foster peace between two states in conflict (ibid.).

(2) Protection and Management of Resources

The removal of borderlines that have been drawn relatively arbitrarily and in that form divided formerly unified ecosystems, makes it possible for wildlife-populations to migrate across national boundaries without problems and to protect endangered species more effectively than in parks that end at a border (Egger-Büssing 2006: 12). Furthermore, the protection of resources, such as rivers or lakes, becomes easier and the risk of transboundary pollution or hazards is reduced. All this increases the efficiency in managing natural resources and also in managing their use for recreational purposes (McNeil 1990: 27).

(3) Preservation and enhancement of Cultural Values

This aspect of the 1990 C.E. proposal is the most critical to an anthropologic analysis and is also the one that has been misinterpreted the most. The conference paper emphasises the benefits of Peace Parks for indigenous communities who live at a border and are – or were, before the drawing or closure of a borderline – used to

migrate in the area with no consideration of leaving or entering a state. Referred to as Transboundary Peoples, their chances are spelled out very clearly:

“It is clear that improvements to the security, the economic conditions, the social status, and the stability of social conditions of these [transboundary] people can occur with creation of international parks” (McNeil 1990: 28).

Unfortunately, as we shall see, this aspect was increasingly excluded in the course of the application of the idea of Peace Parks. In the end, the groups entitled Transboundary Peoples in the 1990 C.E. IUCN conference paper, had to claim their right through national courts. What was taken from this aspect of the proposal was the improvement to the economic conditions. Due to the exceptionally rich diversity of species and the possibility to observe animals in their natural environment, Nature Conservation Areas are a very attractive destination for tourists. The resulting job-opportunities would be a benefit to the local population and the latter would also benefit from the infrastructure that has to be developed to cater to the needs of the tourists (Egger-Büssing 2006: 13f).

The Peace Park Foundation – Four Pillars to Guide Them All

Although the IUCN published guidelines and tries to help where possible in establishing Peace Parks – with their Commission on Environmental Law and their World Commission on Protected areas – there is no universal set of binding rules for the implementation of Peace Parks. Additionally, there are only regional organisations to foster and to assist in implementations effectively, but no world-wide supervising institution. One of them, especially active in Southern Africa, is the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF) (Maier 2006: 21; 25).

PPF was founded on 1 February 1997 C.E. by Anton Rupert, President of WWF South Africa, Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands and President Nelson Mandela. The aim of the organisation is to foster the establishment of Peace Parks in Southern Africa by lobbying and assisting. During the course of this endeavour, the IUCN's Peace Parks idea had been expanded by adapting the Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) concept, released by the World Bank in 1996 C.E. The

outcome was a stronger emphasis on the economic aspect of Peace Parks than had been suggested by the IUCN conference working group (Peace Parks Foundation 2010: 2f; Maier 2006: 26; URL 2, McNeil 1990: 25f, Ferreira 2011: 644)²⁷.

To reach the objective of establishing a Peace Park, the PPF identified three stages²⁸ of the process, each involving several parties and tasks, in which the PPF assists the authorities concerned (URL 9). During this process that – at best – leads to the establishment of a Peace Park, PPF relies on four pillars to guide its own work as well as all stakeholders' effort: "securing protected land, training wildlife managers, training tourism managers and improving accessibility through infrastructure and policy development" (Peace Parks Foundation 2010: 3).

But all these four pillars of assistance to potential stakeholders of a future Peace Park are in practice mainly available to (state) authorities. These authorities represent the actor with the major (juridical) power, especially when it comes to designating land that is to be protected. In connection with these circumstances, the PPF brought up the Metaphor of "going beyond fences" (Spierenburg / Wels 2006: 307), to signalise the will to also include local communities into negotiations. But as recent accounts in this context show, progress is rather slow, agreements often stay one-sided and the metaphorical fences keep their quality of being separative, as, for example, the Austrian jurists and anthropologists Werner Zips and Manuela Zips-Mairitsch point out:

"If the peace afforded at the international level comes at a price to be paid by local resource users who are left out of the bilateral or multilateral agreements on huge conservation areas, the picture becomes less favorable" (Zips / Zips-Mairitsch 2007: 38).

²⁷ Funds are – according to PPF's own statement – mainly raised through donations and through contributions of *Club 21*, that comprises "individuals, families and companies who have donated \$1 million or more" (Peace Parks Foundation 2010: 34).

²⁸ "Advocacy and political support", "Planning" and "Implementation" (URL 9).

6.2 Becoming Africa's First Peace Park

After the //Sa! Makai had finally been evicted from what was, by then, the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park in 1976²⁹, further amendments to the Park were made to accommodate conservational goals as well as touristic needs. By expansion of available and erection of new touristic facilities, the number of visitors increased from 515 in 1954 C.E., up to 14,794 in the survey of 1975/76 C.E. The latter, achieved in the year of the San's eviction, was a "record number" (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 29), as an account on the park's history (period from 1931 to 1981 C.E.) stated in 1984 C.E. This account was written by Van Wyk, a National Parks Board employee, and Le Riche, Ranger of the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park at the time. At no point is there any mention of San. This might be due to the fact that during Apartheid San and other ethnic groups were generalised as Coloureds. Sarcastically, the two authors claim to have held talks with local communities preceding the proclamation of the Park:

"[...] talks were held with all local Coloured leaders, even some from Rehoboth, during which the object in view was put forward. Fortunately the general and unanimous support of all parties concerned was gained [...]" (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 22).

Sarcastically, because the methods of Apartheid regime talks are evident and the following evictions and violent displacements in the region speak for themselves.

Already in this historically one-sided, thus, blind, report by Van Wyk and Le Riche, the issue of state borders hindering wildlife populations from migration was mentioned. There had been poaching that had crossed the state border, which made it seem rational, to the authorities concerned, to put up a fence. The reaction at the time was to discuss possible channeling of the wildlife's migratory pattern by the opening and closing of waterholes (ibid.: 31). A fence had never been installed, because the *Gemsbok National Park* had been established on the Botswana side of the border in 1938³⁰ C.E. and, abutting this area, the Mabuasehube Game Reserve

²⁹ On the history of the region, especially on San history, see chapter 5.

³⁰ The Gemsbok National Park was proclaimed while Botswana was still called *Bechuanaland*, because it was under British protectorate (KGNP 2008: 13).

in 1971 C.E. The two areas were merged in 1992 C.E. (URL 12). Another reason why a fence was never put up is that an agreement between the two states, South Africa and Botswana, had already been signed in 1948, recognising the area of the two parks on each side of the border as one ecological system where wardens have been working together since 1964 C.E. (Url 13).

A 1989 C.E. study marks a turning point in the character of use and management of the two bordering parks. In this study on the feasibility and potential for the development of tourism in the Republic of South Africa, commissioned by the South African Ministry of Economy, conserved natural space was identified as a high-potential resource for tourism. Thus, recommendations resulting from this study suggested developing South Africa's National Parks for touristic use in general, and the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park in particular. Therefore, in 1992 C.E. a joint management committee (consisting of members of the South African National Parks Board and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks of Botswana, thus, not including local communities) was established. Its task was to prepare the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park Management Plan, which was then approved in 1997 C.E. (KGNP 2008: 13f; URL 13).

The final step was undertaken in 1999 C.E., when Botswana and South Africa signed a bilateral treaty that constituted the formal consolidation of the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park and the Gemsbok National Park to an area of approx. 3.6 million hectares, as well as the joint management plan. The official opening took place in the year 2000, at Twee Rivieren, the confluence of the rivers Nossob and Auob, at the border of the two states involved (KGNP 2008: 14). The presidents of Botswana, Festus Mogae, and of South Africa, Thabi Mbeki, solemnised the ceremony at the gate of the new Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park.

“As Africa's first transfrontier park, it served as a symbol of the long anticipated dawn of transnational interdependence and cooperation in Southern Africa“ (URL 13).

7. The #Khomani San Land Claim

Some say the #Khomani did win the land claim, and some say they did not. In fact, the success of the #Khomani San claim for land in and around the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park consists of agreements resulting from two phases of negotiation (1999 and 2002 C.E.) out of court. This follows the tendency to settle conflicts, resulting from unjust events of the past, not through court decisions, but amicably between all involved parties. Because the area between the Nossob and Auob rivers had already been declared *Coloured settlement area*³¹ after World War I, members of the Mier community had been settling in the region when the Park was declared in 1931 C.E. (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 21). They had also been evicted and thus, lodged their own claim in 1998 C.E. and subsequently were also included in the negotiations in the course of the #Khomani San land claim (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 123).

Still under the leadership of Regopstaan Kruiper, the father of the present-day traditional leader, Dawid Kruiper³², the #Khomani began to organise their land claim while still being in diaspora, living partly scattered in the Northern Cape Province, partly in Welkom, 8 km south of Twee Rivieren, and partly as *carnies* at the Kagga Kamma “*Bushmen*” Theme Park. After preparations had been made with the help of the South African human rights attorney Roger Chennells, the #Khomani officially filed their land claim with the respective authorities, under the name *Southern Kalahari San Land Claim Committee*, with Dawid Kruiper as their traditional leader, as Regopstaan Kruiper considered himself as being no longer fit enough to fulfill the role (Chennells 2006: 2). The claim was lodged on the basis of the *Restitution of Land Rights Act* (No. 22) of 1994 C.E., which made it possible for people who had been expropriated during Apartheid to legally reclaim their land (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 123).

During the years preceding the start of the first phase of negotiations, the newly founded South African San Institute (SASI) assisted the #Khomani in collecting information that was crucial to the success of the claim, namely on

³¹ See chapter 5.5 for an explanation of *Coloured settlement area*.

³² See chapter 11.4 for details on traditional leadership and Dawid Kruiper as traditional leader.

“genealogy, cultural land use mapping, language and the other aspects of this attempt to reverse the diaspora of the ≠Khomani San” (Chennells 2006: 2).

It was in the course of this endeavour that the ≠Khomani San appeared to be “a highly cohesive and consensual community” (Robins 2001a: 833), which was soon to be seen askant by themselves as well as by scientists. The situation raised questions on authenticity and “Bushmen-ness” and finally led to a divide within the “Bushmen” community into a *Western* and a *Traditional* group, opposing each other in several concerns (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 124f). This situation will be discussed in Chapter 10 of this thesis.

Another problem that arose in connection with the land claim and the question of who the ≠Khomani *are*, was the question of who *is* ≠Khomani (Robins 2003: 277). The number of claimants rose constantly in the course of the proceeding of the claim, from originally 297 persons to more than 700 members of the appointed Community Property Association (CPA³³) in 2006 C.E. (Chennells 2006: 4).

The first phase of negotiations concerning the ≠Khomani San land claim began in January 1997 C.E. and was concluded in 1999 C.E. The outcome featured several major concessions to the community, and thus, was a complete success from the claimants’ point of view, except for the fact that the land which was restituted was not situated where the ≠Khomani wished. In the course of the two years of the first phase, the negotiations were close to failing, when the Mier community themselves lodged a claim of their own for land. The ≠Khomani felt assaulted, as they considered themselves to be part of the community (ibid.: 3). As has been stated, various different ethnic groups had been generalised under the term *Coloureds* during Apartheid and thus, the San in this regard shared their fate with the Mier. Since the land between the Auob and the Nossob river had been designated as *Mier settlement area* at the time that the park was proclaimed in 1931 C.E., the Mier had been expropriated as well, and thus saw themselves as being in a similar position to the ≠Khomani (Van Wyk / Le Riche 1984: 21). The ≠Khomani finally agreed on sharing their claim with the Mier and the latter were subsequently included in all further negotiations. The legal parties sitting at the negotiating table, thus, were ≠Khomani

³³ More on the role and character of the CPA will be discussed in chapter 11.1.

San, South African National Parks (SANParks), Mier and the South African Department of Land-affairs (Chennells 2006: 2f).

The outcomes of “Phase I” were a milestone, especially for the #Khomani claimants, and for land restitutions to indigenous communities in general: Circa 47,000 hectares of land outside the park had to be transferred to the CPA, thus, to the #Khomani, including approx. 7,000 hectares that had to be donated to the San by the Mier community. The #Khomani San claimants also received land inside the park³⁴ and near Welkom, the latter to establish a commonage in the town, where many of the //Sa! Makai had their base. The agreement of the first phase also arranged for the details of land-use rights, especially those that stood in connection with the (at the time still) Kalahari Gemsbok National Park, to be discussed and defined in a second phase (ibid.: 3). The Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (KTP) was established in the same year, 1999 C.E., which brought new conditions to the negotiations of “Phase II”, especially in regard to the management agreement of the KTP, as we shall see. Negotiations of “Phase II” continued in the following year, 2000 C.E., and finally resulted in an agreement in the year 2002 C.E. The agreement contained several rights, including land-use, commercial and cultural rights. The terms were kept hold of in the *!Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement*, whose terms were closely bound to the Management Plan of the KTP (ibid.: 3f).

7.1 The Ae!Hai! Heritage Park Agreement

The second phase of negotiations in the course of the land claim resulted in the signing of the *!Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement* by South African National Parks (SANParks), the #Khomani San Communal Property Association (CPA), the Mier Local Municipality (for the Mier community) and members of the South African government. The agreement features definitions of the communities’ rights to the land that has successfully been claimed, particularly in regard to the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, represented by SANParks. The rights on which the legal parties agreed and which are of major importance for community involvement in park matters as well as for their daily life are – and here I mainly follow Roger Chennells’ (2006) account of this case – (1) Rights to land inside and outside the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, (2) preferential commercial rights as well as symbolic

³⁴ See the following chapter 7.1 for details.

and cultural use rights, and (3) the *Klein Skrij Lodge* (also Co-operation Lodge and implemented today as !Xaus Lodge) (Chennells 2006: 4).

Rights to Land inside and outside the KTP

The San received a share of rights of ownership and use of ca. 25,000 hectares of land within the Park borders (*San Heritage Land*), the Mier community 28,000 hectares (*Mier Heritage Land*) (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 217). These two areas are now commonly addressed as the *Ae!Hai! Heritage Park*. The rights of ownership are relatively unrestricted, apart from the fact that the land has to stay part of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and remain under SANParks management. Land-use rights underlie more rigid restrictions, that are mainly specified by them being bound to the Management Plan of the Park, which is amended from time to time. Thus, the use of the land is limited to sustainable use which complies with the understanding of conservation as it is defined in the Management Plan and administered by SANParks (Chennells 2006: 4; Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 168f).

Within the Park Management Plan currently in force (approved 2008) there are, for instance, two sub-objectives that might be of crucial importance to the interpretation of this connection in practice. One aims at ensuring “that the permitted managed use of biological resources occurs on a sustainable basis” (KGNP 2008: 20), lacking the insight that the understanding of *sustainability* is defined in a one-sided manner by park authorities. The second sub-objective concerns the conservation and restoring of “natural and cultural landscape and scenic resources of the park” (KGNP 2008: 20). Concerns over this passage were raised, for example by Abraham Malgas, who was worried about Dawid Kruiper “putting up houses everywhere in the Park” (Interview Abraham Malgas 2011) and, thus, endangering what is called the conservation of natural landscape and scenic resources. On the other hand it could be argued that this is exactly what is meant by restoring cultural landscape.

To manage the restored land and its use, the *Joint Management Board* (JMB) was installed. Within the JMB, the San, the Mier and SANParks are evenly represented (Chennells 2006: 4). But the situation, as Roger Chennells describes it in his report for the office of the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights in 2006 C.E., had not changed when I visited the area in 2011 C.E.: decision-making in, and

communication between the members of the Joint Management Board was in disarray (ibid.: 18f; Fieldnotes August 2011). Thus, although the !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement can be seen as a milestone of legal cooperation between African nation-states and indigenous communities (Zips / Zips-Mairitsch 2007: 45), some parts of the agreement are formulated in a way that is rather opaque and features stipulations which are very hard to fulfil for the San, e.g., the fact that the San were expected to present well-elaborated development plans at JMB meetings, which, to complicate things further, only took place sporadically (Chennells 2006: 18f).

The ≠Khomani consider the land that has been restored within the Park as a rather unsatisfying result of the land claim. Robert Konrad's (2008) results show that the San did not use the area of the *San Heritage Land* very much during the time before eviction from the Park. Life happened mostly in the region now marked as S-Zone (the *San Symbolic and Cultural Zone*, which has very constraining restrictions regarding usage), between Auob and Nossob river, and most of the graves are situated near Twee Rivieren. The Heritage Land is therefore considered one of the less important parts of the park's territory (Konrad 2008: 141).

Commercial Rights, Cultural and Symbolic Use Rights

In order to enable "the expression and celebration of the diverse cultures and spiritual significance associated with the park" (KGNP 2008: 20), the !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement contains additional rights granted to the San, concerning preferential commercial as well as cultural and symbolic use rights. These rights regard two especially designated zones, which are – like the land for which the San were assigned ownership – bound to the conservation restrictions of the park's management plan, and thus, are exempt from agricultural and/or housing use (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 166).

These two zones are the *San Commercial Preference Zone* (V-Zone) and the *San Symbolic and Cultural Zone* (S-Zone). The former extends between the border³⁵ of the land of restored ownership (*San Heritage Land* and *Mier Heritage Land*) and

³⁵ The border of the two parts (San and Mier) of restored land within the park runs parallel to the Auob river bed (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 217).

the Auob river, the latter lies within the triangle formed by Auob, Nossob and the South African national borders (ibid.: 217).³⁶

The *San Symbolic and Cultural Zone* is subject to special rights but also bound to narrower restrictions than those of the *Heritage Park*. The rights include individual access to the zones, to participate in symbolic and cultural activities of the community, as well as to erect simple, temporary facilities, such as for cooking or shelter, at designated places within the park. These rights are restricted to the park's approval of every activity the San plan to perform in the area. The reason given for the need of an approval is the impossibility to control the potential disturbance of tourists and/or negative influence on the park's biodiversity (ibid.: 197f).

These rights and restrictions also regard the V-Zone (*San Commercial Preference Zone*). Within this area, the San are allowed to carry out symbolic and/or cultural activities (with the restrictions mentioned applying) and to suggest economic (i.e. tourist) projects to SANParks. SANParks is also obliged to *offer* participation in tourist projects, which are carried out in this area, to the San. In all cases of economic activity, the last word lies with the SANParks authorities. If a project is to take place, decision-making, responsibility and profit has to be shared between the park and San according to negotiated terms (ibid.: 196f).

The Klein Skrij Lodge

The Heritage Agreement also involves a co-operation lodge, which had already been built in 2005 C.E., but was only opened as *!Xaus Lodge* in 2007 C.E., because no concessioner could be found until then. Behind the concept of the co-operation lodge stands the idea of symbolically representing the co-operation of the three parties involved: San, Mier and SANParks. Additionally, the lodge is meant to facilitate jobs in the tourist industry for members of the community, to generate profit via tourism, which is to be shared equally among all parties, and to create a space for advertising other tourist projects of San and Mier communities. The management of the lodge was to be outsourced, and the controlling of the lodge and the sharing of profits lies within the responsibility of the Joint Management Board (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 194).

³⁶ A detailed map of the !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park and the zones can be found on the #Khomani San's website (URL 28).

The co-operation lodge, !Xaus Lodge, is a crucial part of one of the aims that was claimed to have been reached by establishing the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and by settling the #Khomani San land claim: socio-economic development. Therefore, it is one of the focuses for evaluation of the current situation and thus, a focus of my research that will be discussed in greater detail, together with the results from my fieldwork in chapter 13.

8. Where Micro Meets Macro – The Socio-Economic Space of the #Khomani San

Anna Festus lives in Upington, where I met her at a restaurant for an interview. She was “born in the Park” (Conversation Anna Festus 2011), as she told me a few weeks later, when we met at a campfire in Welkom, where the atmosphere was much more relaxed. At the meeting in Upington, she presented herself as a politically engaged, activist #Khomani woman, who tried to get out her message: The “people in the heart of the land claim are also the most neglected people” (Interview Anna Festus 2011), she told me. Her overall tone was positive; she tried to make it clear that things had improved – at least somewhat, even though there was still a long way to go.

The issues raised by Anna Festus in the interview in Upington can be grouped into four major categories: (1) infrastructure, (2) decision-making, (3) traditional knowledge and way of life, and (4) jobs, economic opportunities and the conceptualisation of *work* (Interview Anna Festus 2011). During my analysis of the research data, these four categories – certainly deeply interwoven – turned out to not only sum up most of my findings, but also to be crucial factors in an account on the socio-economic space of the #Khomani, as has been proposed in chapter 3.

As I have argued, development stands in the context of capitalist expansion (macro-reality), *as well as* in the context of local issues (micro-reality). Since *work* is considered to be the core concept of capitalism and development (Chapter 3.3), I consider it to be one of the most suitable phenomena to focus on, when trying to evaluate the stress field of macro- and micro-reality as it appears in the daily life of the socio-economic space. Therefore, the four categories will serve as a guideline in the description of the situation in the Andriesvale-Welkom area as I found it in 2011 C.E., thereby completing the picture of data already presented within the preceding chapters. Some of the phenomena will, however, be treated in separate chapters,

such as the !Xaus Lodge or the conceptualisation of *work*, i.e. how productive and reproductive effort are organised. This is due to the relative complexity and the relevance of these topics for this thesis.

9. Infrastructure

“The ≠Khomani at Welkom tell in July 2002 that development is not happening. We are told this as we sit underneath newly installed electrical cables feeding the house in whose yard we are sitting. People are fetching water from taps, and the streetlight sparkle in the wind and through the drizzle. The brand new craft showroom on the gravel roadside is empty, its windows broken and boarded up” (Tomaselli / Shepperson 2005: 19).

This is how Keyan Tomaselli, Professor in Culture, Communication and Media Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, and his colleague Arnold Shepperson found the situation of infrastructure during their research in Welkom in 2002 C.E. In 2011 C.E. the former gravel road, leading from the junction at Andriesvale to the gate of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, had been bituminised and there were also roadworks going on in Welkom: The paths and roads of sand were flattened, consolidated with gravel and waiting to be bituminised as well – Jobs were available, also to teenagers, who dropped out of school to “earn money on the street” (Conversation Maria Kariseb 2011). Dawid Kariseb’s³⁷ house was equipped with a single light bulb and a giant refrigerator, which was almost always empty.

The craft showroom on the roadside, to which Tomaselli and Shepperson (2005: 19) refer, was freshly renovated and now features a *Drankwinkel*, a liquor store. “It’s too close to the school” (Interview Hans Schneider 2011), Hans Schneider, member of the Mier community, retired building contractor and shop owner in Welkom, complained. In his shop, which is run by his wife Susan, there is no alcohol sold, only food and other commodities, tobacco and airtime for cell phones. In one of the corners there is a small TV and so people meet in the shop to watch soap operas and news. Schneider himself started building a church in Welkom, after he had

³⁷ Dawid Kariseb is married to Maria, who belongs to the Kruiper family. They have a house in Welkom, made of tin, wood and grass, where they live with eight children as well as with the elders Hendrik and Nat Kruiper.

suffered from a heart attack. He saw this as his duty for the community and pointed out that his father already had this sense for solidarity (ibid.). On a walk through the town, Schneider led me to a broken-down building, a hospital his father had built, but which has never been used. “Due to lack of money, they say, and because there is a hospital in Askham” (ibid.), he concluded. The piping and electrical installations had been stolen, the windows and doors were broken and the building now offered shelter to a family of goats.

9.1 Mobility

The roads in the Andriesvale-Welkom area have been improved over the past ten years. The former gravel road that leads to the gate of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park in Twee Rivieren was the first to be bituminised, and some side roads followed and were under construction in 2011 C.E. Still, there are a lot of gravel and sand roads left, that are partly only passable when using 4x4 drive, especially when moving around on the San properties outside the park, e.g. at Andriesvale, Witdraai or Scottysfort. Tourists are now able to proceed to the park’s gate over bituminised routes, what makes it more attractive for them to visit the KTP. The main roads in the park were still consolidated only with gravel, but were on the whole quite convenient to use (Fieldnotes July 2011).

However, most of the people living in the Andriesvale-Welkom area do not own a car, most of the “Bushmen” I met did not even possess a driving licence, and public transportation does not exist. The only ways for most residents of the area to travel the enormous distances between towns and farms are to walk, go by donkey cart or to hitchhike. The latter seems to be the most common method when going from town to town, but farms are usually situated in remote places, which makes walking or the use of donkey carts – when available – the most common modes in these cases. A lot of ≠Khomani commute in this manner between farms in the veld and houses in town, even though some – especially those living at Andriesvale and Witdraai – stay in the veld almost permanently. The matter of transportation becomes crucial in case of the necessity to visit a hospital. As mentioned above, the hospital building in Welkom, for example, was abandoned before it was used, and so an especially prepared corner of the school’s cafeteria serves as a provisional consulting room for

medical personnel visiting regularly. The hospital in Askham is the nearest for most of the area's residents (ibid.).

On my second day in the Andriesvale-Welkom area I visited a family living near Witdraai, where I found a man in terrible condition. His leg had been crushed by a tree a few days ago and had only been wrapped in dirty rags since then. The man was feverish and the only reason he did not feel the pain was because he had been drunk since the accident. Witdraai is the settlement nearest to the hospital, but despite this, the man was not able to travel the ten kilometres from his home to Askham (ibid.).³⁸ This issue is also raised by the #Khomani in connection with HIV/AIDS, malnutrition, and TB prevention and treatment (URL 25).

Another issue concerning transportation was raised by Anna Festus during the interview in Upington. She was very concerned about the fact that some people were not able to participate in decision-making, because there were no means for transport. Even for those who own a car, she said, it's sometimes difficult to acquire gas-money to go to meetings (Interview Anna Festus 2011).

Furthermore, mobility plays a crucial role when choosing a place to live. While most adult #Khomani I talked to would prefer living in the veld all year long, limited mobility forces them to stay in or near a town. Access to food, schools and jobs is almost impossible when living in the veld. These issues will be treated in the according chapters. For now, it is noteworthy that, according to Barnard (1992), H.P. Steyn's visits to the area in 1982 and 1983 featured small groups of #Khomani living scattered across the veld in the summer, and foregathered at the Nossob river in the winter³⁹. This transhumance mobility pattern has also been also recorded for neighbouring communities (Barnard 1992: 90). One could now infer from this that living partly in the veld and partly in town meets this pattern of transhumance. And admittedly, it could, if there was not the pressure for a very high frequency of migration between two settlement locations. This pressure stems from the need to seize certain opportunities – be they in regard to decision making, nutrition, education, subsistence or cultural, ritual or spiritual matters.

³⁸ I took the man and his wife to Askham in my car and an hour later he had to be transported to Upington for surgery; his foot had been smashed to pieces (Fieldnotes July 2011).

³⁹ Whether it is actually winter is not entirely clear, since Barnard writes "summer" twice (Barnard 1992: 90), but from the context it can be inferred that it is a lapse actually meaning *winter*.

9.2 Communication

For those with limited mobility, distance communication is crucial in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. While most news spread through word-of-mouth (and are likely to be biased as a result), complex information is very difficult to pass on. Letters are virtually unused due to the deficit in the literacy skills of most of today's adults. The most common means of distance communication is therefore the cell phone. While reception is (for Kalahari conditions) viable in some spots in most villages, most of the farms and settlements further afield have no reception at all. This is another factor that makes it difficult for "Bushmen" to organise themselves politically when encountering well-organised and technologically well-equipped authorities (Fieldnotes July 2011).

The same situation has taken effect in the case of internet usage. Connections are technically only possible via a mobile data connection. This again is bound to cell phone reception of a certain quality, which is available only at a few spots in the whole region. *The interpreter* uses a signal amplifier, mounted on the roof of her grass house, to improve her cell phone reception, but despite such measures, mobile data connections are still not possible. In addition to the technological paucity there is a massive lack of skills in using computers. Those who do not work with computers in the course of their jobs – and certainly those who are illiterate –, hardly know anything about the possibilities that the internet could offer to support their cases (ibid.).

9.3 Food Supply

As far as I was able to find out, none of the "Bushmen" of the Andriesvale-Welkom area grow any vegetables for nutrition. Some keep chicken, herd sheep, goats and even cattle, mostly for direct consumption of meat, eggs or dairy products. But some, such as Petrus Vaalbooi and his family, produce livestock for the market, although he complained about the situation he is in (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011). While in the village, food is mostly bought at the store. The daily diet of many "Bushmen" consists of bread, which they bake in kettles over the open fire, using wheat flour and soda from the store, or Pap (porridge). Meat and cheese are rarely

consumed and vegetables are rarer still, despite some Tsamma melons (Fieldnotes August 2011).⁴⁰ Malnutrition is therefore a serious problem (URL 25).

When in the veld, “Bushmen” sometimes hunt minor game, such as Steenbok and smaller mammals. But game of any size is very rare on the “Bushmen” farms outside the park. Attempts to (re-)establish herds big enough to sustain their continuance in the area have failed so far, let alone resettling game sufficient for hunting for nutrition. Thus, diet in the veld also consists mainly of what was brought from town, plus roots, wild cucumbers and Tsammas that can be gathered in the veld, and, as previously mentioned, sometimes the meat of hunted game (Fieldnotes July 2011).

9.4 Water Supply

“What’s wrong with this water? When you drink it, you stay thirsty, when you wash with it, you stay dirty!” (Hendrik Kruiper, after taking a gulp of Welkom water; Conversation Hendrik Kruiper 2011a)

Water in the Kalahari is scarce. But as it was in 2002, when Tomaselli and Shepperson (2005: 19) visited Welkom, water today can be taken from taps. The pipes were supplied by the Mier Municipality, most of the maintenance is done by the residents themselves. Water taken from the pipe tastes very salty and feels soapy. According to Anna Festus, the drinking water of Welkom negatively affects eyes and teeth (Interview Anna Festus 2011); the quality is the responsibility of the Mier Municipality. During a conversation in August 2011 at Askham, a municipal official, who does not wish to be named, admitted that there are problems with the quality of drinking water in the area and pointed out that this is the quality of ground water in the Kalahari, but said that the Municipality is “working on it” (Conversation Anonymous A 2011). In direct contrast to this statement is the annual report on the Municipal Blue Drop Score⁴¹, released by the Water Institute of Southern Africa (WISA): As the Mier Municipality in general is urged to provide close monitoring data,

⁴⁰ *Citrullus lanatus citroides*: The wild growing variant of the water melon.

⁴¹ The Blue Drop Certification Programme was initiated by the South African Department of Water Affairs and Forestry in 2008 to improve drinking water quality and management. The Blue Drop Score is the result of an annual analysis of several criteria, which stand in line with the programmes objectives (URL 6).

the Askham system has been monitored continuously for 12 months, as required. The Blue Drop Score of the Andriesvale performance area dropped to 22.61% in 2011, the Aksham area raised its score to 27.72%.⁴² Furthermore, the report states that

“[...] drinking water in all the supply systems poses an unacceptable risk of infection to consumers. 7,153 people are at risk of contracting diarrhoeal diseases. [...] Municipal management should note that failure to provide people with safe water could manifest in serious health effects” (URL 5).

While drinking water of disputable quality is provided in Welkom, neither water nor electricity is provided to people on many of the farms, especially in Andriesvale. Anna Festus stated that the Mier Municipality is not providing services for the houses on the #Khomani farms (Interview Anna Festus 2011). This was confirmed by the afore-mentioned municipal official, when he informed me that the “Bushmen” are living on private land and that the municipality is not responsible in this case (Conversation Anonymous A).

9.5 Alcoholism and Crime

On a Wednesday, while driving to Dawid Kruiper’s whereabouts on a farm near Andriesvale, I had to perform an emergency braking manoeuvre on a sand road. A 17-year-old, passed-out young man was lying half in the waist-high grass, half on the road. He turned out to be completely drunk, at around 11 a.m., and this young man was not an exception, as I experienced and was told on several occasions (Fieldnotes July 2011).

Alcoholism is a major problem among San in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. Although there has not been any particular research on this issue in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, the situation in the South African parts of the Kalahari can be compared to the San’s in Botswana’s Kalahari regions. Both groups share a history of marginalization and identity loss, which are named as major reasons for alcohol

⁴² A Blue Drop Score below 33.3% indicates “inadequate DWG [Drinking Water Quality] Management [...] efficiency levels” (URL 6).

abuse. In a review, comparing public concern with alcohol abuse among Canadian First Nations and Botswana San (2011), Piggott, the author, identifies several factors in addition to marginalization and identity issues – of which some are evidently also relevant for the San in South Africa as well: Poverty, increased alcohol access, and remoteness (Piggott 2011: 18).

As Piggott points out, alcohol has been available to the San for a long time, but the accessibility has increased in the last decades (ibid.: 13). Traditionally, alcohol was produced by fermenting fruits, but in rather small quantities and in low strength. When he was young, Abraham Malgas (Interview 2011) told me, the people used to drill holes into Tsamma melons, mash the insides with a stick, seal the hole and bury the melons in the hot sand. After a few days the melons contained alcohol, which was then drunk occasionally. Still in his childhood, before the relocation from the park, the San were supplied with alcohol by park authorities, albeit in small quantities (ibid.). Dawid Kruiper mentioned *ration packs*, which were given to the San, that contained – besides commodities such as tobacco, sugar, coffee – small amounts of alcohol (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011a). In 2011, I counted more liquor stores in the Andriesvale-Welkom area than stores only selling food. The alcohol sold there ranges from expensive high-quality wine to cheap high-percentage alcohol, which leads to almost immediate inebriation of the consumer. The latter is consumed by “Bushmen” in large quantities, whenever there is money to buy it (Fieldnotes August 2011).

Most ≠Khomani’s household income is based on social aid (Interview Anna Festus 2011). Thus, money is rare, but nevertheless a lot of ≠Khomani spend a large portion of it on alcohol. The revenues from selling crafts on the roadside is directly invested into alcohol at the Drankwinkel vis-à-vis (Tomaselli 2005: 102). A day which I intended to spend with a San at a craft-selling-spot near the Molopo Lodge⁴³, ended three hours after it began: After the first tourist had bought a few crafts, the man whom I accompanied got so drunk that he spent the rest of the day sleeping (Fieldnotes August 2011).

Alcohol abuse seems to be a predominantly male problem in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. Although I have seen women drunk, the ratio of drunk males to drunk females was approximately 20:1 (ibid.). Several women told me that the reason for this difference is that drinking is the men’s domain (Conversation Maria Kariseb 2011;

⁴³ A tourist facility near Andriesvale.

Interview Anna Festus 2011; Conversation Linki 2011; Interview Cady 2011). These statements suggest a societal connection, which needs to be reassessed in the field.

The remoteness also contributes to the problem of alcohol abuse (Piggott 2011: 18); there is simply nothing better to do, especially for teenagers. There are no cinemas, libraries or any other youth facilities in the immediate vicinity, and the scarcity of jobs creates an atmosphere of boredom, as a 14-year-old told me (Interview Cady 2011). But alcoholism is not only a problem of the youth. As Dawid Kariseb put it:

“I can’t say it’s just the youth. Some of the old men also drink like that. [...] Maybe when they’ve finished work they have to be kept busy with something else. Ja. Maybe then it’ll go better”⁴⁴ (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

Several times there were parties on weeknights, with loud music until the morning hours, near the place I was sleeping at in Welkom. Young men and women were drinking and dancing just outside the village. One particular night I woke up due to excessively loud motor-noises. On the next morning I saw skid marks just ten centimetres away from my tent – some drunk teenagers had been driving a car through the village, over fences and through yards, because they were bored, as they stated (Fieldnotes July 2011).

Violence and alcohol are strongly connected, as the statistics on South Africa’s Anti-Alcohol-Website show (URL 7). The consequences are physical abuse, fights and even murder. According to Ted Leggett from the Institute for Security Studies, 69% of murder victims tested in 2002 C.E. in the Northern Cape Province, had alcohol in their blood (Leggett 2004: 19). Almost every week of my stay I was informed about a violent assault among “Bushmen”. The latest crime statistics of the only police station in the Andriesvale-Welkom area at Witdraai, covering the period from April 2010 to March 2011 C.E., show one murder, five sexual crimes, one attempted murder, 29 assaults with the intent to inflict grievous bodily harm, 11 common assaults and one common robbery, to name only the crimes against persons (URL 8).

⁴⁴ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

9.6 School

Primary School is available to children in Welkom, for further education it is necessary to leave the town, in most cases to go to boarding schools, since the nearest Secondary School is more than 100 km away (URL 25). Additionally, some consider boarding schools to have a corrupting effect on the children, to disconnect them from their families and, thus, from traditional life (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a). A lot of young people drop out of school to contribute to their families' income, mostly by working on temporary projects, such as roadworks (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011b) or as assistants during elections (Interview Jalorita 2011). A crucial aspect of locationally-bound education has already been addressed in the *Mobility* section of this chapter: If ≠Khomani want their children to attend the national education system, they have to stay in, or at least near a village or town. Dawid Kariseb emphasises that he considers it important to send his eight children to the school in Welkom as well as to teach them in the Veld, to be able to cope with the western way of living as well as to know about traditional ways, even if this means that he needs to commute between town and veld (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a). Crucially, these circumstances also contribute to the overall situation of the San, as will be concluded in chapter 15.

10. *Traditional vs. Western* – Knowledge and Ways of Living

“But I’ll go from here and I lay next to the bush. The snake won’t bite me, the scorpion won’t sting me, I won’t get cold. The rain will rain down on me, I’ll get up. But this man, that reads and writes, can not endure what I go through here by the bush. Because I have the brain”⁴⁵ (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

This statement, made by a “Bushman” from the so-called *Traditional* group of the ≠Khomani, addresses one of the main sources for inner conflict in the Andriesvale-Welkom area: The divide into *Traditional* and *Western* “Bushmen”. Besides its potential for conflict, which will be discussed in the section on *Decision-*

⁴⁵ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

making, this divide is also (1) a visible effect of the necessities of the land claim as well as NGO and donor expectations, and (2) marks two different approaches (or reactions) to the *western way of living*, and thus, development.

10.1 A Visible Effect

While ethnic groups are never homogenous, the heterogeneity of those who claim to be ≠Khomani San is astounding. The understandings of what is community, tradition and what it needs to call oneself a ≠Khomani differ greatly, which is what led to the divide into the two groups of *Traditional* and *Western* “Bushmen” after the land claim was won (Robins 2003: 277). Nevertheless, both groups have ties to the land they claimed and the title is not to be contested. But it is due to the requirements of South African national law that a ≠Khomani identity had to be constructed: “the land claim process required coherent and consistent narratives of cultural continuity and belonging” (ibid.).

Shortly after the land restitution, the construct revealed its weakness, when Communal Property Association (CPA)⁴⁶ leader Petrus Vaalbooi and traditional leader Dawid Kruiper questioned the positions of their respective groups publicly. Petrus Vaalbooi even demanded that the land be divided and Dawid Kruiper considered agreeing, fearing that the *Westernised* group would take over all of the land if he refused (Robins 2001a: 841; 2003: 276). That the heterogeneity of the ≠Khomani actually led to this near-breakup, appears to be a consequence of the plans which the two different groups have for the restituted land, for the construction of their identities. While the Vaalbooi group consists mainly of stock farmers, the Kruiper group prefers a hunter-gatherer way of living (Robins 2003: 278). Subsequently, their plans for land use and their demands from government, NGOs and donors differ vastly from each other.

The situation is also rooted in the ambivalent expectations of NGOs and donors, who demand not only that the San be *authentic* and live traditionally on the one hand, but that they also fulfil the goals of the NGOs’ “Civilising Mission” (Robins 2001a: 844) on the other hand (ibid.: 844f). This leads to an inner conflict between identity and agendas, and since NGOs and donors are uncomfortable with the San combining elements of western society and their own society into a *hybrid*, positions

⁴⁶ See chapter 11. *Decision-making*.

had to be taken (Robins 2003: 278). But as we shall see, the *Traditionalist* group also partly begins to consider it necessary to include western elements.

10.2 Two Different Approaches

Dawid Kruiper aspires to a traditional lifestyle that excludes all western aspects, apart from some commodities. During an interview on a farm in Andriesvale, he explained how he would wish the future to appear. Besides basic infrastructure (water, electricity) on the farms outside the park and means of transport, he wished to be supplied with commodities:

“The time that I was in the park, years ago, there were donkeys and there were dogs. We made our lives in the park, at that time. The park gave us a ration pack with tobacco, coffee and all those things. We didn’t live at Twee Rivieren permanently, we moved around in the veld. If I could have that lifestyle back, that I’m very proud of, I would live happily with my people. And I’d have respect for anybody”⁴⁷ (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011a).

Essentially, Dawid Kruiper is calling for unconditional basic income, as has been discussed very frequently in Europe – and especially in Austria – over the last few years (see, for example, Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung: URL 10). But his position is not only very conservative, it is also clearly based on a denial of the pressure that lies on the area, and thus, on *his people*. The pressure derives from macro-reality, more precisely from the fact that tourism is the biggest industry of the region and facilitates a lot of jobs. This is what Dawid Kariseb is concerned about, when he states that it is necessary for his children to obtain certain western skills, although he clearly refuses the *westernised* way of living (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a). To be able to meet the challenges of this pressure, while at the same time keeping tradition, he’d like his children to visit the (western) school in Welkom as well as spending time with him or other elders in the veld, to gain traditional knowledge and learn the way of living:

⁴⁷ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

“From my side it will be in both schools. It doesn’t help that I take them out of the school [in Welkom] and only put them in the Veld School, because they must come to the pen and the paper. Here in the veld, they will know a bit about this stuff, [but they also have to visit the school in Welkom,] so that they can know the english that I don’t know”⁴⁸ (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

This is part of what Steven Robins calls *indigenous modernities*, referring to the anthropologist Marshal Sahlins and others. He argues that traditional San in particular have to obtain skills which make it possible for them to gain “‘exogenous’ modern means of production, such as cultural tourism, wage labour, and government and donor grants” (Robins 2001a: 843). Although I do not agree with Robins on the term *modern*, since I consider the ≠Khomani to be modern in the sense of contemporary per se and much of what Robins calls modern in fact concerns aspects of technology, his perspective hits the mark precisely. As I previously mentioned, Eric Wolf argued convincingly that interconnections are nothing new to the human world, and, thus, societies and cultures are very dynamic (Wolf 1997: 3f). Therefore, as Robins puts it,

“[...] groups adapt and recast their dependencies on modern means of production in order to reconstitute and reproduce their own cultural ideas and practices” (Robins 2001a: 843).

This may seem logical, but it indicates a crucial change to a paradigm that used to show San only as victims.

The second approach is represented by Petrus Vaalbooi, who lives at a farm called Scottysfort, near Andriesvale, as a stock farmer. He and his family spend the day herding and caring for some sheep and cows, but they cannot get the farm running. That is why Vaalbooi demands help from the Department of Land Affairs of

⁴⁸ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

the Republic of South Africa, and says that there have been agreements that have been broken by the government (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011).

Petrus Vaalbooi concentrates on development according to his own needs, on full integration into capitalism, while keeping a special status as indigenous and therefore being eligible for special subsidies:

“We need them to listen to us. [...] We need money to buy sheep and we need money to buy cows. And they must subsidise us to be strong farmers. The farmer needs his vehicles, he must buy his medicine to inject the animals with, he can’t doctor the sheep on his own, he must pay labourers to do that. He must get a decent monthly salary from the government, until he’s strong enough to help himself. That is the promise, that the Department of Land Affairs gave”⁴⁹ (ibid.).

Vaalbooi mentioned traditional knowledge and way of living only marginally, and in a way to justify that he had fulfilled his part of what he considers to be *the* agreement between ≠Khomani and the government: The ≠Khomani keep tradition alive (so that tourism can benefit from cultural sights) and the government gives them money, in his case to run his farm properly (ibid.).

Concluding this section, the two ways that split up the ≠Khomani into two opposing groups since the land restitution can be argued as being incompatible with each other. Apart from money, they have almost no demand in common but the fulfilment of what both consider to be *the* agreement with the government: Meeting the expectations of tourists, donors and NGOs by *being “Bushmen”* and, in exchange, receiving aid to support their way of living (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011a; 2011b; Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011).⁵⁰

⁴⁹ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

⁵⁰ Projects that aim at preserving cultural and traditional knowledge will be discussed in chapter 12.

11. Decision-making

Decision-making in the Andriesvale-Welkom area is characterised by competing groups (Robins 2003: 277), alliances, intrigues and a general feeling of not being part of important decisions, of being left out. These problems do not concern decisions being made within the communities (or, to be more specific, within the *Traditional* and within the *Western* group) about practical or everyday concerns, such as legal issues (sentences, penalties, etc.) or organising transport within the region. Problems occur mainly whenever “outsiders” are involved, when questions about land, land use, economic and/or cultural projects or (especially) money arise. These problems reflect on the situation of the San of the Andriesvale-Welkom area from the disparity within the community of the #Khomani as the whole of land-claimants. This creates an imagined community, as Robert Konrad (2008) argues, using the concept of Benedict Anderson: An imagined community is not based on kinship structures, but on an abstract concept of belonging-together (Konrad 2008: 152). This perspective is supported by the findings of Steven Robins, who argues, as already mentioned, that the #Khomani had to be created in order to justify their claim for land (Robins 2003: 277). This does not impair their land-rights, because the people that came together under the name #Khomani do have rights to their land, but – due to Apartheid – have not been living in a structure as South African national law demands it.

11.1 Structures – Communal Property Association and the Interim Committee

The core of the decision-making structure was the Communal Property Association (CPA), an institution that holds the legal land title and is responsible for its management as well as for maintaining democratic structures in all decision-making. CPAs are common practice to organise land restitutions in South Africa, but, as is the case all over South Africa, serious cases have been raised against many CPAs, also against the #Khomani/Mier CPA (Konrad 2008: 152f). Subsequently, there have been several reelections of the CPA board, but it still did not function as desired, which is why “it did not continue” (Interview Anna Festus 2011). The collapse of the CPA is due to the fact that Mier and #Khomani communities do not share the

same approach to land use⁵¹, which also contributes to the fact that ≠Khomani activists began organising themselves apart from the Mier community, in the “Interim Committee of Representatives of the ≠Khomani San” (ibid.). This new structure was created during the year 2011 C.E., and an initial meeting as a consolidated group was held on 6 August 2011 C.E. in Askham. The tone of the meeting was benevolent throughout, but decisions were rare, since a lot of people who were supposed to attend simply did not show up. Anna Festus traces this circumstance back to the issue of lacking resources for transport, as previously mentioned in the chapter on *Mobility*, on the one hand, but also to a certain lack of interest or belief in the new structure on the other hand, bringing alliances and competition among groups into the game. After the meeting, Anna Festus’ brother, Ruben, interim chairman of the interim committee, pointed out that the new body should include all groups of the ≠Khomani and that tensions among the different groups should be reduced. But while addressing these tensions he complained about certain groups not being willing to cooperate, referring to a violent attack that had been carried out against him in Andriesvale several weeks before by residents of the town (Conversation Ruben Festus 2011). He explained the attack as resulting from this unwillingness, while others reported to me that it all started because Ruben publicly hit someone in the face (Fieldnotes August 2011).

During the interview in Uppington, which took place before the meeting in Askham, Anna Festus pointed out that the ≠Khomani need to respect their own structure as the most important step towards being able to make decisions at all (Interview Anna Festus 2011).

11.2 The “Other People”

During an interview, a ≠Khomani San, who prefers to stay anonymous and is therefore called Anonymous B, complained about being left out and being controlled by “the other people” (Interview Anonymous B 2011). As I found out, he was actually talking about two groups: South African San Institute (SASI) employees and the *Western “Bushmen”*. The latter refers to the divide of ≠Khomani of the Andriesvale-Welkom area in a *Western* and a *Traditional* group (Robins 2001a: 834; Chapter 10), and, for Anonymous B, SASI stands as an example for NGOs and donors in general.

⁵¹ As it has been argued in chapter 10.

SASI, the South African San Institute, formed in the course of the formation of the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) as its organisational arm in the Republic of South Africa, officially in 1996 C.E. Its purpose is to support the San in South Africa on three levels: (1) legal support and advocacy, (2) culture, heritage and language and (3) tourism, the latter by “the development of income generation projects” (URL 11). The ≠Khomani San land claim was SASI’s first major project and it was a big success in their eyes. SASI also played its role in the subsequently rising issue of the divide of the ≠Khomani, actually trying to assist in what I would call *community-building*, in helping the San to (re)create a mode of togetherness in the situation (Robins 2003: 278). As empirical data shows, this endeavour was unsuccessful, at least until now (Fieldnotes August 2011).

But there are also cases raised against SASI concerning more practical issues. Anonymous B, for example, was talking about opportunities to earn money in the region, when he started complaining about a project he was part of, referred to as the *bushcamp*, a touristic facility located in a valley near Witdraai. The facility was planned and built involving local “Bushmen” and SASI to host tourists who are especially interested in nature. Anonymous B was involved during planning and construction of the site, but as soon as it had been finished, he felt excluded (Interview Anonymous B 2011). His perspective is supported by Anna Festus, who said that involvement of people in NGO projects very often stops below management levels (Interview Anna Festus 2011). This point of view is supported by the findings of Steven Robins, who argues that NGOs and donors value specific skills that are possessed by *Western* “Bushmen”, like Petrus Vaalbooi, rather than by *Traditional* “Bushmen” (Robins 2001a: 842).

11.3 The Joint Management Board

The most important structure of decision-making between the three parties that were involved in the settlement of the ≠Khomani San land claim – ≠Khomani, Mier, and South African National Parks (SANParks) –, is the Joint Management Board (JMB). In the course of the !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement the JMB was assigned to be the central instance of communication and decision-making on everything that stands in connection with restored land within the park – thus, with the *!Ae!Hai Heritage Park* – and other matters concerning park-community relations.

Additionally, it is possible for the JMB to amend and make changes to the park's management plan (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 185). Each of the parties is entitled to name between three and five representatives and their *locum tenens* as well as to call in (voteless) experts on specific matters (ibid.: 185ff).

But equal representation of the communities on the JMB is, de facto, not given. Firstly, structural bylaws of the JMB hindered equal participation from the beginning, since the Heritage Agreement attributes most of the responsibility of the JMB's agenda to SANParks (ibid.: 191), which creates a structural imbalance. Secondly, the mode of negotiating and decision-making is crucially biased by western structures, which do not get along with modes of San decision-making⁵² and, thus, hinder San from fully participating in the processes. Thirdly, the two facts combined lead to a paradoxical standoff, because it is indeed possible to change responsibilities within and the structures of the JMB (ibid.: 185), but one needs to go the way of existing structures to change them (Interview Anna Festus 2011).

11.4 Traditional Leadership

In addition to the divide into *Traditional* and *Western* "Bushman", concerns are raised about the *modi operandi* of the traditional leader, Dawid Kruiper, among the *Traditionalist* group members, thus raising turbulences on another level. While the San are known to practice a (relatively) consensual mode of decision-making and cooperative problem-solving, Joram /Useb, member of a Namibian San community, points out that governance structures of (Namibian) San traditionally feature a (mainly male) leader, who either inherited the position or was elected. Although a San leader was appointed certain functions and was expected to show certain qualities, he remained *primus inter pares* (/Useb 2001: 18f).

Dawid Kruiper inherited the position, Robert Konrad sums up his findings, from his ancestor Ou Makai. But while in the diaspora, Kruiper did not take office (Konrad 2008: 118). His potential position became relevant again when preparations for the land claim were being made. In a footnote to that topic, Steven Robins quotes Roger Chennells, the #Khomani's attorney: "many of the San know that he [Dawid Kruiper] is responsible, that's why he's got his leadership position" (Roger Chennells quoted

⁵² On many occasions I have been told that decisions among the #Khomani are a product of consensual discussions, very often made under a tree, but certainly "not inside an uncomfortable hall" (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a; Fieldnotes August 2011).

in Robins 2003: 277, footnote 8). From then on, Dawid Kruiper was in charge of official representation in traditional concerns, while Petrus Vaalbooi was considered the political leader and was appointed head of the CPA.

More than ten years after Dawid Kruiper took office, many of the ≠Khomani in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, who see themselves as *Traditional* “Bushmen” and therefore are supporters of the traditional leader, consider the way he does things as being inappropriate, contra-productive and/or even protectionist, in terms of his core family.

Anonymous B states that he very often does not get seen, because he is not one of Dawid Kruiper’s children (Interview Anonymous B 2011). Abraham Malgas, one of the elders and always striving for peaceful interactions among the “Bushmen” and with “non-Bushmen”, criticises Kruiper very strongly:

“Oom Dawid doesn’t talk right. He doesn’t wanna talk right. Because he’s scared that they’ll take the land from him. [...] We hear that we have a leader, but we don’t know that we have a leader. [...] Dawid, I don’t wanna talk bad about Dawid, but [...] when Roger [Chennells] left, he [Dawid Kruiper] packed up and went to Andriesvale. And when he moved out to Andriesvale, he threw us away. He is now with other people. Where is his Bushmen now?”⁵³ (Interview Abraham Malgas 2011).

Not only Abraham Malgas feels forsaken. Many ≠Khomani complained about Dawid Kruiper increasingly retreating to and spending most of his time on the ≠Khomani’s land in the park. These concerns mainly refer to his role as the one who can negotiate changes of the situation with authorities. In the “Bushmen’s” opinion, he cannot fulfil his role as long as he stays in remote places in the veld. And his designated successor, his son John, is not considered as having the qualities of a traditional leader by many (Fieldnotes August 2011).

Decision-making among the ≠Khomani is a very difficult process. The field of power in the Andriesvale-Welkom area features various different ethnic, fragmented

⁵³ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

groups, with different fields of interests, goals and means. For the #Khomani, the most crucial factor is the divide into a *Western* and a *Traditional* group. Additionally, the leadership, that was built up more than ten years ago, loses the faith and support of the group members. Anna Festus sees advancements of the situation mainly hindered by these dead-end structures and therefore calls for a change: “A strong representative needs to come up from the #Khomani” (Interview Anna Festus 2011).

12. Jobs, Economic Opportunities and Conceptualisation of *Work*

The biggest employer in the region is certainly the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park. But as Robert Konrad noted regarding his data from 2005 C.E., the percentage of San who were employed by the park, numbered approximately two percent of all employees (3 of 89). Most of the employees were Mier or, especially among the management, White employees (Konrad 2008: 135f). This situation had not changed at all in 2011 C.E. (Interview Anna Festus 2011). Although neither SANParks nor the South African government are directly responsible for the economic situation of the #Khomani, they took responsibility for a major part of the San’s deprivation in the past by restituting their land. Therefore, they are certainly responsible for rebalancing the injustice of the past, which subsequently led to their structural discrimination today. This is the logical consequence of the acceptance of the outcome of the #Khomani San land claim and was kept hold of in the Ae!Hai! Heritage Park Agreement and, subsequently, in the park’s management plan as cooperation and involvement (KGNP 2008: 31). Still, after ten years as land owners, the household income of most of the San living in the Andriesvale-Welkom area is based on social aid (Interview Anna Festus 2011; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). #Khomani San are upset: “They gave us plans – from the year 2000 till now – and none of the plans can work”⁵⁴ (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011).

Jobs are generally rare in the Northern Cape Province, especially for those lacking western education, which includes many of the #Khomani. The *Statistics South Africa’s* Labour Force Survey states an unemployment rate in the Northern Cape Province of 31.3 % opposing an employment rate of 36.4 % and thus, a labour force participation rate of 53 % for the first quarter of the year 2011 C.E. The latter

⁵⁴ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

means that 336,000 of 717,000 people between 15 and 64 years of age – who are considered as being fit to work – are “not economically active” (Statistics South Africa 2011: 7).⁵⁵ Thus, the numbers in total show that 455,000 of 717,000 persons are either unemployed or economically not active.

Young people are especially concerned by unemployment. Elvis, a 20-year-old member of the Mier community living in Welkom, is a trained electrician, completed a computer course in Upington⁵⁶ and is fluent in Afrikaans and English. In 2011 C.E. he was unemployed, earning only a small amount of money from occasional jobs. He had worked for an electrical company in Upington and then for the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park on a per project basis from March until June of the year before. While looking for employment – at best, Elvis stated, at *Eskom*, the major South African electrical power provider – he helps neighbours and friends with their electrical problems. Without payment. “I just do it. I love electricity” (Interview Elvis 2011). Some of the young people get into a vicious circle when they drop out of school to earn money for their own or their families’ survival. One of Dawid Kariseb’s sons left school in June 2011 C.E. to earn some money at the road works that were done in Welkom (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011b), and Jalorita, a 14-year-old Mier girl, dropped out of school to earn money as an assistant during elections (Interview Jalorita 2011).

12.1 “Bushmen” Heritage as Cash Crop

Most people interviewed, including many of the San themselves, see one of the major obstacles for those unemployed in the low education level of the ≠Khomani living in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, which has already been discussed in chapter 9.6 of the thesis at hand. In connection with this circumstance, Anonymous B, a San from the *Traditional* group, sees a major issue in the fact that the *Traditionalists* in particular are fleeced by those San who are better trained in western skills, as well as by NGOs, SANParks and government authorities.

⁵⁵ “Not economically active” means that “employment refers to market production activities” (Statistics South Africa 2011: 7), i.e. refers to the *formal* sector of economy.

⁵⁶ The computer course Elvis completed at the company “Creative Minds” cost 3,400 ZAR (331 €).

“I will put on my [traditional dress; ...], but the man, that writes, won’t wear his traditional dress. He looks at me to do that. [...] I am the man that loosens the money and he takes it over there. He speaks and he writes and he speaks English, I don’t understand English, so he’s the man that speaks with the man”⁵⁷ (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

This statement expresses very clearly what actually happens in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. While *Western* “Bushmen”, who herd sheep, goats and partly cattle, are not very interested in a concept of “*Bushmen*” *heritage* that goes beyond a justification of the land claim (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011), others, including NGOs, SANParks, private companies and government authorities, tend to use this heritage as a selling-point to attract tourists. This is the point at which the authenticity problem (Robins 2001a: 844f) and capitalist economy meet and turn tradition into a tradable product. A commodity that can even be seen as subject to investment speculation, when, for example, money would be invested at !Xaus Lodge in anticipation of rising income due to the lodge’s location in the !Ae!Hai Heritage Park, even featuring a *cultural village*.

In this way, tradition becomes a cash crop. Some ≠Khomani consider the attention of tourists to traditional life to be of value (Lee 2003: 92; Interview Anonymous B 2011). But the combination of circumstances, like the low (western) educational level of most *Traditional* “Bushmen” and the fact that tourism is the only noteworthy industry in the region, lead to the present situation in which the *Traditionalist* “Bushmen” feel exploited. “I am the man that loosens the money and he takes it over there”⁵⁸ (Interview Anonymous B 2011) is how Anonymous B calls it, when his appearance as *traditional* “*Bushman*” is used to generate money of which he sees barely anything. Many feel *managed* by authorities and very often by those “Bushmen” who are able to read and write in English (ibid.; Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011b; Conversation Andries Thys 2011a) and claim their right to live in a self-determined manner.

⁵⁷ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

⁵⁸ See footnote 57.

12.2 Craft-making

While, as already mentioned, most of the #Khomani in the Andriesvale-Welkom area live on social aid (Interview Anna Festus 2011), many of them try to contribute to their households' income by selling craft items. Craft items are articles made of material that can be found or obtained in the veld: Ostrich eggshells, seeds, pieces of wood, leather, stone or bone. These articles – necklaces, bows, arrows, armlets, wind chimes, etc. – attest to the great artistic and handcrafting skills of those manufacturing them. While men mostly do burning work on bone and wood pieces and women assemble smaller pieces after putting them in shape, both genders show specialisations on specific types of articles. But the data from my fieldwork does not suggest a gender-specific specialisation in certain types, e.g. bows are only made by men or jewellery is only manufactured by women (Fieldnotes July 2011).

Some consider craft working to be an art, others see it as a means of survival, as a means to obtain at least a little cash. Anonymous B raves about crafting. For him it is clearly an activity that affords very specialised skills and high qualifications. He is considered a master of his art and emphasises the importance of it for the tradition of the San. Therefore, his pieces show a very high level of detail and particularity, especially in branding. The single elements of which one piece is made, he said, tell a story. A Springbok bone, ostrich eggshell-pieces, camel-thorn seeds: Assembled together they make up a unique whole that has a history and tells this history to tourists taking it home and to the people they show it to:

“That person tells the story over there [...]. And that's where I feel happy. Because I can't write it, so that's my story”⁵⁹ (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

For Dawid Kariseb the craft articles are – not only, but mainly – a source of income. His specialisation is tracking and, if he could choose between tracking for money and making crafts to sell them, he'd choose tracking. Dawid Kariseb used to work for the park for a while, but had to quit after an accident. The crafting is very important for him to contribute his share to the family's income. He does sell

⁵⁹ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

medicine to *outsiders*, thus, “Black people and other Bushmen” (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a), the latter meaning not part of the //Sa! Makai⁶⁰. But that does not earn him much. Kariseb states, that “if I don’t do craft, what will I get? That I have to do. Because I don’t have other work”⁶¹ (ibid.).

The articles are sold to tourists. This mainly happens either (1) directly at the side of the road that leads to the Twee Rivieren gate of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and passes major ≠Khomani settlements in walking distance, (2) through a marginally organised distribution system to local and even distant gift stores, or (3) at !Xaus Lodge.

(1) **Selling crafts by the roadside** is the least effective method. As Anonymous B points out, an average weekly income from this activity is about 70 ZAR (6.80 €; Interview Anonymous B 2011). And as I argued in chapter 9.5, the income from such a sale at the roadside is often directly *invested* into alcohol. The low income is almost entirely determined by the frequency and mode of tourists stopping at the stalls on the roadside. Most of them rush past the craft sellers to reach the camp at Twee Rivieren before sunset, since the nearest city, Upington, is some 300 km away. This mode of selling crafts is also subject to seasonal park-visitor numbers and weather conditions (Interview Anonymous B 2011; Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

(2) Many of those making crafts are loosely involved in a **craft distribution network**. On the one hand, most of the local lodges feature gift shops with craft articles from local artists of different sizes – from one item hanging behind the receptionist’s desk to small stores offering several types of craftwork. Some artists are even involved in wider distribution networks that reach as far as !Kwha ttu, a San Cultural Centre in the Western Cape Province near Cape Town (Interview Maria Kariseb 2011; URL 14).

(3) **Selling crafts at !Xaus Lodge** is certainly the most lucrative way to do so. For many tourists the visit to the *Craft Village* in the Dunes of the *Heritage Park* is a spectacle that induces most of them to buy crafts at prices determined by their producers and to give tips to the San. In this way, the weekly earnings from craft

⁶⁰ See chapter 5.5.

⁶¹ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

selling are pushed to almost the double the income from roadside sales. Since the !Xaus Lodge is a main focus of my research, it will be treated in detail in chapter 13.

Anonymous B argues that making and selling crafts could be combined with cultural education for the children, if there was a centre near the roadside where he and other artists could sit and manufacture crafts for sale, while showing the children how to do it. The *Craft Village* at !Xaus Lodge is unsuitable for this purpose, Anonymous B states, because it is so remote. Remote from the rest of the community, and too remote for the children to accompany the adults all the time⁶². Several projects had been launched of which he thought they could become such a centre, but it always turned out to be a failure, due to several reasons, he points out, but most of the time because “the others took it over” (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

12.3 Entrepreneurs and Farmers

Whenever I discussed possibilities of wage-labour in any business that had nothing to do with the Veld, San argued against that way. The reasonings reached from cultural arguments to the basal fact that many do not want to have a boss⁶³:

“At the factory, if there was work there, I have a boss. Here, where I sit, I’m my own boss”⁶⁴ (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

Although, as Anna Festus states, entrepreneurs are supported by several authorities, it is again the lack of (business) skills that hinders most of them in starting their own business, for example in guided walking tours, and thus, tracking, as it is offered by all major and even smaller lodges and accommodation providers in the area. According to Anna Festus, a bank for small-scale entrepreneuring is planned by the Department of Land Affairs; the Peace Park Foundation is also involved in this program (Interview Anna Festus 2011). Unfortunately, this statement could not be verified so far (2012).

⁶² Details on the *Craft Village* at !Xaus Lodge, see chapter 13.4.

⁶³ As we shall see, this might also point to a specific conceptualisation of work (Chapter 14).

⁶⁴ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

Roger Chennells estimated the number of stock-owners among the ≠Khomani to be 70 individuals in 2006. “Within the group, stock numbers differ radically, from 3 head of small stock to 800” (Chennells 2006: 13). These stock farmers⁶⁵ among the ≠Khomani see themselves as relatively successful entrepreneurs, but feel left alone:

“We work with land affairs, we work with department of agriculture, we work with the premier’s office: nothing has happened”⁶⁶ (Interview Petrus Vaalbooi 2011).

Petrus Vaalbooi is perhaps the best known stock farmer among the “Bushmen” of the Andriesvale-Welkom area. He and his family cultivate a farm called Scottysfort, featuring ca. 6,000 hectares of semi-arid soil, near Andriesvale. As he points out, the farm – during its best time – produced 1,500 sheep per year. Today, he has only a few dozen sheep, of which he considers only three or four to be of good quality. The clan also tries to breed cattle, but that turned out to be even more difficult. What he demands, is help from the government. Money, to buy animals, to fix the farm facilities, like fences, and, last but not least, to pay himself a salary, until he is able to stand on his own feet as a farmer (ibid.).

12.4 Heritage Park Project

So far, the term !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park, or simply Heritage Park, has been used in this thesis merely to name the restored land within the park. The term derives from the fact that the area is still part of the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, although it is no longer owned by the state. Therefore, the appended term *Park* assures that the territory continues to be perceived as a conservation area. Already during negotiations it was planned to also designate the area for preserving “the cultural and traditional knowledge of the ≠Khomani San and Mier communities, while improving their livelihood opportunities” (URL 15).

2009 was a turning point for this project, when South Africa’s National Lottery Distribution Trust Fund donated a sum of 4.8 million ZAR (467,877 €). This money is

⁶⁵ Approx. 10 % – of a total of ca. 700 members – of the ≠Khomani own stock.

⁶⁶ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

designated to be used to develop the aims of the !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park, thus, to aid in preservation of ̳Khomani (and Mier) cultural and traditional knowledge as well as improving their livelihoods. While the Canadian International Development Agency sponsored a suitable vehicle for transportation to the park and back⁶⁷, the money from the National Lottery Fund is used to cover expenses (ibid.).

Two kinds of projects are part of the bigger !Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park project. On the one hand, there are tourism projects, mainly concerning accommodation, and on the other hand, there are attempts to foster cultural and traditional knowledge transfer. Namely, there are three sites to cater to both approaches: Imbewu, Sebobugas and !Xaus.

Imbewu and Sebobugas are sites inside the park featuring camps for tourists to stay overnight and enjoy a “simpler interaction with the Kalahari desert and its people” (URL 16) including *story telling* and *guided walks*. Accommodation is provided in form of grass huts, but tourists are encouraged to sleep in the open. During my time in the Andriesvale-Welkom area, I unfortunately had no opportunity to observe interactions at one of the camps, since, to my knowledge, no tourists spent a night there. All in all the number of guests seems to be very small, which is not surprising, since most of the acquisitions happen either over the ̳Khomani’s website (URL 17), which offers no possibility of booking apart from e-mail and cell-phone contacts of the “Bushman Council” – a rather official contact that might keep most potential visitors from actually booking⁶⁸ (URL 18). Alternatively, tourists and other visitors (such as myself) are personally invited to go there on occasion. Here, again, the issue of lacking skills in tourism management comes into play.

The Imbewu camp also features the *Veld School* project, which is dedicated to the aim of preserving cultural and traditional knowledge by transferring it to ̳Khomani children. The Veld School is led by Dawid Kruiper, who sees this appointment as his *monkey years*, thus, the time in the life of grandparents when

⁶⁷ Concerning the mentioned issue of *mobility*, it is worth noting that the terms of use of this vehicle are not clear to the ̳Khomani. Some argue that its use is restricted to transport between the Heritage Park and housing locations outside the park. Others say some also use it for other purposes, whether it is allowed or not. Nevertheless, my research showed that most do not even know who is responsible for the administration of its use.

⁶⁸ Tariffs are also not shown (URL 18).

they take care of children of a certain age⁶⁹ (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2001b). SANParks see this as a very practical approach with two sides. On the one hand, this approach makes it possible for children to be

“taken into the bush under the guidance of the elders, and the traditions and customs are demonstrated and taught” (URL 15).

This is also emphasised by Dawid Kruiper, who explained to me that this is the only way to teach the children correctly, by *living* with them in the veld. Just explaining, he stated, does not help, they need to practice – and not just for a few hours, but for days on end. In Kruiper’s eyes the ideal situation would be to stay in the veld permanently and to only leave it on occasion, thus, the reverse of the current living situation (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011b).

On the other hand, GIS (Geographic Information System) monitoring, supported by the Peace Parks Foundation, has been implemented to evaluate the harvest and use of *medicinal* plants. For SANParks, this combination is pioneering for sustainable community-led environmental approaches in South Africa (URL 15). Why the GIS system is limited to medicinal plants is not absolutely clear and a statement concerning this issue could not be acquired. The discussions on the commercialisation of *Hoodia* for diet pills by pharmacological companies (e.g. New 2006: 345) certainly draws critical attention to it, but this is beyond the scope of my research⁷⁰.

The !Xaus Lodge is, in its conceptual form, the practical implementation of the *Co-operation Lodge*, or *Klein Skrij Lodge* that was envisaged in the *!Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement* (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 194). Since a major portion of the focus of my research lies on the !Xaus Lodge, it will be discussed in detail in the following separate chapter.

⁶⁹ The term *monkey years* refers to a story that features children throwing apples at monkeys, again and again, which are then eaten by the latter. At the end of the story, a child does not throw an apple but a stone, while the monkey still thinks an apple is coming towards him. This upsets the monkey (supposedly a baboon), who then flies into a rage. Some monkeys, especially baboons, can be very dangerous animals, and angering them is not considered a good idea. Thus, the children behaving in this manner are considered naughty, which is the essence of the story: Taking care of children when they are at a naughty age (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011b). The custom of grandparents taking in children after their infancy among the #Khomani was already recorded in 1937 C.E., as Barnard points out (Barnard 1992: 88) and the story told appears to refer to this.

⁷⁰ See e.g. Vermeylen 2007.

13. The !Xaus Lodge

When I made my way from my camp at Welkom to Rooibrak – an old borehole that today is a waterhole for game inside the KTP –, where I was supposed to meet staff of the !Xaus Lodge, I was aware that I was going to enter a very special field. The lodge, situated behind 91 sand dunes, approx. 30 km far from the Auob river bed (URL 19), is a *microcosmos* where many of the forces and tendencies, which can be observed in the area as a whole, come together. But I was not prepared for the intensity of the tensions and for how *explosive* the situation actually was. Therefore, !Xaus Lodge is an ideal place to evaluate the situation that resulted from the success of the #Xhomi San's land claim. It epitomises the idea of *socio-economic development*, especially of *sustainable development*, since it is not only supposed to cater to economical aspects in a *sustainable* way – by creating jobs and facilitating training of the local community members – but also to include support of conservational agendas – mainly by providing informations to tourists, as we shall see.

At Rooibrak I met Abraham de Klerk, spouse and partner of Anel de Klerk, the manager of !Xaus Lodge. The tall, White man, speaking English with a strong Afrikaans accent, drove ahead over the dunes, which were quite difficult to navigate with my small 4x4. After ca. an hour of driving we reached the lodge, situated on a large dune, overlooking a huge salt pan. I was warmly welcomed and Abraham and Anel de Klerk sat down with me on the terrace of the lodge and generously dedicated several hours to answering all my questions and telling me about the lodge. I recorded an interview with them during this conversation.

The main building of the lodge had been built on the highest point of the dune next to the pan. It features the kitchen, the dining room, an office, a lounge and a small gift store. On both sides of it, along the ridge of the dune, 12 chalets (24 beds) are arranged, all of them featuring a small balcony facing the pan. The buildings stand on poles and are connected to each other by a wooden runway, that expands into a terrace with seating and a pool area, in front of the central building. The manager's family – Anel de Klerk, Abraham de Klerk and their 8-year-old daughter – live in one of the chalets on the ridge. To the south, the staff quarters are situated around a flat square at the foot of the dune. The employees of the lodge live there in

shared huts, designed similarly to the chalets. A few hundred metres away from the last chalet to the north, at the border of the salt pan, the *Craft Village* – where ≠Khomani San produce and sell craftwork to tourists – is situated (Fieldnotes August 2011).

13.1 History and Organisation of the Lodge

During the introductory talk I had been given by Abraham and Anel, as well as on the !Xaus Lodge's website, much emphasis was laid on the fact that the name of the Lodge, !Xaus, means *heart* in Nama (URL 21; Interview Anonymous B 2011). This is, firstly, due to the shape of the salt pan at its northerly end, which, when applying some imagination, looks like the upper end of a heart-symbol. Secondly, the naming emphasises the cooperation aspect of the idea behind the lodge concept (URL 21; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). This idea was already envisaged in the *!Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park Agreement*, where it also says that the lodge is to be managed by the Joint Management Board (JMB), which consists of representatives of the ≠Khomani and the Mier communities and SANParks (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 194). Symptomatically for how this management cooperation turned out in practice, the !Xaus Lodge's website sees the metaphor of the heart only regarding the cooperation between the two communities, San and Mier, leaving out SANParks, who actually play a crucial role, especially when it comes to dispersing the revenue of the lodge (URL 21).

The concept of this Cooperation Lodge also involves economic aspects. These are in regard to job-creation as well as advertising opportunities for other community projects. Its location within the Heritage Park is seen as making it the ideal spot for the latter, since the area is considered to be the main location for community tourist projects to take place (Bosch / Hirschfeld 2002: 194). The camps Imbewu and Sebobugas are actually quite close, but advertising does not happen at the lodge, at least not in a way that would attract tourists in any significant numbers. Also, most guests' visit to the !Xaus Lodge is part of a well-planned trip, leaving no space for unexpected detours (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). The website of the lodge also states that !Xaus

“[...] assists in leveraging donor funding for off-site community health, agricultural, educational and job creation projects” (URL 21).

This intention is part of their procedures and networks, which are very hard to see through, supposedly involving over-regional cash flows and standing in close connection with a multitude of NGO, donor and government projects that are carried out all over the area. Therefore, apart from educational and job creation projects, !Xaus Lodge’s involvement in leverage activities is beyond the scope of my research⁷¹. The two exceptions in this context (education/training and job creation) will be discussed in the respective sections of this chapter.

The lodge itself was already erected in 2005 C.E., but only opened in 2007 C.E., because a concessioner had to be located. While the land as well as the lodge facility itself is legally owned by the ≠Khomani and the Mier communities, the operation of the Lodge was, from the beginning onwards, designated to be outsourced. This is, as the managers of the lodge state, due to the lack of skills among the communities’ members (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). The concessioner that finally took over the management of the lodge is *Transfrontier Parks Destinations* (TFPD). As the managers of the lodge emphasised and the website of the !Xaus Lodge states, TFPD is a *Black Empowerment Lodge Management Company*, i.e. 30 % Black-owned (ibid.; URL 21).⁷² According to their own statement, the company specialises in business-orientated sustainable tourism projects and currently operates five lodges, trails, camps and guesthouses all over Southern African Transfrontier and conservation areas. TFPD claims a standard of community-involvement and sustainability at all its destinations (URL 3).

After the construction of the lodge had been finished in 2005 C.E., the communities had already given up on it, since no concessioner could be found, or was willing to operate the lodge. This changed when TFPD took over the operation of the facility, which had in the meantime become decrepit. After a grant of 4.5 million

⁷¹ One project has to be briefly noted here as an example, though. For purposes of *Corporate Social Responsibility*, a market concept especially popular these days, the Scandinavian *Oryx Salt* company donates a certain amount for each package of salt sold, on which this donation is advertised (TFPD 2010). The company’s website states the following: “ORYX desert SALT is harvested in the Kalahari desert in South Africa in a region which has never been inhabited” (URL 24).

⁷² According to Anel de Klerk, the TFPD “is a couple of friends, actually, that put money together, actually, to start running this thing” (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

ZAR (438,635 €) from government authorities was obtained, the lodge was renovated and additional facilities were added in order to be able to start operations. The !Xaus Lodge was officially opened in 2007 and since then operates as the only privately owned (i.e. owned by San and Mier communities) luxury accommodation in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (TFPD 2010; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

As already mentioned, TFPD has its own guidelines and aims regarding benefits for and participation of the local communities. The implementation of these guidelines brought them the *Imvelo Award for Responsible Tourism*⁷³ 2010 C.E. in the category of *Best Practice Economic Impact*. The numbers and conclusions presented in the submission that resulted in the winning of the award, suggest a success in this context (TFPD 2010). But two questions remain: How are these principles lived in daily practice at the lodge? And (how) do these arrangements contribute to the improvement of the San's livelihoods?

13.2 Financial Benefits and Revenue Dispersal

The first issue to be addressed in this context are the financial benefits for the communities. TFPD states, that “!Xaus Lodge has generated more than 5.1 million ZAR (497,119 €) in income for the Gordonia area” (TFPD 2010) and that the destination development measures, carried out by TFPD, increased the property value for the communities crucially to ca. 11 million ZAR (1,073,940 €; TFPD 2010). The latter is certainly correct, but the value of the lodge decreases dramatically as soon as it is not maintained anymore, because the weather conditions in the desert rapidly damage the buildings and other facilities (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). Therefore, the property value of the lodge stands and falls with its operation. Additionally, the creation of a *!Khomani San and Mier Community Trust* has been envisaged, to receive a ten percent stake of the TFPD after ten years of operation (TFPD 2010).

⁷³ The *Imvelo Award for Responsible Tourism* is awarded under custody of the *Federated Hospitality Association of Southern Africa* (FEDHASA), to “recognise tourism and hospitality businesses that make a real, measurable and sustained contribution to Responsible Tourism” (URL 23).

The 5.1 million ZAR income generated by !Xaus for the Gordonia area, as stated by TFPD, is made up of the operational expenditure spent in the region⁷⁴ (ibid.). These expenditures include sale on commission of artistic pieces and craftwork of locals in the lodge's gift shop, purchase and continuous supply of textile products from the *Vezokuhle Sewing Co-operative* in Upington, promotion of local guesthouses and service providers, and purchasing wine from regional wine producers, firewood from local providers and food from the supermarket in Askham (TFPD 2010; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). Additional indirect income might be added to this by purchases (flights to Upington, car rental, fuel, etc.) that are made by tourists visiting the area only because of the !Xaus Lodge, but there is no data available regarding this part.

Community members employed at the lodge, are paid according to their position and skills, with a baseline of South Africa's minimum wage of ca. 1,000 ZAR (98 €) a month, as Anel de Klerk points out:

“It's basically the minimum wages [...] So most of them [the employees] get more than that. But the tourism industry all over the country doesn't pay well” (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

Other than the financial aspects of staff and employment at !Xaus, the topics relating to the *Craft Village* will be discussed in the respective sections within this chapter.

A further benefit (and possibly the most contested one within the communities) to San and Mier from tourism at !Xaus is the share they receive from the lodge's revenue. As a sort of rent for the lodge and the surroundings, the lodge pays five percent⁷⁵ of its turnover to SANParks. The latter are then supposed to disperse the money in three equal portions among the members of the Joint Management Board (JMB) – namely themselves, the San and the Mier community – (Interview !Xaus

⁷⁴ 92% of the total; spent mainly in the towns of Askham and Upington – data from 2009/10 C.E. (TFPD 2010).

⁷⁵ This percentage is fixed up to a total turnover of 5 million ZAR (487,372 €).

Lodge Managers 2011; E-Mail Gray 2011⁷⁶). Unfortunately, I was not able to find out if the payments from SANParks were carried out correctly or not – while #Khomani representatives say they are not, SANParks state that they are. The truth of the matter is that the !Xaus Lodge experienced a loss for every year since opening, and did not expect to make a profit for 2011 C.E. either (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). As previously mentioned, the lodge is a luxury accommodation, with its primary market in overseas tourists, mainly from Europe. The *economic crisis* also has negative impacts on the tourism industry in general, and on the !Xaus Lodge, as a luxury accommodation, in particular. Therefore, although the rates for one overnight stay (including meals and activities) are 3,100 ZAR (302 €) – 1,950 ZAR (190 €) for SADC citizens – per adult person, the running expenses of the lodge exceed the revenue (URL 22; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

13.3 Employment & Training

Working at the !Xaus Lodge is a very demanding job. The Lodge is, as already mentioned, situated 30 km off the Nossob river bed in the midst of sand dunes. Although there is another, more convenient road to the community gate in the south, traveling there and back is a relatively arduous task. The area lacks fresh water and electricity and long-distance communication is only possible via satellite. The power supply for the lodge is provided by a diesel generator, which only operates a few hours in the morning and in the evening, drinking water can only be taken from bottles and all other facilities are supplied with purified ground water, the quality of which has already been discussed in chapter 9.4. !Xaus Lodge is, as a matter of fact, situated in the desert, and it is this remoteness that makes working at the !Xaus Lodge a difficult job, and also creates a great potential for conflict (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

⁷⁶ The e-mail from Barry Gray (08.08.2011) at TFPD was sent to Anel de Klerk, who requested information on the dispersal of the percentage of turnover and printed the e-mail out for me. The events that led to this situation, are a perfect illustration of the tensions that exist at the !Xaus Lodge: During a dinner on 7 August 2011 at the !Xaus Lodge, guests asked me about the purpose of my visit. I explained my research outline to them and in course of doing so, mentioned donations that have been made to the #Khomani by donors, that actually have nothing to do with TFPD or the !Xaus Lodge. These donations were used among certain #Khomani community members in non-transparent ways. De Klerk, overhearing this conversation out of context, assumed that I was telling the guests about the dispersal of the !Xaus' turnover percentage. The misunderstanding was clarified when Anel de Klerk unexpectedly handed me the print-out of Barry Gray's email, which also contained her original message. Although this situation could be clarified, it is an example – and not the only one – for a rather tense situation at !Xaus, regarding the strict guidelines of cooperation.

17 people were employed at the !Xaus Lodge in 2011 C.E.; 16 of them, including Abraham and Anel de Klerk, worked directly at the Lodge in the park and one, a #Khomani woman, working at Twee Rivieren in the lodge's laundry (Interview Linki 2011; Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). The percentage of members of the two communities working at the Lodge is exactly the same: seven San (three men and four women) and seven Mier (one man and six women). Ellen Bok, member of the Mier community, is assistant manager and head chef at the lodge. The activities on the lodge are not divided between San and Mier, but between gender. Thus, Mier men also do tracking and guided walks with the tourists and San men also do maintenance of facilities and vehicles, and women of the San community as well as women of the Mier community work as waitresses and in housekeeping (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). "So they [the members of the two communities] cooperate in the departments of the lodge" (ibid.), argues Anel de Klerk.

The staff works on a two-week shift basis and receives, as already mentioned, wages according to their positions and skills, but not less than the minimum wage of approx. 1,000 ZAR (98 €). Additionally, the employees are supplied with food (for the time they spend at the lodge) and are members of a pension fund. Transportation to the lodge and back, workwear and accommodation at the lodge are supplied by the lodge as part of the employment contract (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers; TFPD 2010).

Staff quarters are located at the foot of the dune on which the lodge was built. They were designed like the chalets for the guests, which originally featured an open side towards the balcony, that was only covered by a canvas curtain. As Anel de Klerk points out, this was due to an underestimation of the temperatures during the desert winter (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). In the guest chalets, the open side had already been replaced with a sliding door, offering more protection from the harsh weather conditions. The staff quarter chalets still feature the canvas curtain, although the management has applied for another government grant to install sliding doors there as well. The money from the grant will also be used for urgent repairs and to redo faulty work on the roofs of some of the buildings⁷⁷ (ibid.). Staff members

⁷⁷ During the construction of the !Xaus Lodge, visiting #Khomani pointed out mistakes in the construction of the roof. The contractors ignored these objections – today the roofs are leaking (Dyll 2009: 56).

share their quarters divided by gender, and the number of people sleeping in one quarter – four to five persons – depends on the size of the respective chalet. They all share one kitchen, located in a bigger hut opposite a huge pile of (supposedly organic) waste at one of the edges of the square, around which the quarters are grouped (Conversation Joaquin 2011).

Joaquin, a San guide working at the lodge, pointed out that he had a hard time getting used to working conditions at !Xaus. The isolation got to him and he also did not get along with the men he shared his quarters with. In the meantime, he stated, it was getting better. Joaquin actually comes from Platfontein, near the city of Kimberley. He was trained as a guide at !Khwatla, the San Cultural Centre in the Western Cape (Conversation Joaquin 2011). That he is employed at !Xaus, although he does not *actually* belong to the #Khomani community, has a simple reason: Persons applying as guides need to have special training, not only in order to be able to identify tracks and plants correctly and to tell stories and facts about them, but also to ensure that their knowledge of English is sufficient and, last but not least, that they take appropriate care of the security of the people they guide through the wilderness.

Although many of the #Khomani San, especially those of the *Traditionalist* group, actually possess a certificate from just such a guide-training, it is difficult to find people who are willing to work at !Xaus. The remoteness and the two-week shifts make it hard to take the decision to commit to a job at !Xaus Lodge (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011; Conversation Andries Thys 2011a; Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011b). As Anel de Klerk states, the personnel is allowed to bring family, but only on occasion, as space is limited:

“They just arrange with us [the managers] and then they can bring in a husband or friend and the children and, ähm, we just try to limit it to a certain amount, so that it doesn’t get too crowded [...]. Especially in holiday seasons they take turns for the children to come in or their husbands to visit, or their friends to visit and things like that” (Anel de Klerk, Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

In practice, this means separation from the family for at least two weeks per month, which is unacceptable for many #Khomani, although common in the tourism industry

(Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011; Conversation Andries Thys 2011b; Conversation Joaquin 2011).

During the interview with Anel and Abraham de Klerk, I asked them why they had been handed the responsibility of managing the lodge. The answer was very clear: Due to lack of skills, among Mier and San, to manage a lodge of this kind. But as they stated, TFPD is very eager to change this situation, and also to foster other types of education among their staff, with a special focus on hospitality training (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). TFPD supports and encourages training at !Khwatla and at the South African College of Hospitality, as they state in their submission for the Imvelo Award for Responsible Tourism, in hospitality work, guiding and tracking and provides internships at the !Xaus Lodge (TFPD 2010). The latter is part of a cooperation with the secondary school in Rietfontein, a nearby town. Every year young people are given the opportunity to do an internship at the lodge, but most of the time they do not stay, as de Klerk pointed out, mostly due to the remoteness of the workplace. But she also described the case of a man, whom they did not accept as an employee, because he did not fit into the small community at the Lodge. !Xaus Lodge employees are also sent to day-courses in Rietfontein, held by a consultant company that is paid by several different tourism companies to improve the skills of their employees (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). Another reason, pointed out to me by Abraham and Anel de Klerk, is the fact that the lodge is not managed by members of the communities themselves, that is, that the members do not want to take orders from someone who is from their own community, or, as Anel de Klerk puts it, “they don’t listen to their own people” (ibid.). Abraham de Klerk agrees in this case:

“I think it’s also one of the main issues. They don’t wanna see another – maybe say for instance family member or what – higher than the other ones” (ibid.).

Although all this time and effort is devoted to training, Andries Thys, a #Khomani from Welkom, working at !Xaus as a guide, states that the employees’ skills are rarely valued. Thys spoke on behalf of some other employees as well, who did not dare to talk to me while I was at the lodge and whom I was unable to meet during their time off, outside the park. He told me about complaints about

condescending behaviour of the management towards their employees and grievances concerning the staff housing situation. The first complaint is, in his opinion, mostly due to the difficult situation at the lodge as an isolated place with such a small number of people in close contact with each other, but he also sees a certain amount of disrespect hidden in the condescending behaviour. The latter, concerning the housing situation, in his opinion, is because there is no money to facilitate quarters large enough for everyone to stay conveniently (Conversation Andries Thys 2011a).

The managers of the lodge deliberately chose not to control or overhear any of the conversations I had with any of the staff. Nevertheless, many of the staff members did not want to talk to me personally – they sent Andries Thys to do so. Others did not even want the things they told me to be mentioned within this thesis, not even after I promised to anonymise what they had said. They feared negative consequences and therefore the latter is also understandable, especially since – considering the small number of people working at the lodge – everything they told me could have been traced back to them. I respect these wishes.

As I have already argued, it is hard to find certified guides who are willing to work at the lodge, which is why Andries Thys felt secure enough to talk freely and also agreed to being mentioned within this thesis. I mention this because the things of which he accuses the management of the lodge are of a serious nature. Thys told me about a White man who had been trained as a guide and began working at the lodge in 2011 C.E. The first thing he told me was that the guide was not able to pass a *test*, which Thys set for him. With his fingers, Thys made a track into the sand and asked the new guide to interpret it. The latter identified “the fake” as a Gemsbok track, and as a result, Thys felt disrespected by having to earn the same money as a person who was not able to do his job properly, and by the fact that the new guide is not San.

The next issue concerns so-called *night-drives*. During such an activity at !Xaus Lodge, the tourists are placed at the back of a converted 4x4 car, at a height where they are safe from predators and able to observe animals. One guide drives the vehicle, while another guide sits on a chair on the radiator cowling, equipped with a strong light to spot animals in the dark, looking for their eyes in particular. This is considered to be the most dangerous function during such a night-drive, because there is no protection in case of an accident or a predator attack. Since the arrival of

the new guide, Andries Thys told me that it is always the White guide and Abraham de Klerk driving the car, while he and Joaquin, both San, have to sit in front and spot. In Thys' eyes this has nothing to do with experience, as I suggested to him, because the White guide is privileged in other situations too, although he is obviously less qualified. For Andries Thys, the situation at !Xaus has become intolerable, and he feels greatly discriminated against, as he said during a conversation at a campfire in Welkom (Conversation Andries Thys 2011a). Nevertheless, he enjoys the actual *work* of being a guide. But he wishes to be able to run the lodge with other people of the community, without the management of *outsiders*, which he perceives as oppressive. He wants to *manage himself* as soon as possible, with someone from the communities who is specialised in business administration, Thys explained (ibid.).

Linki, the ≠Khomani woman working at the lodge's laundry at Twee Rivieren, is on the other hand very happy to have a job at !Xaus, for the simple reason, as she states, that she had none before. She enjoys the work there, especially because it is not her washing the laundry, but the machines, she joked. However, she would prefer to "do business", as she states, putting up pool-tables and organising dances for money (Interview Linki 2011).

Concluding this section, it can be argued that the situation at !Xaus Lodge concerning employment, training and relations between the different actors within this field, is relatively hard to see through. On the one hand there are the managers and the TFPD, who are understandably interested in a good reputation for the lodge and are eager to emphasise the financial benefits for the communities as well as the training of their members and the other projects that have been implemented to *uplift* the locals. On the other hand, there are the employees, who are mostly happy with their work, but deeply unsatisfied with the situation of being managed by *outsiders* at a place as remote as the !Xaus Lodge is. Additionally, numerous tensions developed due to the isolation which these 16 people live in.

Most of the employees would like to manage themselves, and appear to perceive hierarchy as oppressing. The fact that the employees tend not to "want to see another [...; one of them] higher than the other ones" (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011), as Abraham de Klerk put it, is not necessarily a sign of a lack of skills, but could also be a different approach to the western concept of *management*.

At the end of the interview with Abraham and Anel de Klerk, that lasted over two hours, the latter draw a conclusion that might be rather surprising:

“You know, what I’m also thinking now, you can try and do training with them: If there’s no job for them, they can’t do anything with their training. [...] So never matter how much they’re training them, if there’s not a job for them to do, they’re not going to earn money to make a living from” (ibid.).

13.4 Craft Village

“Meet the Bushmen, legendary hunter-gatherers, at work in the serenity of their craft village and marvel at the tastes of the Mier’s unique culinary offerings. And then, fulfilled in spirit recall the words of Laurens van der Post: ‘This ancient African land seen through the eyes of the Bushmen is mystical, magical and spiritual’” (URL 20).

The excerpt cited above advertises accommodation at !Xaus on SANParks’ website for the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park (ibid.). Such representations have been subject to heavy criticism, and the staff at TFPD is very eager to point to the works of Keyan Tomaselli and his research group on this matter⁷⁸ (E-Mail Annecke 02.08.2012). Kate Finlay, a member of Tomaselli’s research group, concludes from her research on !Xaus’ promotional material that a representation of the San living like *Stone Age people* is what tourists await from, and therefore expect to see at !Xaus:

“Not all opinions of the focus groups members fell within the dominant viewpoint of the San being a Stone Age people, but most

⁷⁸ A lot of research has been conducted on representations like these, featuring essentialist notions, especially by Keyan G. Tomaselli and members of his research group. Tomaselli’s research is part of the 20-year project *Rethinking Indigeneity* at the Centre for Culture, Communication and Media Studies at the University of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. The focus of the project lies in “Discursive Negotiations via Cultural Tourism and Community-Lodge Partnerships” and on the !Xaus Lodge – and the San’s representation at the lodge as well as in their promotional media – as a major case study (URL 26). Unfortunately, the book with the findings, “Cultural Tourism, Methods and Identity: Rethinking Indigeneity” (TFPD 2010: Annexure), edited by Keyan G. Tomaselli, had not been published before the thesis at hand was completed.

felt that the #Khomani should represent themselves in this light in order to meet tourist expectations of inauthentic attractions” (Finlay 2009: 358)

For this reason, the managers at !Xaus Lodge are keen to rectify the image of the San working at the *Craft Village*. Before the tourists are led down to the village in groups, either one of the guides or Abraham de Klerk gives an introductory talk, in which he sets the facts straight. He states that “The guests sometimes are in a misperception [...], they think the Bushmen still live like 100 years ago” (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). During the talk, the history of the San is presented to the tourists and it is made clear that the San are modern persons, *wearing modern clothes* and are not stone-age people. When I witnessed the talk, I could see the disappointment in some faces, as Anel de Klerk had told me to expect the day before. The TFPD and its staff have learned from Tomaselli’s research and thus, advertise the cultural village in a much more considered manner than the teaser on SANParks’ website, that appears to be a relic from less well-informed times:

“The community does not provide a choreographed, stereotypical ‘song and dance’ for the visitors, but instead provide a 21st century view of their life and skills” (TFPD 2010).

This approach testifies to the effort that has been made by TFPD to set the picture of San right, at a lodge that is partly owned by them. But as Finlay’s data leads us to infer, many tourists *want* to see the “Bushman” as *stone-age people* (Finlay 2009: 357f), and thus, they *do* see them as such. Certainly, the *Craft Village*, a reconstruction of a Kraal, that might have never existed in this fashion, featuring craft huts and nothing “modern” apart from the San themselves, does not contribute to a proper perception. The scenes I witnessed at the *Village*, when a group of tourists arrived, ranged from the repulsive behaviour of a family of South African Whites, who talked to the San in Afrikaans as if they were imbecilic, to moments of understanding, when a tourist from Italy talked to a San with the help of Andries Thys as interpreter.

Most of the San working at the *Cultural Village* that day saw the tourists’ visit very pragmatically: A good amount of crafts had been sold. Some of them pointed out that they enjoy presenting their traditions to the visitors, others mentioned displeasing

situations, in which they were asked to pose for photographs in a certain way. But all in all they had come to terms with the situation. The approach Anel de Klerk takes certainly contributes to a discursive handling of the situation on both sides: “We don’t want to betray them [the ≠Khomani], we don’t want to make them like museum pieces” (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

To *make them museum pieces* was also not the idea behind the *Craft Village*, as Anel de Klerk points out:

“The whole idea behind the Craft Village was actually [...] for the Bushmen to come and do their craft here. Where the tourists actually see how they do their craft. The main reason was also for them to get together again. Bring in the children, sharing knowledge with one another” (ibid.).

In some aspects, this approach appears to work, as Anonymous B, who sometimes works at the !Xaus Lodge Craft Village, explained. At the Lodge he has time to make his crafts, is able to present *his* tradition to tourists, who will then tell the story at home, and at the same time ≠Khomani children can watch and learn. He actually wishes to have a place like this outside the park as well, as long as it is not possible for the ≠Khomani to permanently live inside the park, as !Xaus Lodge is very isolated. Also, the stated goal of bringing San children into contact with traditional crafting and thereby transferring knowledge, is quite hard to fulfil, since the children cannot stay at the village all the time, especially once they have reached school-age (Interview Anonymous B)⁷⁹.

The San who work at the Craft Village also come to the lodge in two-week rotational shifts. Transportation is supplied by the lodge; the logistics of which of the ≠Khomani go and when is organised by themselves. The San spend their day crafting at the Kraal at the edge of the salt pan. Their products are then displayed in a tray at the entrance to the Craft Village and sold to tourists. They also have the possibility to sell them in the lodge’s gift store without having to pay a percentage to the lodge, or to distribute them to other TFPD’s lodges, where a commission fee

⁷⁹ The issue of crafting, craft-sale and a *Crafting Centre* outside the park is discussed in detail in chapter 12.2.

applies (TFPD 2010). In addition to the income from craft sales⁸⁰, !Xaus Lodge pays a *representative fee*⁸¹ of 35 ZAR (3.40 €) to each adult per day and supplies them with food and accommodation at the largest of the staff quarters, which they have to share with each other. The number of people who are allowed to come and stay at the lodge to work at the Craft Village is limited to seven adults plus their children, but this does not work all the time, as the managers of the lodge pointed out (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011).

14. Conceptualisation of *Work*

One of the most interesting phenomena I encountered during my fieldwork was the conceptualisation of *work* among the #Khomani, or, the way in which productive and reproductive effort are organised. In some cases, when a conversation or interview went in-depth into the issue of *work*, things got complicated. Whether or not I was being assisted by *the interpreter*, misunderstandings came up and in one case (Interview Dawid Kruiper 2011b) we even had to switch the topic to avoid the failure of an interview situation. At first, I thought this had something to do with my way of asking questions or with the situation of unemployment, jobs being rare and the daily struggle to obtain money. But after some investigation into the causes, it appeared to me as if my conversation partners and I were talking at cross-purposes in matters concerning *work* (Fieldnotes July 2011).

In her article on “Community Development Strategies in the Kalahari” (2009), the South African anthropologist Lauren Dyll recalls a conversation with Deon, a guide and craft maker at !Xaus Lodge, about how his “attitude towards ‘work’ further complicates the situation” (Dyll 2009: 55). For Deon “work means ‘being himself’, doing what he usually does, sitting around the fire making crafts, creating his own space and time” (ibid.). Dyll concludes from this fact that

⁸⁰ When selling crafts at the roadside outside the park, the average income is about 70 ZAR (6.80 €) per week. According to Anonymous B, the earnings at !Xaus Lodge – from craft sales alone – are about double this amount per individual per week (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

⁸¹ A kind of wage for being at the lodge and representing the #Khomani in front of tourists.

“[... this] is indicative of how research and media attention have positioned the traditional ≠Khomani in relation to entertainment and intellectual production” (ibid.).

This means that many ≠Khomani consider themselves “only” able to gain sufficient amounts of money by *being “Bushmen”*. This is certainly true in many cases, but I consider it possible that the example of Deon’s *attitude towards work* stands for exactly this: his attitude towards *work*, referring to the way in which he conceptualises it. I consider this to be possible because I encountered similar attitudes during several conversations and interviews, but mainly with adult or senior ≠Khomani from the *Traditional* group, after I had readjusted my technique of approaching the topic (Fieldnotes July 2011).

For example, Linki, a ≠Khomani woman working at Twee Rivieren at the laundry for !Xaus Lodge, told me that she is quite happy with her job for the lodge. But as she concluded, she would rather set up a business of her own, by putting up a pool-table and organising dances for money. When I asked her for the reason, she replied that she preferred to manage herself, rather than working for someone else. I went on to ask if she considered doing her own business easier *work* than what she had to do at the laundry. Linki replied that the *work* for !Xaus was easy enough, since the machines do it all, and that – she pointed out that she had told me this already – having her own business meant being able to manage herself. It turned out that managing herself was synonymic for *not having to perform work* (Interview Linki 2011). During a conversation with Hendrik Kruiper at *the interpreter’s* fireplace in Welkom, he told me that he sometimes used to *work* in the past, for farmers and some other jobs. But the farther he goes back in his memories, he emphasised, the less he had to *work* and the more he could *stay as he was* (Conversation Hendrik Kruiper 2011b).

During an interview conducted in the veld, Dawid Kariseb was talking about *work* and listed jobs he had in the past. When I asked him about his *work* in the veld, one of the situations mentioned above began, where both of us were talking at cross-purposes. Finally, he stated that *work* was only in town, not in the veld. As *work* he summed up all things related to either wage-labour, income generating activities or activities that were necessary because of life in town (such as fencing, craft-selling, etc.). Whereas being in the veld did not involve any classification of activities that

were cut off from others by either connotations of strain or productivity. And, again, being in the veld for him meant managing himself: “Here, where I sit, I’m my own boss” (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

Certainly the data on this issue is far from complete, which is due to the fact that I did not expect to come across such a surprising outcome. Nevertheless, the available data indicates that conceptualisation of *work* among the #Khomani differs significantly from the conceptualisation of *work* in capitalism. As I have argued in chapter 3, *work* in capitalism intrinsically connotes strain or productivity, thereby structuring the organisation of effort in European society. But (at least some of) the #Khomani do not seem to distinguish certain categories of activities pertaining to strain or productivity in general from other activities pertaining to the opposites of these qualities. Certainly, they do distinguish between activities related to generating money, and activities that do not. Dawid Kariseb, after my insistence on an answer, even goes so far as to name all activities, that somehow relate to Western life as *work*, as I previously mentioned, while creating a separate category, in opposition to the first, that contains traditional activities, with a special focus on *being in the veld* (Interview Dawid Kariseb 2011a).

This might well have to do with Dyll’s assumption that media representation and research interests have had impacts on the #Khomani’s way of perceiving themselves, of perceiving and conceptualising *work*. But considering the fact that the ancestors and members of today’s #Khomani have already partly been performing wage-labor for at least the past hundred years, and the data, which shows that they are very capable of distinguishing wage-labour from traditional activities, it appears more likely that a conceptualisation of *work*, thus, to distinguish between productive, reproductive and any other form of effort or activity in economical relation, is not a traditional part of the #Khomani way of living.

15. Conclusion

As I have argued in this thesis, there are two elements, which are especially crucial to the construction of the socio-economic space of the ≠Khomani San: The macro-reality of capitalist expansion and the micro-reality of local issues. Critiques of post-development theories rightly assert that economic reductionism blinds out the material (micro-) realities of those concerned. Most indigenous communities are not ready to contest capitalism and its structures, mechanisms and commodities in a leftist revolutionary manner, as for instance Steven Robins (2003) observes, and as the results of my fieldwork show. Instead, they construct indigenous modernities, hybrid approaches towards the connection of traditional and modern elements (Robins 2003: 280ff). But as I have argued, these approaches are a consequence of the dynamics of their socio-economic space, which also includes a macro-reality with roots in capitalist mechanisms, especially in the process of its (global) expansion.

While changes in the socio-economic space of the ≠Khomani were long influenced by colonialism and, especially during the 20th century C.E., by Apartheid, today's macro-reality brings the phenomenon of development into play. The development of development evolved from the evolutionist model of modernisation, from dependency theories towards approaches which tend to involve local communities, at least in theory. But throughout all these changes, one thing remained a part of development: The generalisation of European structures, economic ones especially.

Accruing from this assumption, the concept of *work* can be identified as a central element for the processes of development projects, since it is crucial to capitalism and therefore also for development efforts. In this manner, *work* itself constitutes the way in which productive and reproductive effort are organised in European structures, as society distinguishes groups of certain activities, which refer to either strain or productivity, from other activities.

As research data indicates, *work* can be identified as the connecting element between macro-reality and micro-reality in the ≠Khomani's socio-economic space. All things that are a crucial part of the ≠Khomani's everyday-lives relate to *work* and its conceptualisation in one way or another. Through implementation of development projects, earning money to sustain all basic necessities has become inevitable for the ≠Khomani San of the Andriesvale-Welkom area. The regulations of conservation, as

set by the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, hinder the San from taking up an economic mode other than capitalism, and at the same time these structures also hinder them from fully taking part in it.

≠Khomani tradition has become a cash crop in the region. While *Western* “Bushman” try to make their subsistence through livestock farming, they still insist on being “Bushmen”, and are thus attempting to construct a new form of authenticity, to meet NGO, donor and government expectations, while at the same time struggling for grants to get their farms running. *Traditional* “Bushmen” depend almost entirely on their tradition to earn money, either by making crafts and selling them or by *being* “*Bushmen*” and thus presenting themselves to tourists in this manner, as it is the case at the Craft Village at !Xaus Lodge. Most opportunities to generate household income in the region depend on cultural tourism, because the skills to obtain other jobs are missing (apart from some infrequent physical labour).

As Stockmann (2010) points out, education and training are used as vehicles to fulfil the desires which are evoked by the radiance of the *Western model* (Stockmann 2010: 3), respectively those parts of this Western model which are considered to be useful for the San and thereby constituting indigenous modernities. But these vehicles are either not present or difficult to access and the tension between the aim to preserve culture and at the same time including Western aspects further complicates the situation, especially regarding aspects of a new form of transhumance residency and, in connection, (auto-)mobility. Furthermore, as Anel de Klerk, manager at !Xaus Lodge, points out, even good training does not help, especially in the tourism industry, if there are no jobs available (Interview !Xaus Lodge Managers 2011). The results of this situation are alcohol abuse and an increasing crime rate.

The few jobs which are available for ≠Khomani San are almost exclusively bound to tourism, although only a few are employed by the biggest employer of the region, the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park. A number of ≠Khomani are either employed at !Xaus Lodge or work as cultural representatives at the lodge’s Craft Village. The latter causes essentialist self-perception as well as the reproduction of essentialist perception of the ≠Khomani among many tourists, although this issue is being addressed by !Xaus Lodge managers. The situation for regular employees at the lodge appears to be very difficult, and cases of ethnic discrimination have even been raised against the White management. The ≠Khomani are far from real participation

in all the issues concerning the park on the level of decision-making, which is, additionally, hindered by difficulties in the areas of communication and mobility, as well as in economic matters.

On the one hand, it is argued that San lack the skills and training which are necessary to run a business like the !Xaus Lodge. But on the other hand, almost all the projects that have been implemented so far call for skills of negotiation and/or participation, which would require the ≠Khomani to have exactly those skills which are presented as a reason for them not being able to fully participate. In this sense, the problem today is not so much exclusion of the San from the decision-making process, but the unconditional intention to implement capitalistic structures.

Concluding the thesis, it can be said that *work* is the most crucial element for the situation of the ≠Khomani in the context of their relation to the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, thus, for their socio-economic space. Development projects have brought crucial changes to the way in which ≠Khomani organise productive and reproductive effort. Available data suggests that traditionally there was no difference made between productive and non-productive efforts among the ≠Khomani.⁸² Today, activities are distinguished by their capacity to generate income. Aims of development projects explicitly include the preservation of the San's culture, but in reality, most projects relating to culture also relate to cultural tourism. Furthermore, all projects concerning the promotion of cultural "survival" are actually in vain, whether they relate to cultural tourism or not, because the ≠Khomani are kept from *living their culture* by the need to obtain money. This constitutes a vicious circle: To obtain money, people need to live in or at least near towns, and education (and training) – which would elevate job opportunities – is mostly available there. But living in town requires money, which increases the necessity to live in or at least near town, and so on and so forth. Many ≠Khomani, especially those of the *Traditional* group, would prefer to live in the veld, making their subsistence by hunting and gathering, and thus, *traditionally*. But the vicious circle mentioned previously hinders them from

⁸² These findings stand in line with other euro-centric presumptions about indigenous concepts. As, for example, Manuela Zips-Mairitsch (2009) points out regarding the perception of (land) rights and law in general among San in Botswana: The indigenous concept of a *title to land*, respectively of the *necessity* for a title to land as conceived of in Europe, vastly differs from the European point of view (e.g. Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 375).

doing so. The results include heavy alcohol abuse, a high HIV/AIDS rate and increasing crime rates.

In this manner, the socio-economic space of the #Khomani has been dramatically changed and continues to change rapidly. *Culture* cannot be *performed*, and it cannot be preserved by visiting it occasionally in the form of performances for tourists or by taking trips to the Veld School. And as Manuela Zips-Mairitsch puts it:

“Culture is always dynamic and should therefore not be frozen, neither for scientific reasons of conservation nor for touristic reasons of economisation” (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 193⁸³).

Economic characteristics are crucial for the culture of the #Khomani. Tracking, drawing, dancing, music, medicine etc. are all embedded into a certain way of living and stand and fall with the lifestyle of hunting and gathering, which is bound to unconditional use of land for all purposes. The way in which development is implemented in the Andriesvale-Welkom area will eventually lead to an assimilation of the #Khomani into the rural population and to the near-complete loss of their cultural and societal characteristics, which will at best be preserved in a museological way. But some of the #Khomani still see chances for a positive future. For example, Anonymous B, who spoke about almost all issues within this thesis, phrases it thus:

“If tradition and development could walk together, then we would have lived much better”⁸⁴ (Interview Anonymous B 2011).

⁸³ Originally in German, translated by the author: “Kultur ist immer dynamisch und sollte daher auch nicht aus wissenschaftlichen Gründen der Konservierung oder aus touristischen Gründen der Ökonomisierung eingefroren werden” (Zips-Mairitsch 2009: 193).

⁸⁴ The “quality” of the English spoken by San in the quotes results from my inability to speak Nama or Afrikaans. See Chapter 2.3 on this issue.

15.1 Future Research

The conceptualisation of the organisation of productive and reproductive effort among the #Khomani is an especially interesting field and requires further research. The whole idea of development is built on the assumption that *work* is performed by all people in the world and therefore, that capitalist structures – i.e. a system of labour – can be easily installed. Even within the field of Anthropology, the universalism of *work* is taken for granted. The German ethnologist Gerd Spittler, for example, writes:

“No one would seriously deny that in all societies people perform work in the sense of producing food and articles of daily use and providing services for others. Work is necessary for the survival of every society” (Spittler 2008: 11).

Research data suggests that many #Khomani do not distinguish activities into categories of productive/non-productive at all. And as John Holloway also argues, “work, as an activity distinguished from other activities, is not common to all societies”⁸⁵ (Holloway 2011: 4). In this light, it might seem more *productive* to turn towards a dynamic definition of activities relating to economic matters, one which is shaped by discourse and by means of praxeology. Further research in this matter might be suitable for displacing the Anthropology of Work with an Anthropology of Doing.

⁸⁵ Originally in German, translated by the author: “denn die Arbeit als von anderen Aktivitäten getrennte Aktivität ist nicht allen Gesellschaften gemein” (Holloway 2011: 4).

16. References

16.1 Literature

ALI, Saleem H.

2007. *Introduction: A Natural Connection between Ecology and Peace?*
In: ALI, Saleem H. (ed.). *Peace Parks: Conservation and Conflict Resolution*.
MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

ALTVATER, Elmar / GEIGER, Margot.

2011. *Die Mehrfachkrise: warum Land knapp und immer wichtiger wird*.
In: EXNER, Andreas / FLEISSNER, Peter / KRANZL, Lukas / ZITTEL, Werner (eds.). *Kämpfe um Land. Gutes Leben im postfossilen Zeitalter*.
Mandelbaum, Wien.

AMIT, Vered.

2000. *Introduction: Constructing the field*.
In: AMIT, Vered (ed.). *Constructing the field: ethnographic fieldwork in the contemporary world*.
Routledge, London a.o.

BARNARD, Alan.

2006. *Kalahari revisionism, Vienna and the 'indigenous peoples' debate*.
In: *Social Anthropology*, Vol. 14, 2006.
Wiley Blackwell Publishing.

2007. *Anthropology and the Bushmen*.
Berg, Oxford a.o.

1992. *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples*.
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge a.o.

BERNARD, H. Russel.

2011. *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches.*
Alta Mira Press, Plymouth.

BORCHGREVINK, Axel.

2003. *Silencing Language : Of Anthropologists and Interpreters.*
In: *Ethnography 2003: 4.*
Sage Publications, London a.o.

BOSCH, Dawie / HIRSCHFELD, Elena (eds.).

2002. *The Ae!Hai Kalahari Heritage Park bundle: including the agreement whereby the Land Claims of the #Khomani San Community and the Mier Community are finalized and associated documents.*
Commission on Restitution of Land Rights, Pretoria.

BROCK, Lothar.

1991. *Peace through Parks. The Environment on the Peace Research Agenda.*
In: *Journal of Peace Research, Vol. 28, No. 4, 1991.*
Sage Publications.

BÜSCHER, Bram / DIETZ, Ton.

2005. *The State and the Conservation-development Nexus in Southern Africa.*
In: *The Journal of Transdisciplinary Environmental Studies, Vol. 4, No.2, 2005.*
Roskilde University, Roskilde.

CHENNELLS, Roger.

2006. *Report on the Land Rights of the #Khomani San Community for the Commission on Restitution of Land Rights.*
Unpublished.

COMAROFF, John L. / COMAROFF, Jean.

2009. *Ethnicity, Inc.*

The University of Chicago Press, Chicago a.o.

COMMISSION ON NATIONAL PARKS AND PROTECTED AREAS.

1990. *Promoting Effective Management of Transfrontier Parks and Reserves: Guidelines.*

In: THORSELL, Jim (ed.). *Parks on the Borderline: Experience in Transfrontier Conservation.*

IUCN, Gland a.o.

DURRENBERGER, Paul E.

2005. *Labour.*

In: CARRIER, James G. (eds.). *A handbook of economic anthropology.*

Edward Elgar Publishing, Cheltenham.

DYLL, Lauren.

2009. *Community Development Strategies in the Kalahari: an Expression of Modernization's Monologue?*

In: HOTTOLA, Petri (ed.). *Tourism Strategies and Local Responses in Southern Africa.*

CAB International, Wallingford a.o.

EGGER-BÜSSING, Nina.

2006. *Frieden, Naturschutz und wirtschaftlicher Aufschwung – Annäherung an Konzepte von Peace Parks.*

In: ELLENBERG, Ludwig / ZOLL, Stephanie (eds.). *Berliner Geographische Arbeiten, Heft 106: Tagungsband „Peace Parks – Ressourcenmanagement an Grenzen“.*

Geographisches Institut der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

ELLIS, William.

2010. *The #Khomani San Land Claim against the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park. Requiring and Acquiring Authenticity.*
In: WALKER, Cherryl et al. (eds.). *Land, Memory, Reconstruction, and Justice. Perspective on Land Claims in South Africa.*
Ohio University Press, Athens, Ohio.

ESCOBAR, Arturo.

1991. *Anthropology and the development encounter: the making and marketing of development anthropology.*
In: *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 18, Issue 4, 1991.
Blackwell Publishing.

FASCHINGEDER, Gerald.

2001. *Kultur und Entwicklung. Zur Relevanz soziokultureller Faktoren in hundert Jahren Entwicklungstheorie.*
Brandes & Apsel, Frankfurt a. M.

FERREIRA, Sanette L. A.

2011. *One Decade of Transfrontier Conservation Areas in Southern Africa.*
In: WASTL-WALTER, Doris (ed.). *The Ashgate research companion to border studies.*
Ashgate Publishing, Farnham a.o.

FINLAY, Kate.

2009. *The Un/changing Face of the #Khomani: Representation through Promotional Media.*
In: *Visual Anthropology*. Vol. 22, Issue 4, 2009.
Routledge.

GARDNER, Katy / LEWIS, David.

1996. *Anthropology, Development and the Post-modern Challenge.*
Pluto Press, London a.o.

GINGRICH, Andre.

1999. *Erkundungen. Themen der ethnologischen Forschung.*
Böhlau, Wien a.o.

GIRTLE, Roland.

2001. *Methoden der Feldforschung.*
Böhlau Verlag, Wien a.o.: 4., völlig neu bearbeitete Auflage.

GLÄSER, Jochen / LAUDEL, Grit.

2009. *Experteninterviews und qualitative Inhaltsanalyse.*
VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden: 3., überarbeitete Auflage.

GORDON, Robert J.

1999. *“Bain’s Bushmen“. Scenes at the Empire Exhibition, 1936.*
In: LINDFORS, Bernth (ed.). *Africans on stage : studies in ethnological show business.*
Indiana University Press, Bloomington a.o.

GUPTA, Akhil / FERGUSON, James.

1997. *Discipline and Practice: “The Field” as Site, Method, and Location in Anthropology.*
In: GUPTA, Akhil / FERGUSON, James (eds.). *Anthropological locations : boundaries and grounds of a field science.*
University of California Press, London.

HAMMERSLEY, Martyn / ATKINSON, Paul.

2007. *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.*
Routledge, New York a.o.: Third Edition.

HITCHCOCK, Robert K. et al.

2006. *Introduction: Updating the San, Image and Reality of an African People in the Twenty First Century.*

In: HITCHCOCK, Robert K. et al. (eds.). *Updating the San, Image and Reality of an African People.*

National Museum of Ethnology, Minpaku.

HOCHLEITHNER, Stephan.

2011. *Anthropologie der Arbeit – Annäherung und Plädoyer dagegen.*

In: HOCHLEITHNER, Stephan / LEITNER, Katharina (eds.). *arbeit:ver:handeln.*

HammockTreeRecords, Wien.

HOLDEN, Phillipa.

2007. *Conservation and human rights—the case of the ‡Khomani San (bushmen) and the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, South Africa.*

In: *Policy Matters: Conservation and Human Rights, Vol. 15, 2007.*

IUCN, Gland.

HOLLOWAY, John.

2011. *Doing. Tun In-gegen-und-jenseits der Arbeit.*

In: *Streifzüge, Nr. 51.*

Kritischer Kreis, Wien.

HOPWOOD, Bill et al.

2005. *Sustainable Development: Mapping Different Approaches.*

In: *Sustainable Development, Vol. 13, Issue 1, 2005.*

John Wiley & Sons.

IUCN / UNEP / WWF.

1980. *World Conservation Strategy: Living Resource Conservation for Sustainable Development.*

IUCN, Gland.

KGNP.

2008. *Kalahari Gemsbok National Park Management Plan 2008.*
Kalahari Gemsbok National Park, Uppington.

KONRAD, Robert.

2008. „*Lions and Jackals*“ – *Peace Parks im südlichen Afrika und ihre Auswirkungen auf die lokale Bevölkerung. Eine Analyse am Beispiel des Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park.*
Unpublished Diplomarbeit at the University of Vienna, Wien.

KUPER, Adam.

2003. *The Return of the Native.*
In: *Current Anthropology*, Vol. 44, Nr. 3, 2003.
University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

LEE, Richard B.

2003. *Indigenous rights and the politics of identity in post-apartheid southern Africa.*
In: DEAN, Bartholomew / LEVI, Jerome M. (eds.). *At the risk of being heard : Identity, indigenous rights, and postcolonial states.*
University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.

LEE, Richard B. / HITCHCOCK, Robert K.

2001. *African Hunter-Gatherers: Survival, History, and the Politics of Identity.*
In: *African Study Monographs, Suppl. 26*, 2001.
The Center For African Area Studies, Kyoto University, Kyoto.

LEGGETT, Ted.

2004. *What's up in the Cape? Crime rates in Western and Northern Cape provinces.*
In: *South African Crime Quarterly*, Nr. 7, March 2004.
Institute for Security Studies, Pretoria.

LÉVI-STRAUSS, Claude.

1974. *Structural Anthropology. Vol. 2.*
Basic Books, New York: New edition.

MAIER, Sascha.

2006. *Peace Parks eine universelle Idee?*
In: ELLENBERG, Ludwig / ZOLL, Stephanie (eds.). *Berliner Geographische Arbeiten, Heft 106: Tagungsband „Peace Parks – Ressourcenmanagement an Grenzen“.*
Geographisches Institut der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

MARKS, Shula.

1972. *Khoisan resistance to the Dutch in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.*
In: *The Journal of African History. Vol. 13, Issue 1, 1972.*
Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

MARX, Karl.

1962. *Das Kapital. Erster Band.*
Dietz Verlag, Berlin, DDR.

MAYRING, Philipp.

2003. *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse - Grundlagen und Techniken.*
Beltz / Deutscher Studien Verlag, Weinheim, Basel: 8. Auflage.

MCNEIL, Richard J.

1990. *International Parks for Peace.*
In: THORSELL, Jim (ed.).
Parks on the Borderline: Experience in Transfrontier Conservation.
IUCN, Gland a.o.

MENZEL, Ulrich.

2010. *Strukturalismus und Dependenztheorie.*

In: STOCKMANN, Reinhard / Menzel Ulrich / NUSCHELER, Franz.

Entwicklungspolitik. Theorien – Probleme – Strategien.

Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, München: 2010.

NEW, William.

2006. *Rich and poor countries divided on patent treaty.*

In: *Bulletin of the World Health Organization*, Vol. 84, Nr. 5, May 2006.

World Health Organization, Geneva.

NOVY, Andreas / PARNREITER, Christof / FISCHER, Karin.

1999. *Globalisierung und Peripherie.*

In: NOVY, Andreas / PARNREITER, Christof / FISCHER, Karin (eds.).

Globalisierung und Peripherie. Umstrukturierung in Lateinamerika, Afrika und Asien.

Brandes & Apsel / Südwind, Frankfurt a.M.

PEACE PARKS FOUNDATION.

2010. *Annual Review 2010.*

Peace Parks Foundation, Stellenbosch.

PIGGOTT, Thomas W.

2011. *Globalisation, collaboration, and indigenous alcohol abuse.*

In: *Studies by Undergraduate Researchers at Guelph*, Vol. 4, No. 2, 2011.

University of Guelph, Guelph.

POLANYI, Karl.

1957. *The great transformation. The political and economic origins of our time.*

Beacon Press, Boston.

ROBINS, Steven.

2001a. *NGOs, 'Bushmen' and Double Vision: The #khomani San Land Claim and the Cultural Politics of 'Community' and 'Development' in the Kalahari.*

In: *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Volume 27, Issue 4.

Routledge, New York a.o.

2001b. *Historical Background to the Situation of San in South Africa.*

In: ROBINS, Steven / MADZUDZO, Elias / BRENZINGER, Matthias.

An Assessment of the Status of the San in South Africa, Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

Legal Assistance Centre, Windhoek.

2003. *Whose Modernity? Indigenous Modernities and Land Claims after Apartheid.*

In: *Development and Change*. Volume 34, Issue 2.

Blackwell Publishing, Oxford (USA).

RUBEL, Paula G. / ROSMAN, Abraham.

2003. *Introduction: Translation and Anthropology.*

In: RUBEL, Paula G. / ROSMAN, Abraham (eds.). *Translating Cultures: perspectives on translation and anthropology.*

Berg, Oxford.

SANDWITH, Trevor et al.

2001. *Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Co-operation.*

IUCN, Gland a.o.

SASI.

2010. *A 14-year Review on SASI and the San in South Africa 1996 - 2010.*

South African San Institute, Kimberley.

SCHLEHE, Judith.

2008. *Formen qualitativer ethnografischer Interviews.*

In: BEER, Bettina (ed.). *Methoden ethnologischer Feldforschung.*

Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin: 2. überarbeitete und erweiterte Fassung.

SCHRIRE, Carmel.

1995. *Digging through darkness : chronicles of an archeologist.*

University of Virginia Press, Charlottesville.

SCHULZ, Gerhard.

2004. *Geschichte im Zeitalter der Globalisierung.*

Walter de Gruyter, Berlin.

SMITH, Adam.

2005. *An Inquiry into the nature and causes of The Wealth Of Nations.*

Available at <http://www2.hn.psu.edu/faculty/jmanis/adam-smith/Wealth-Nations.pdf>.

Pennsylvania State University Online Publication.

SÖKEFELD, Martin.

2008. *Strukturierte Interviews und Fragebögen.*

In: BEER, Bettina (ed.). *Methoden ethnologischer Feldforschung.*

Dietrich Reimer Verlag, Berlin: 2. überarbeitete und erweiterte Fassung.

SPIERENBURG, Marja / WELS, Harry.

2006. *"Securing Space" : Mapping and Fencing in Transfrontier Conservation in Southern Africa.*

In: *Space and Culture, Vol. 9, No. 3, 2006.*

Sage Publications.

SPITTLER, Gerd.

2008. *Founders of the Anthropology of Work. German Social Scientists of the 19th and Early 20th Centuries and the First Ethnographers.*

LIT Verlag, Berlin.

STATISTICS SOUTH AFRICA.

2011. *Quarterly Labour Force Survey Quarter 1, 2011.*
Statistics South Africa, Pretoria.

STOCKMANN, Reinhard.

2010. *Einleitung: Entwicklung.*
In: STOCKMANN, Reinhard / Menzel Ulrich / NUSCHELER, Franz.
Entwicklungspolitik. Theorien – Probleme – Strategien.
Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag, München.

TFPD.

2010. *The !Xaus Lodge submission that resulted in winning the 2010 Imvelo Award for Responsible Tourism: Best Practice Economic Impact category (independent operators).*
Available at <http://www.tfpd.co.za/resources/ImveloEntry&Summary.pdf>.
TFPD, Tokai.

THONDHLANA, Gladman / SHACKLETON, Sheona / MUCHAPONDWA, Edwin.

2011. *Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park and its land claimants: a pre- and post-land claim conservation and development history.*
In: *Environmental Research Letters*, Vol. 6, No. 2, 2011.
IOP Publishing, Bristol.

TOMASELLI, Keyan G. (ed.)

2005. *Where global contradictions are sharpest. Research Stories from the Kalahari.*
Rozenberg Publishers, Amsterdam.

TOMASELLI, Keyan G. / SHEPPERSON, Arnold.

2005. *Negotiating Research with First People.*
IN: TOMASELLI, Keyan G. (ed.). *Where global contradictions are sharpest. Research Stories from the Kalahari.*
Rozenberg Publishers, Amsterdam.

/USEB, Joram.

2001. *'One Chief is Enough!': Understanding San Traditional Authorities in the Namibian Context.*

In: BARNARD, Alan / KENRICK, Justin (eds.). *Africa's Indigenous Peoples: 'First Peoples' or 'Marginalized Minorities'?*

Centre of African Studies, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh.

VAN WYK, P. / LE RICHE, E.A.N.

1984. *The Kalahari Gemsbok National Park : 1931-1981.*

In: *Koedoe, Vol. 27, No. 1: Supplement, 1984.*

AOSIS Open Journals.

VERMEYLEN, Saskia.

2007. *Contextualizing 'Fair' and 'Equitable': The San's Reflections on the Hoodia Benefit-Sharing Agreement.*

In: *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability, Vol. 12, Issue 4, 2007.*

Routledge, New York a.o.

WILMSEN, Edwin N.

1989. *Land filled with flies: A political economy of the Kalahari.*

University of Chicago Press, Chicago a.o.

WILMSEN, Edwin N. / DENBOW, James R.

1990. *Paradigmatic History of San-speaking Peoples and Current Attempts at Revision.*

In: *Current Anthropology, Vol. 31, No. 5, 1990.*

University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

WOLF, Eric R.

1997. *Europe and the People without History.*

University of California Press, Berkley a.o.

WOLMER, William.

2003. *Transboundary conservation: the politics of ecological integrity in the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park.*

In: *Sustainable Livelihoods in Southern Africa Research Paper no. 4.*

Institute of Development Studies, Brighton.

ZIPS, Werner.

2007. *Das Stachelschwein erinnert sich – Ethnohistorie als praxeologische Strukturgeschichte.*

Facultas.WUV, Wien: 2. Auflage.

ZIPS, Werner / ZIPS-MAIRITSCH, Manuela.

2007. *Lost in Transition? The Politics of Conservation, Indigenous Land Rights and Community-Based Resource Management in Southern Africa.*

In: *Journal of Legal Pluralism*, Nr. 55, 2007.

LIT, Münster a.o.

ZIPS-MAIRITSCH, Manuela.

2009. *Verlorenes Land? Indigene (Land)Rechte der San in Botswana.*

Reimer, Berlin.

16.2 Internet

URL 1.

<http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=19&mid=20>
30.05.2011; no longer available.

URL 2.

<http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1&mid=2>
28.01.2012.

URL 3.

<http://www.tfpd.co.za/about-us.php>
20.02.2012.

URL 4.

<http://www.sasi.org.za/who-is-sasi.php>
20.02.2012.

URL 5.

<http://www.ewisa.co.za/eWISAWaterworks/misc/MunicipalContacts/defaultSiyandaContacts.htm##6>
29.02.2012.

URL 6.

http://www.ewisa.co.za/misc/BLEU_GREENDROPREPORT/blue_drop_certification.htm
29.02.2012.

URL 7.

<http://www.alcohol.org.za/statistics>
20.02.2012.

URL 8.

http://www.saps.gov.za/statistics/reports/crimestats/2011/provinces/n_cape/pdf/witdraai.pdf
29.02.2012.

URL 9.

<http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1&mid=16>
12.03.2012.

URL 10.

<http://www.faz.net/aktuell/wirtschaft/wirtschaftswissen/bedingungsloses-grundeinkommen-geld-verdienen-ohne-zu-arbeiten-1818043.html>
12.03.2012.

URL 11.

<http://www.sasi.org.za/who-is-sasi.php>
12.03.2012.

URL 12.

<http://www.sanparks.org/parks/kgalagadi/tourism/history.php#brief>
12.03.2012.

URL 13.

<http://www.peaceparks.org/story.php?pid=1002&mid=1039>
12.03.2012.

URL 14.

<http://www.khwattu.org/index.php?id=12>
12.03.2012.

URL 15.

<http://www.peaceparks.org/programme.php?pid=25&mid=1112>
12.03.2012.

URL 16.

<http://www.khomanisan.com/accommodation/#The!ae!haiHeritagePark>
12.03.2012.

URL 17.

<http://www.khomanisan.com>
12.03.2012.

URL 18.

<http://www.khomanisan.com/information/#TariffsandBookings>
12.03.2012.

URL 19.

<http://www.xauslodge.co.za/kgalagadi>
12.03.2012.

URL 20.

<http://www.sanparks.org/parks/kgalagadi/tourism/accommodation.php>
12.03.2012.

URL 21.

<http://www.xauslodge.co.za/about-us>
12.03.2012.

URL 22.

<http://www.xauslodge.co.za/rates>
12.03.2012.

URL 23.

<http://www.imveloawards.co.za/aboutus.html>
12.03.2012.

URL 24.

<http://www.oryxdesertsalt.co.za/>
20.03.2012.

URL 25.

<http://www.khomanisan.com/projects-and-donations/>
20.03.2012.

URL 26.

http://ccms.ukzn.ac.za/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=735&Itemid=90
24.03.2012.

URL 27.

<http://www.ethikprojekt.ch/texte/arbeit.htm>
21.11.2011.

URL 28.

<http://www.khomanisan.com/information/#GettingThere>
20.03.2012.

16.3 Interviews

Anonymous B.

27.07.2011, Near Andriesvale.

Cady, n.a.

05.08.2011, Welkom.

FESTUS, Anna.

01.08.2011, Upington.

Jalorita, n.a.

05.08.2011, Welkom.

KARISEB, Dawid.

30.07.2011a, In the Veld.

21.08.2011b, Welkom.

KRUIPER, David.

28.07.2011a, Andriesvale.

28.07.2011b, Andriesvale.

Linki, n.a.

05.08.2011, Welkom.

MALGAS, Abraham.

29.07.2011, Welkom.

SCHNEIDER, Hans.

29.07.2011, Welkom.

VAALBOOI, Petrus.

09.08.2011, Scottysfort.

!Xaus Lodge Managers: DE KLERK, Abraham / DE KLERK, Anel.

07.08.2011, !Xaus Lodge.

16.4 Conversations

Anonymous A.

06.08.2011, Askham.

FESTUS, Ruben.

06.08.2011, Askham.

Joaquin, n.a.

07.08.2011, !Xaus Lodge.

KARISEB, Maria.

29.07.2011, Welkom.

KRUIPER, Hendrik.

28.07.2011a, Welkom.

27.07.2011a, Welkom.

Linki, n.a.

05.08.2011, Welkom.

SCHNEIDER, Hans.

29.07.2011, Welkom.

THYS, Andries.

08.08.2011b, !Xaus Lodge.

20.08.2011a, Welkom.

16.5 Legislative Texts

Union of South Africa.

1913. *Natives' Land Act*, No. 27 of 1913.

Government Printer, Pretoria

1950. *Population Registration Act*, No. 30 of 1950.

Government Printer, Pretoria.

Republic of South Africa

1991. *Population Registration Act Repeal Act*, No. 114 of 1991.

Government Printer, Pretoria.

1991. *Abolition of Racially Based Land Measures Act*, No. 108 of 1991.

Government Printer, Pretoria.

1994. *Restitution of Land Rights Act*, No. 22 of 1994.

Government Printer, Pretoria.

16.5 Fieldnotes

Fieldnotes July 2011.

Taken by the author, South Africa.

Fieldnotes August 2011.

Taken by the author, South Africa.

16.6 Correspondence

E-Mail ANNECKE, Wendy to the author.

18.07.2011.

02.08.2011.

E-Mail GRAY, Barry to DE KLERK, Anel.

08.08.2011.

E-Mail MULLER, Eleanor to the author.

02.08.2011.

17. Appendix

17.1 Abbreviations

B.C.E.	=	before common era
B.P.	=	before present
C.E.	=	common era
CPA	=	Communal Property Association
FEDHASA	=	Federal Hospitality Association of Southern Africa
KGNP	=	Kalahari Gemsbok National Park
KTP	=	Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park
ILO	=	International Labour Organization
IUCN	=	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JMB	=	Joint Management Board
NGO	=	Non-governmental Organization
PPF	=	Peace Parks Foundation
RSA	=	Republic of South Africa
SADC	=	Southern African Development Community
SANParks	=	South African National Parks
SASI	=	South African San Institute
TFCA	=	Transfrontier Conservation Area
TFPD	=	Transfrontier Parks Destinations
UCT	=	University of Cape Town
UNDRIPS	=	United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples
WIMSA	=	Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa
WISA	=	Water Institute of Southern Africa
WWF	=	World Wildlife Foundation
ZAR	=	South African Rand

17.2 Abstract / Zusammenfassung

Abstract

The Diploma Thesis at hand deals with the changing of the socio-economic space of the #Khomani San, living in the Southern Kalahari on the territory of the Republic of South Africa, and its implications for the organisation of productive and reproductive effort. The #Khomani San Community is a diverse indigenous group, who lodged a land claim against national authorities, in order to regain land from which they were evicted in the course of the establishment of a national park, which is today known as Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park, the first Peace Park of Africa. Since an out of court settlement was reached in 2002, development projects have been implemented, but these did not visibly improve the San's livelihoods in a significant manner.

Within this thesis, the theoretical context of development, capitalism and indigenous modernities is explored and the findings from the author's fieldwork carried out from July to September 2011 C.E. are presented to examine the situation within a scientific approach. *Work* is identified as a core concept of development as well as of the micro-reality in the Andriesvale-Welkom area. The changing of the socio-economic space of the #Khomani San turns out to be directly connected to this circumstance and to stand, in return, under direct influence of this fact.

Zusammenfassung

Die vorliegende Diplomarbeit beschäftigt sich mit der Veränderung des sozio-ökonomischen Raums der #Khomani San – die in der südlichen Kalahari auf dem Gebiet der Republik Südafrika leben – und mit deren Implikationen für die Organisation von produktivem und reproduktivem Aufwand. Die #Khomani San Community bildet eine durch Diversität gekennzeichnete indigene Gemeinschaft, die eine Klage gegen staatliche Behörden anstrebte. Ziel dieser Klage war es, ihr Land zurück zu erhalten, dessen sie im Zuge der Errichtung eines Nationalparks enteignet worden waren, der heute Teil des Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park ist, des ersten Peace Park Afrikas. Seit im Jahr 2002 u.Z. eine außergerichtliche Einigung in der

Landrechtsklage erreicht worden war, wurden Entwicklungsprojekte etabliert, die jedoch die Lebensumstände der San nicht in signifikanter Weise verbessern konnten.

In der vorliegenden Diplomarbeit wird der theoretische Kontext von Entwicklung, Kapitalismus und *indigenous modernities* erkundet. Daran anschließend werden die Ergebnisse meiner Feldforschung, die zwischen Juli und September 2011 stattfand, präsentiert um die Situation im Rahmen eines wissenschaftlichen Berichts zu untersuchen. *Arbeit* wird als Kernkonzept von Entwicklung, wie auch der Mikrorealität im Andriesvale-Welkom Gebiet identifiziert. Die Veränderung des sozio-ökonomischen Raums der ≠Khomani San stellen sich als direkt mit diesem Kernkonzept in Verbindung stehend und, im Gegenzug, als direkt davon beeinflusst heraus.

17.3 Curriculum Vitae – Stephan Hochleithner

Born on 24.09.1984, Mistelbach, Austria

Education

2007 - present

University of Vienna, Austria

- Diplomstudium *Kultur- und Sozialanthropologie*
- Focus module *Peace and Conflict Studies, International NGOs & Anthropology of Law*
- Main Focuses *Political and Economic Anthropology, Anthropology of Work / Doing*
- Title of Thesis

'If Development and Tradition Could Walk Together'. The Changing of the Socio-Economic Space of the #Khomani San and the Implications Thereof for the Organisation of Productive and Reproductive Effort

2009 - 2010

National University of Ireland Maynooth, Ireland

- Erasmus Scholarship in *Anthropology*
- Subsidiary Subject *New Gaelic*

2008 - 2009

UN University: Regional Centre of Expertise, Karl Franzens University Graz, Austria

- Full-Semester Course in *Sustainable Development*

Karl Franzens University Graz, Austria

- Module *Global Studies*

2006

Bundes-Oberstufen-Realgymnasium Mistelbach, Austria

- *Matura*, pass with merit

Research Experience

2011

Kalahari, South Africa / Botswana

- Anthropology of Work, Evaluation of Projects of Sustainable Development
- 3 months
- Research for Diploma Thesis

Publications

2011

Hochleithner, Stephan; Leitner, Katharina (Hg.).

arbeit:ver:handeln. HTR, Wien: 2011.

Anthropologie der Arbeit – Annäherung und Plädoyer dagegen.

In: Hochleithner, S.; Leitner K. (eds.). *arbeit:ver:handeln*. HTR, Wien: 2011.

Menschen als Ressourcen – Körper als Kapital.

In: Blog *Ozeanflug*, 2011.

2010

Fremd bin ich und fremd ist mir.

In: *Streifzüge* Nr. 50, Wien: 2010.

Previous Positions

2012 - present

Tutor for *Anthropology of Ethnohistory (Ethnohistorie)*

University of Vienna, Austria

- Assistant to ao. Univ.-Prof. DDr. Werner Zips
- Tutoring students, assisting during lectures

2011 - 2012

Tutor for *Anthropology of Law (Rechtsanthropologie)*

University of Vienna, Austria

- Assistant to Dr.ⁱⁿ Manuela Zips-Mairitsch
- Tutoring students, assisting during lectures

2010 - present

Project Manager 'Scientific Publications'

HTR-Verlag, Vienna, Austria

- Coordination of the editing and production process of scientific publications
- Organisation of book presentations
- Training in publishing management and publishing laws

2008 - 2009

Tutor, Programme for Integrative Professional Training

Verein Lebenshilfe, Graz, Austria

- Tuition and Teaching of migrants and handicapped adolescents during their professional training
- Evaluating Learning-progress, writing reports and reviews

2007 - 2008

‘Buddy’, Family-Reunion-Programme for persons recognised as having a right of asylum

Austrian Red Cross, LV Wien, KHD, Dept. Migration and Integration, Vienna, Austria

- Supporting persons recognised as having a right of asylum during the family reunification process
- Advisor in legal concerns

2006 - 2007

Project Manager ‘Multifunctional Database and Responsive GUI Development’

Austrian Red Cross, LV Wien, KHD, Medical Service Readiness Unit, Vienna, Austria

- Project planning and documentation
- Development of internal guidelines and operational sequences
- C# Programming
- Prototyping and cooperation with the IM department

Language Competences

- German (First Language)
- English (Fluent)
- Spanish (Beginner Skills)
- Afrikaans (Beginner Skills)