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Introduction

The first lecture presented here was written as the keynote address of Botswana's second Basarwa Research Workshop, held at the University of Botswana on 24th-25th August, 1995. The workshop was sponsored by the Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD) and organized by the National Institute of Development Research and Documentation (NIR). My intention in the lecture was to highlight past research on Basarwa (Bushmen) and point to new directions, including applied research which is being done, or could be done, within the programme being initiated through the new co-operative venture between NORAD and NIR.

The second lecture was written for presentation to an audience mainly of academic staff from the departments of Anthropology, Development Administration, and Indigenous Law at the University of South Africa (UNISA). Also present were anthropologists from other nearby universities, and some students. My intention was to convey to this diverse audience some of the complexity of Bushman culture, and how this complexity may relate to development strategies drawn up from a distance. I used Bushman culture as an example, and illustrated the complexities of social development itself through an interlinking example, that of the published priorities of the British Overseas Development Administration (ODA).

Even though they were presented independently, I believe that the two lectures relate very well to each other. They do have a paragraph or two in common, and I have allowed these to remain in order to keep the flavour of the original lectures. However, the lectures touch on different aspects of Bushman research, Bushman culture, and social development, and taken together should enable those with an interest in either Bushmen or in social development to appreciate the problems of researchers, planners, and Bushmen alike.

Incidentally, there has been a great deal of debate on which term to use for 'Bushmen' collectively, and there is firm no agreement among scholars or among Bushmen themselves. Following the most common practice though, I usually employ the term 'Basarwa' in a Botswana context and the term 'Bushman' in an international context. The official term in Namibia is 'San', which has some following among academics but is not a preferred term among Bushmen themselves. In fact, Bushmen themselves who have an opinion seem to prefer 'Basarwa' or 'Bushmen'. Other terms sometimes used
include 'N/oa Khoene' ('Red People' in Nharo and some other Khoe languages), 'Ju/'hoansi' ('Real People' in the Ju or !Kung language), and 'Kua' (like 'Ju/'hoansi' either a term for a specific group or a term which may be used generically, found in some southern Khoe languages).

The Author

Alan Barnard is Reader in Social Anthropology at the University of Edinburgh and has been attached to the Centre of African Studies since 1980. He has carried out field research with the Nharo (Naro) and other Bushman groups and written widely on comparative aspects of Bushman and Khoisan ethnography. His books include A Nharo Wordlist, with Notes on Grammar (1985), Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples (1992), and a children's book, Kalahari Bushmen (1993).
Keynote Address:
The State of the Art in Anthropology and Sociology

Presented at the Basarwa Research Workshop,
University of Botswana, Gaborone, 24th August 1995

Vice-Chancellor, Mr Chairperson, distinguished delegates, fellow researchers, and friends.

It is a great honour for me to be asked to address you today. But before I outline some of the research which has been done in the past, and that still needs to be done among Basarwa, and for Basarwa, please let me tell you a little about myself and how I came to be interested in Botswana, and in Basarwa research in Botswana.

When I was a high school student in the United States, in 1967, my school was chosen to participate in a mock, model United Nations. My school, along with other schools in the eastern United States, sent delegates to 'represent' different countries in the model United Nations. Our school was given three countries: Denmark, Uruguay, and Botswana. I had not yet heard of Botswana at the time, but I found myself among its delegation. Not only that, but we met the real Ambassador in New York. Then, just before that conference, I was chosen to be the mock Ambassador of the newly independent Republic of Botswana. For one week I did my best to represent your country, but it was still some time before I gained first-hand knowledge of your people, or dare I say, your peoples.

I first visited Botswana in 1973. Then in 1974, I returned for 16 months to do fieldwork for my Ph.D. at the University of London. My supervisor was Adam Kuper, who had worked with the Kgalagari of Kuli, in the Ghanzi district. Among his interests was the relationship between Kgalagari and the Basarwa who lived with them in that area. I set out to study this relationship from a Basarwa point of view. Somewhere along the line, I was side-tracked, more than once. I was given permission to work among G/wi in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, but I ended up instead with Nharo in the Ghanzi farms. I did some work on relations between Nharo and Afrikaners, but what interested
me more was the way in which Nharo maintained their identity and their culture in spite of their domination by outside groups. Before I left London I had become interested in kinship theory, and I found among the Nharo a powerful kinship system which occupied my attention, as I tried to learn the Nharo language and come to grips with the strange situation of the Ghanzi farm block.

Although kinship had become the focus of my research, ethnicity remained always in my mind. Then I had a minor, anthropological conversion experience, on the road to D'Kar. I noticed that Nharo, Ts’aokhoe and Haba all had very similar kinship systems (see map, Fig. 1). I noticed that these kinship systems were similar is some ways to those of the G/wi and G//ana, some of whom also lived in that area. Then I noticed that Nharo, Ts’aokhoe and Haba kinship (and also Qabakhoe and N/aints’e) shared with that of the Au//eisi and Ju//hoansi certain features related to their common system of naming their children. But what was really significant is that all these peoples themselves also realized this. When they realized that I knew this, each could explain to me the differences between their kinship system and the others.

All the kinship systems were different, but they were related. It occurred to me that the only way to explain fully any one of these systems is to explain it in terms of the others -- to build a larger picture -- a structure of kinship structures. Only then do the complex patterns become clear. Of course, every adult in every society intuitively knows the structure of his or her kinship system; only anthropology students find these structures difficult. But students of anthropology seek a different kind of understanding, just as linguists seek a different understanding of language structures than do ordinary people who just speak languages.

My Ph.D. thesis focused on kinship, but in the course of research I examined a number of other aspects of Nharo life from a similar, comparative perspective. Kinship is a fairly technical field. It is theoretically important, but perhaps not of much interest to those outside the tradition of British social anthropology. So instead, let me exemplify the kind of theoretical approach which I have advocated through a different aspect of society, and one that is literally more visible to most people than kinship. Namely, settlement patterns.
Fig. 1. Present locations of Basarwa ethnic groups
Settlement patterns of four Basarwa groups

Consider the settlement patterns of four Basarwa groups at the time they were intensively studied, the Ju/'hoansi (IKung), G/wi, and IXo of the 1960s, and the Nharo (Naro) of the 1970s. When I began to look at that problem in the anthropological literature, around 1976, I noticed that ethnographers did not seem to be reading each other's work very carefully. The theoretical position of most ethnographers at the time, was that the environment either determines or severely limits the social organization, including, most obviously, the settlement pattern. But no-one had thought to look at how diverse Basarwa settlement was. The Ju/'hoansi aggregated in the dry season and dispersed in the wet season. The G/wi did the opposite. Ju/'hoansi territories overlapped each other, with areas of good resources being used by more than one band. IXo territories were the opposite of that, being separated by strips of 'no-man's land' where hunting was not allowed and no-one used the resources. Different ethnographers did not generally refer to each other's work at all, on these issues. Each implicitly seemed to be suggesting that what they had found, in their particular part of the Kalahari, was true of the whole.

Let me illustrate this with a crude diagram of the difference between summer and winter among Ju/'hoansi and G/wi (Fig. 2). According to various ethnographers, Ju/'hoan bands disperse deep within their own band territory in the summer, and aggregate at waterholes, more than one band at a time, in the winter. This was particularly the situation in the early 1960s; since then there has been a tendency to stay longer at the winter camps, especially in drought years. G/wi bands, as described by George Silberbauer, do not generally have overlapping territories, although incidentally, G//ana bands in the eastern part of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve do have this. In the early 1960s G/wi bands would aggregate as bands only in the summer, when each band would migrate within its territory in search of surface water and water-bearing tsama melons.

When I noticed this diversity, I became sceptical of the theory which most researchers had accepted, not sceptical of the differing data of individual researchers. My initial feeling, against the mood of the time, was that the environment was not such a determining factor after all. Diversity must be caused by social factors, or even by random historical-cultural change. However, when I examined the data more carefully, I soon changed my mind. The most important causes of diversity turned out to be micro-environmental factors. The Kalahari environment itself has a natural diversity which
Fig. 2. Ju/'hoan and G/wi seasonal cycles
exhibits determinant forces on the ways in which people can use its resources. Of course the G/wi did not aggregate in the dry season like the Ju/'hoansi, because unlike the Ju/hoansi, the G/wi had no permanent sources of water to aggregate around!

I mention this incident partly to show that discoveries can be made in the library as well as in the field. But in fact, if I had not been trying to understand my own field data on Nharo settlement in the wider context, I would not have made these connections. Exactly the same is true of Elizabeth Cashdan with her studies of the G///ana on the boundary between the Ghanzi and Central districts. She came to similar, and more sophisticated, conclusions a few years later (see Cashdan 1983) when she began to specialize in the study of settlement patterns. In the progress of my own work I have represented Kalahari Basarwa settlement by three slightly-different models, which can be expressed visually (Fig. 3).

In my paper 'Kalahari Bushman settlement patterns' (1979), I tried to explain the apparent correlation between territoriality and nucleation on the one hand, and the relative lack of water on the other hand. In 'Social and spatial boundary maintenance among southern African hunter-gatherers' (1992a), I refined my notion of territoriality, looked at other resources apart from surface water, and considered new, reconstructed data on /'Auni and /Khomani of the southern Kalahari. The importance of these last groups is that their land is very poor in resources, but they apparently were not as territorial as the IXô. Well, I could have thrown my 1979 model out the window, but instead I tried to adapt it by speculating that there is a threshold of abundance at which territoriality is at its most important. This model had previously been applied to data on hunter-gatherers on the Northwest Coast of North America, and it seemed to make sense in the Kalahari too. Meanwhile, in 'Rethinking Bushman settlement patterns and territoriality' (1986) I had represented settlement patterns in yet another way, by contrasting the relative permanence of aggregation among Nharo to the relative permanence of dispersal among the IXô, and this, to the inverse seasonality of the G/wi and Ju/'hoansi.
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Fig. 3. Three models of settlement and territoriality
All of these are crude models. None is backed up by quantitative data. They are not complete pictures at all. They are just ways of thinking about a problem. A more complete picture can be built if we consider, for example, not just a general notion of 'territoriality', but a more specific focus on units of territoriality (i.e., family, band, and band cluster), duration of territoriality, and exclusiveness of territories. I published a diagram illustrating this in my book *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa* (Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>family</th>
<th>band</th>
<th>band cluster (nexus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ju/'hoansi</td>
<td>non-territorial</td>
<td>overlapping</td>
<td>territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IKung)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G/wi</td>
<td>temporarily assoc.</td>
<td>exclusive</td>
<td>territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G//ana</td>
<td>temporarily assoc.</td>
<td>overlapping</td>
<td>territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with territory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!Xó</td>
<td>territorial</td>
<td>territorial</td>
<td>exclusive territories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Naro)</td>
<td>non-territorial</td>
<td>territorial</td>
<td>exclusive territories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Band clusters (nexuses) are not reported among Ju/'hoansi, G/wi or G//ana. (Barnard 1992b: 236)
So, you may ask, what difference does all this make? The fact is that settlement is of practical as well as theoretical importance, especially when people are forced, for whatever reason, to change their place of residence. This is not only the case with Basarwa, of course. If you put mine workers into all-male compounds that look more like beehives than human settlements, as happened frequently in South Africa, then unhappiness, illness, and violence can be expected. If you put them into settlements that exhibit the spatial organization of Batswana villages, it is much less likely that such problems will occur. Those who planned the successful settlements around Orapa and other large mines presumably knew that. Or, if you stack families vertically, in high-rise apartment blocks, with no safe open areas for children to play in, they will grow into disillusioned and sometimes delinquent adolescents. That is what has happened in many urban areas in Europe and North America since the 1960s. Planners and architects generally now know better.

Likewise, intensive and comparative studies of the complexity of Basarwa settlement, including both micro-settlement and macro-settlement, are important. (Micro-settlement is the spatial layout of the camp or village; macro-settlement involves the movement and distribution of camps or villages on the land.) Let me use just one example of resettlement to illustrate the point: Bagani, on the Okavango in northern Namibia (Fig. 4).

When I visited Bagani in 1991 there were 500 plots marked out, of four hectares each. Of these 500, 170 were occupied, and 330 were empty, in spite of a food-for-work programme and a great abundance of water and firewood. Each plot was numbered at 100 metre stretches along the road, with space for gardens back to the next road, 400 metres away. A school had been set up. The teacher was Owambo, and instruction was in Afrikaans. Two ethnic groups were represented, IXü and Kxoee. As the project co-ordinator put it, their 'chiefs' met regularly and there was a community council, but members of the two language groups kept their distance from each other -- preferring to settle in different parts of the scheme. I am not going praise or criticise the details of that scheme here, but it is fair to say that such a thing is plainly not developed with Basarwa culture (actually two Basarwa cultures in this case) in mind. The entire idea of the settlement is alien to Basarwa tradition. The demarcation and sizing of plots restricts the propensity of groups to form on the basis of close kin ties, and it inhibits the flexibility of movement which is important for social well-being and for preventing conflict. Bagani may eventually work very well, but ignoring tradition is
a high risk strategy, especially when dealing with such a large number of people and a culture in which those people normally come into contact only in small groups.

Fig. 4. Four-hectare plot, Bagani (idealized)
Research on Basarwa groups

Let me now present a brief overview of Basarwa, Bushman, or N/oakhoe ethnic groups and of ethnographic research which exists on these peoples. Relatively little of the research has been explicitly done for development purposes, but a great deal of it is useful for such purposes. And a knowledge of the diversity of Basarwa groups is essential, especially if research is to be co-ordinated on more than one linguistic or ethnic group.

IKung

The IKung consist of three main ethno-linguistic groups -- the Ju/'hoansi or Central IKung of northern Botswana and Namibia, the IXû or Northern IKung of Angola, the FAu//eisi or Southern IKung -- and possibly one or two distinct, smaller groups.

Traditionally, these three labels identify indigenously-defined dialect areas, but they also correspond roughly to cultural units and environmental zones. It is difficult to estimate the IKung population. In total, they may number as many as 25,000 or even 30,000. The largest group is certainly the Ju/'hoansi, though the IXû are scattered across a larger land area.

The Ju/'hoansi are the best-known of all Khoisan peoples, and in some areas the term Ju/'hoansi is taking on the larger meaning of 'Basarwa' in general. The Ju/'hoansi, narrowly-defined, are probably the most-studied, and best-studied, of any ethnic group in the world. Due to the theoretical interests of many who have worked with the Ju/'hoansi, readers of their ethnographies are too often left with the mistaken impression that these people lived until recently in splendid isolation both from other Basarwa groups and from non-Basarwa. It is as if culture contact there were unknown or likely to lead only to contamination of the 'purity' of the foraging lifestyle. In reality, Ju/'hoansi have long lived in contact with other groups, including Herero and Batawana. As Professor Tloj showed in his History of Ngamiland (1985: 28-29, 52-54), they have shared their land, served as clients in patron/client relations, and traded with such people for centuries.

Early ethnographers of IKung-speaking groups include Lebzelter, Passarge, Kaufmann, and Dorothea Bleek (for bibliographical references, see Barnard 1992b: 41). Yet their work has long since been overtaken by superb studies by the Marshall family, Richard Lee, and many others.
In 1950, Laurence Marshall retired from a career in engineering and business. He took his wife Lorna, and his children Elizabeth and John to the Kalahari. Between 1950 and 1961 members of the family made eight expeditions. Laurence confined his own published observations to photography. John became a film maker and has since documented in that medium both traditional practices and the rapidly changing way of life of the Ju/'hoansi of Namibia. Elizabeth wrote a best-selling book on the family's travels and the peoples they encountered (Thomas 1959), while Lorna, a graduate in English literature, wrote up the more systematic ethnography. The results were published in the journal Africa, in The !Kung of Nyae Nyae (Marshall 1976), and in a further book coming out soon on belief and ritual.

In 1963-1964, Richard Lee conducted his doctoral research with the Ju/'hoansi of the Dobe area of Ngamiland. He too returned many times for further fieldwork. Many of his students have also worked at Dobe, and we now have detailed data on that area for a period of over thirty years. Other researchers in that area include Megan Biesele, who has written extensively on symbolism and communication, as well as on social development, Patricia Draper who has worked on gender and socialization, Nancy Howell who has written on demography, Richard Katz who did an intensive study of the medicine dance, Marjorie Shostak who wrote a world-famous biography N/isa (a Ju/'hoan woman), Polly Wiessner who has worked on exchange and gift-giving, and Edwin Wilmsen who is interested in relations between Ju/'hoansi and neighbouring groups both at present and through the historical and archaeological record (for references, see Barnard 1992b: 41-42). There is a separate Portuguese tradition of scholarship on the !Xû of Angola (Barnard 1992b: 42-43). More recently, Edinburgh postgraduate students Rick Rohde and James Suzman have been working with Ju/'hoansi and !Au//eisi in Namibia. They have been looking at issues of land use and land rights, Basarwa on commercial and communal farms, and social development, among other things (see, e.g., Botelle and Rohde 1994; Suzman 1995). James Suzman is here today.

Finally on the !Xû, in 1990 some 4000 !Xû and Kxeö soldiers and their families were resettled at Schmidtsdrift, near Kimberley, in South Africa. Already, at least three researchers -- H.P. Steyn, Louis Vorster, and John Sharp -- have published academic articles on the social problems of this mixed, resettled community (see Steyn 1994; Vorster 1994; Sharp 1995).
IXô and Eastern #Hôa

The IXô, defined broadly, are a widely-scattered people. They are few in number and call themselves by an extraordinary variety of names. IXô (IXôô) is the most widely-used term, though #Hôa is common in the east and Tshasi in the south. Dorothea Bleek knew the westernmost IXô as the N/u //en. The Eastern #Hôa are only very distantly-related, if at all, to the IXô or Western #Hôa. They speak an entirely different language, and to my knowledge no ethnographer has ever done a study of them as a group.

The IXô are known to the outside world mainly through the linguistic work of Anthony Traill and the anthropological publications of H.J. Heinz, whose superb 1966 M.A. thesis on their social organization was only published last year (Heinz 1994). Dr Heinz made his first trip to the Kalahari in 1961 to study parasitic diseases, which was his field, and only afterwards took up anthropology and social development. I am pleased to see that he is here today. No other ethnographer has studied IXô life in any depth, but several German scholars have completed specialist studies, particularly in ethology (see Barnard 1992b: 62-63).

Just as importantly, the IXô were the people who introduced Liz Wily to the problems of social development -- problems which led her to strive so relentlessly for the benefit of Basarwa peoples. Wily was Botswana’s first Basarwa Development Officer. The debate between Wily and Heinz is a fascinating example of the way interpretation plays a part in social science research. To Wily, IXô practices of sharing, reciprocity, and communal land ownership exemplified the benefits of collectivization and even communism. Heinz, on the other hand, saw in IXô economic individualism the incipient capitalist principles of private ownership and free enterprise. Each had interpreted their experiences at the Bere settlement scheme as evidence for the equation of Basarwa ideology with their own.

/'Auni-#Khomani

The /'Auni and #Khomani are very, very few in number, having been linguistically absorbed into other population groups. However, they were the subject of intensive investigations by a number of scholars in the early part of the twentieth century, especially in the 1930s. The journal Bantu Studies devoted two issues (numbers 10[4] and 11[3]) to these investigations.
In 1982 and 1983, the South African anthropologist H.P. Steyn visited the area and found a remnant population still hunting and gathering (Steyn 1984). Some still identified themselves as #Khomani, though all members of the community then spoke Nama. They were living extensively on tsama melons and hunting mainly gemsbok and smaller, non-migratory game. The existence of this group, at that time, in such a poor environment, is a testimony to the great resilience and adaptability of Basarwa populations.

Let me turn now to the Khoe-speaking peoples.

G/wi and G///ana

The G/wi and G///ana, of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve are Khoe or Central Khoisan speakers, as indeed are most Basarwa in Botswana. They have been more isolated than other groups, but some migrate between the Reserve and areas to the west, east, and south. Some who live in the Reserve also call themselves Kua, which is an ethnic label more commonly associated with Basarwa groups to the south.

Major ethnographic studies include those by George Silberbauer, in the early 1960s, on the G/wi, and by Jiro Tanaka, in the late 1960s and since then, on mixed or undifferentiated G/wi and G///ana groups in the same area. Tanaka has also had students, including Kazuyoshi Sugawara and Masakazu Osaki, who have worked on a number of specific aspects of G/wi and G///ana life, including hunting techniques, visiting practices, and processes of sedentization. Other studies include those by Elizabeth Cashdan, in the late 1970s, on eastern G///ana and related groups on the boundary between the Reserve and the Central district (e.g., Cashdan 1984); and Carlos Valiente-Noailles, in the 1970s and 1980s, also on eastern G///ana and similar groups (e.g., Valiente-Noailles 1993). Cashdan's main interests have been in settlement patterns and trade, and Valiente-Noailles' interests, in settlement and migration, traditional law, and general social organization. The earlier studies, by Silberbauer and especially by Tanaka, had a more ecological focus.

Let me go into a little more detail on the work of Silberbauer and Tanaka. The G/wi came to prominence in the 1960s through the work of George Silberbauer, who was then Ghanzi District Commissioner and Bushman Survey Officer. He served for six years in those posts, spending some three years, beginning in 1958, among the G/wi of #Xade pan. This pan became the site of Silberbauer's borehole, in the south-central part of the Reserve. At least until the late 1970s, the #Xade area was known colloquially
among Ghanzi Basarwa as 'Silberbauer's farm'. As Bushman Survey Officer, Silberbauer was commissioned to conduct research on the Basarwa in general, but for reasons of practicality he chose to concentrate on the G/wi. His important *Bushman Survey Report* was published by the Bechuanaland Protectorate government in 1965, but its impact, as Janet Hermans (1995: 44-45) has recently pointed out, was reduced by the fact that it coincided so nearly with independence. Silberbauer now lives in Australia and has since published one important monograph, *Hunter and Habitat in the Central Kalahari Desert* (1981) and some shorter works on the G/wi. In spite of the early date of his fieldwork, his writings have a timeless character and are among the best-written of any on Basarwa.

Jiro Tanaka began his fieldwork in 1966. His major English-language book is *The San*, which appeared in 1980. Tanaka has concentrated on observational studies and has provided a great deal of detail on the use of the environment and on social life. Among his more interesting papers, relevant to development issues, is one called 'Egalitarianism and the cash economy among the Central Kalahari San' (Tanaka 1991), which highlights the relation between social values and economic pursuits in the changing central Kalahari context -- including the impact of illegal hunting on horseback.

*Eastern and Northern Khoe groups*

The culturally-defined Eastern Khoe Basarwa comprise a number of groups scattered from the Kweneng District in the south to Ngamiland in the north. They may number as many as 50,000. Most live in the Central District, often as clients of Bamangwato, Bakgalagari, Kalanga, and Herero. The cultural (as opposed to linguistic) distinction between Central and Eastern Khoe Bushmen is a nebulous one, and I would include among 'Eastern' groups some G//ana who have migrated from the C.K.G.R. to take up a more settled life among the cattle-herders to the south and east. The salient characteristics of 'Eastern' groups, in this sense, are their association with herding people and their high degree of cultural and spatial hybridization.

The classic ethnography of the Eastern Khoe is that of the early twentieth-century missionary, Samuel Shaw Dornan (1925: 65-207). After Dornan, concern was expressed about the practical question of relations between the Bantu-speaking majority and the Basarwa minority. Three enquiries, by government, church, and the League of Nations, were established and reported in the 1930s. In 1937, a further committee was set up, consisting of representatives from the administrations of the Bechuanaland
Protectorate, South West Africa, and the Union of South Africa, as well as academics, to ensure the preservation of the Basarwa. The results of that were published in 1939 (for further details and references, see Barnard 1992b: 119-121). There was a long gap in research interest until the 1970s, when William Chasko, James Eberet, Ørnulf Gulbrandsen, Elizabeth Cashdan, Robert Hitchcock, and others, did extensive survey work in Central District. I have already mentioned Cashdan’s work (but see also Cashdan 1985; 1986). Hitchcock, who spent many years as a government officer, concentrated on economics, demography, and development issues (see, e.g., Hitchcock 1978; 1993). Both Cashdan and Hitchcock have paid close attention to relations between groups and to comparisons between Basarwa and non-Basarwa of the area. To the south, Helga Vierich, Phina Motzafi-Haller, and Susan Kent have analysed the social and economic life of mixed Bakwena, Bakgalagari, and Basarwa settlements in a similar vein. Susan Kent’s work is especially interesting, because she has demonstrated in detail that sedentization does not always have negative effects on Basarwa culture (see, e.g., Kent 1992; 1993). Kent was originally an archaeologist, and her work has touched on hunting, exchange, household income, kinship, and gender relations, among other things.

The Kalahari fringe area has also drawn the attention of other archaeologists, notably James Denbow and Edwin Wilmsen (e.g., Denbow 1986). Of great significance is the fact that this archaeological work points to contacts between hunter-gatherer and herder-cultivator populations extending back over several centuries. This means that the Basarwa of the Kalahari fringe may be regarded not so much as recently-acculturated, but as possessing a hybrid culture of some antiquity. Recent archaeological findings suggest a long period of contact and a clear association with the Great Zimbabwe culture, beginning over 1000 years ago.

The Northern Khoe groups are those of the Okavango and surrounding areas. They live by fishing, as well as by hunting and gathering. Linguistically, they resemble quite closely the Central Khoe groups.

Northern Khoe groups have been the subject of studies by H.J. Heinz and the linguist Oswin Köhler. On these groups Heinz has produced six papers, which will soon be brought out as a book. Köhler has published extensively on the Kxoë of the Caprivi Strip. Unfortunately for most of us, the vast majority of his publications are in German, but they discuss such diverse topics as attitudes towards outsiders, attitudes towards illness and curing, hunting magic, mythology and religious belief, the concept of freedom among the Kxoë, and oral history (for references, see Barnard 1992b: 121). In recent years Klaus Keuthmann, along with linguists Rainer Vossen and Joseph Tsonope, has been working with similar groups on the Botswana side of the border. That work should
provide new insights. My suspicion is that all of the Northern Basarwa groups are economically similar to their neighbours, but poorer, and that their culture has elements in common with those of their Bantu-speaking neighbours, but also much in common with those of Kalahari Khoe-speaking groups, for example, kinship attitudes and relations within the group.

Ironically, in spite of all this work on the Eastern and Northern Khoe-speakers, we have relatively little data on many aspects of their society. It was for so long assumed that they were merely 'acculturated Bushmen' that few ethnographers have described them in terms of a lifestyle of their own. Their economic life, including aspects of trade, are virtually the only nearly-fully described facets of their social organization.

Nharo and related groups

The Nharo live in the western part of Ghanzi district, mainly in the Ghanzi farms. There are some also in Namibia. They number perhaps 9000. In most Nharo areas there is a relatively good water supply, due partly to their locations along Ghanzi ridge. Bakgalagari entered the territory the early nineteenth century, and Afrikaners arrived permanently in the 1890s. To the north-east of the Nharo, live the Ts’ao khohe and some smaller groups, who are all very similar to the Nharo.

The first true ethnographer of the Nharo was Dorothea Bleek, in the early 1920s. Subsequently, there followed a period of decline in Khoisan ethnographic studies generally. Bleek herself went north to do fieldwork among Angolan !Kung and East African Hadza. It was not until 1968 that work again began among the Nharo, when Mathias Guenther began his studies of farm and mission Nharo in an eastern area of the Ghanzi farms. He wrote his Ph.D. on the pluralism and implicit ethnic conflicts of Ghanzi society, and has since produced a large number of books, reports and articles on the plight of the Basarwa in this district (e.g., Guenther 1979). Guenther has also written extensively on Nharo religion and has produced a major ethnographic study of the Nharo (Guenther 1986). In 1969, H.P. Steyn began his studies of nomadic western Nharo groups near Kalkfontein. He focused on Nharo subsistence and economic relations. I started fieldwork with Nharo in 1974 (for further bibliography on the Nharo, see Barnard 1992b: 136-37).

To date, no ethnographer has studied the Ts’aokhoe or the #Haba, north of the Nharo. However, there are other studies of Basarwa in the Ghanzi district which should be mentioned. In 1976 Gary Childers, a Peace Corps volunteer, produced a government
report which was unique in the breadth of its coverage. Childers (1976) claims to have interviewed every resident of the Ghanzi farms. The statistical information he provided is a useful supplement to the more in-depth and analytical studies which have been done by anthropologists. The other report I would mention is the one by Alice Mogwe (1992), for the Botswana Christian Council. Her report is of special interest for two reasons. First, it presents the views of Nharo and other Ghanzi Basarwa themselves, in their own words. Secondly, it discusses a great variety of human rights issues and provides clear and well-argued recommendations which, if put into practice, would undoubtedly have great benefit. In my view, Mogwe's report is the most insightful and thought-provoking of all the development-oriented works on the plight of Basarwa peoples.

Hai//om

Finally, the Hai//om. The Hai//om are one of the great ethnographic anomalies of the Khoisan culture area. Their enigmatic name means 'tree-' or 'bush-sleepers'. They have long been thought of as !Kung who acquired the Nama-Damara language at some time in the not-too-distant past. Towards the end of the South African colonial period, the Hai//om were said to be maintaining vociferously their identity as non-!Kung, while officials insisted on classifying !Kung (actually !Xû) and Hai//om together as members of the same 'population group'.

The Hai//om, once a famous people, have been neglected by recent generations of anthropologists. Their leading early ethnographer was Louis Fourie (e.g., 1928), medical officer to the South West Africa Administration in the 1920s. Then, after a gap of nearly 70 years, in 1990 -- the year of Namibian independence -- Thomas Widlok began intensive research on social change and economic relations among the Hai//om. He completed his Ph.D. at the London School of Economics last year, and has begun publishing significant work on the Hai//om, and some comparative material (see Barnard and Widlok 1996). One of his findings which might interest this audience is his discovery of what he calls an 'inverse mafisa' system (Widlok 1994: 185-88). In Botswana, the people who receive mafisa cattle to look after for others are generally less well off, often Basarwa. However, in the 'inverse mafisa system' the poorer Hai//om lend their livestock to wealthy Owambo, and the Owambo get to keep not only the milk but even the offspring of these animals. Why do the Hai//om do it? It enables them to own livestock, but still to move about freely; and more significantly, it enables them to stave off traditional requests for sharing within their community, because their wealth in
livestock is deposited elsewhere. Without this system, Hai//om would be under great pressure to slaughter their animals. A comparative knowledge of systems such as this 'inverse mafisa' one can help us greatly in understanding the benefits and drawbacks of mafisa itself. That is one of the reasons why Basarwa research in general is so important.

Ethnography and ethnographers

In all, the number of researchers who have done work on Basarwa since the Second World War is enormous (Hitchcock 1986: 388-95). The Marshall family expeditions, including associated personnel, number at least 23 research workers. The Harvard Kalahari Research Project includes 14. The Smithsonian Institution - George Washington University Archaeological and Ethnoarchaeological Research Project includes 11. The Kalahari Research Committee of the University of the Witwatersrand has incorporated 20 members of staff, both from that institution and from elsewhere. The University of New Mexico Kalahari Project has had 23 affiliated personnel. And the Botswana Government's Remote Area Development Programme has employed no fewer than 53 consultants, advisers, and officials with a direct knowledge of Basarwa affairs. A recent development in Basarwa studies is, in fact, writing the history of Basarwa studies and commenting on the impact of these studies: Robert Hitchcock (1986), Janet Hermans (e.g., 1995), and Sidsel Saugestad (1994), among others, have made excellent contributions.

A reflection back on the writings of the turn of the century shows a similar picture to that of more recent times. The problems I had in sifting through the data of recent writers for Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa (Barnard 1992b) are probably not much different from those which bedevilled Isaac Schapera sixty-five years ago, when he compiled The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa (Schapera 1930). In many respects, the earlier material is easier to handle today than the new material, because the old has a timeless character. I do not mean that it represents a true point in time when a static 'traditional' culture really existed, but rather that it has come to us as a finite source. The ethnography of today is rapidly changing our pictures of Basarwa society, but Basarwa society itself has been much affected by events of the past: by the arrival of Bakgalagari, Batswana, Afrikaner, and Herero people, by the rinderpest in the 1890s and the drought of the 1930s, by trade, employment, and subjugation. In our attempts to understand social and ecological change we should not overlook the fact that it
is cultural continuity which implicitly defines change itself. Basarwa remain a diverse and distinct cultural entity.

I do not hold that much store in the argument that says that ethnographers inflict their individual personalities upon the data. Yet, the diversity of ethnographic material does deserve comment. Lorna Marshall (1976), Richard Lee (1979; 1993), and Edwin Wilmsen (1989), for example, have different views of Ju/'hoan society, not in points of detail, but in their fundamental understandings of what the Ju/'hoansi think and do, and how they relate to the outside world. These different points of view are largely independent of the changes in Ju/'hoan society itself. They actually reflect varied conceptions of the very idea of culture. At a certain level of analysis, the data are dependent on the theoretical perspective of the researcher. This is perhaps especially true in social anthropology, but it is true in other social sciences as well.

The question is often raised as to how much research is enough (see, e.g., Datta 1994: 4). The question reminds me of efforts which were made in the late nineteenth century to close down the United States Patent Office, on the grounds that all useful inventions had, by then, already been invented. In 1920 Dorothea Bleek chose to work with the Nharo partly because enough had already been written about the Hai//om, the #Au//eisi, and the Ju/'hoansi. In 1951 Lorna Marshall began work with the Ju/'hoansi of what is now Namibia because they seemed relatively unknown. In 1958, George Silberbauer decided to work with the G/wi both because they seemed to be the most isolated group and because they were the least studied. In 1963 Richard Lee changed his initial plan to work with the G/wi because Silberbauer was already working with them. Lee went to work with the Ju/'hoansi, but on the Botswana side of the border, where he represented them as a different 'people' from Marshall's Namibian Ju/'hoansi. And so the search continued, for the least researched, or at least the least-recently studied Basarwa people. But the proper question we should be asking is not simply whether a whole people have been recently studied. More useful questions are: What aspects of their society have been studied? And what aspects have not been studied? What aspects are constant through time, and what aspects are changing? Why are they changing? And ultimately, what can we do to ensure that the changes which occur will be for the better?

I have already pointed out that we academics, collectively, already know a great deal about innumerable aspects of Basarwa society, and about the diversity of Basarwa responses to environmental, socio-economic, and policy pressures. However, against that, I would point out that there is much we do not know. For useful comparisons to be made in a Botswana context, it is important that researchers from Botswana do studies of Basarwa groups comparable to studies which they have done on other sectors of the
population. There is a need for work on social problems such as alcohol abuse. There is a need for research on development issues such as access to water, livestock, education, and Botswana's democratic institutions. There is a need for research, both among Basarwa and in the library, on legal issues -- most obviously their rights to land. The same is true of Namibia, and possibly also South Africa.

One of the things I enjoy most about being an anthropologist is that it gives me great freedom to pursue variety of research interests and to write for a variety of different audiences: for anthropologists, anthropology students, archaeologists, historians, Africanists, development-studies specialists, and development practitioners; for the general public; and most recently, for children. I believe that it is also good for researchers, in general, to maintain more than one area of interest, although it does take time to learn a literature -- in my case, in kinship studies, hunter-gatherer studies, history of anthropology, and some smaller interests.

There is, of course, no reason why researchers in Botswana (for example) should not engage in the so-called 'Kalahari debate' (see, e.g., Barnard 1992c) or debates within hunter-gatherer studies or kinship studies if they want to. There is no reason why researchers from Europe should not study alcohol abuse in Botswana, if they want to. Ideally, a researcher should do both. But researchers abroad have an advantage in certain fields, and researchers in Botswana have an advantage in other fields. When I was working on my Ph.D. in the 1970s, I was one of perhaps a dozen anthropological specialists on kinship theory in the United Kingdom. But I was the only specialist on Basarwa or on any Khoisan people. In Botswana, that situation could be reversed, and it might be appropriate for it to be so: a dozen social scientists specializing in Basarwa studies and one (or two) in kinship theory. It would be even better if some of those researchers were, themselves, Basarwa. I am sure that in the very near future, if not already, they will be.

**Types of research and relations between them**

Finally, let me say something about the types or research in the social sciences and the relations between them, with special reference to social anthropology and sociology. There are three areas into which research is traditionally divided: (1) empirical, (2) theoretical, and (3) applied. Applied research, I would argue, has two aspects: application on behalf of the community at the source of the data, and application on behalf of the community which receives the data. In reality, of course, there are no firm
boundaries between any of these areas. There is considerable overlap. Let us look at each, briefly, in turn, and at some of the relations between them.

First, empirical research involves the collection of data, but the situation is a bit more complicated than that. The data can be ethnographic, showing the characteristics which distinguish one cultural unit or population group from another. Or the collection of data can be directed at some specific concern, such as inter-group relations, the division of labour, family life, or formal kinship structures, for example. Yet no social research, even the most ethnographically particular, is just pure research in the sense that it exists for its own end. The very fact of collecting ethnographic data highlights both the ethnological similarities and differences between peoples, and the social problems individual members of those groups have. Through reports and publications, the social scientist thus reveals these things to other researchers, to government and NGOs, often to the wider public, and sometimes, to the very people who are said to be 'being studied'.

To my mind, with regard to this phrase 'people . . . being studied', social scientists do not actually study people at all; what we study are the social and cultural products of people in society, the social relations and social processes which bind and divide members of such societies, and the very images these studies themselves create. In short, we say we study people, but in reality we study relationships. We say we collect facts, and we do, but we also create images in the process. It is important to remember that. The ethnographic images we researchers create of Basarwa have implications for both theoretical and applied work.

Secondly, theoreti . . al research. Theoretical research involves the understanding of raw data within a framework whose purpose is to make sense of such data. In the discipline of sociology, social theory has long been perceived as quite distant from empirical research. In social and cultural anthropology, however, relations between theory and data are generally seen as closer. The difference between those who call themselves sociologists and those who call themselves anthropologists rests partly on how they see relations between social theory and empirical research. The distinction also rests partly on the historical traditions of the two disciplines -- who trained us, and which great books we read. One of the reasons why Basarwa research has been so important in anthropology is that great ideas, if not great books, have come through Basarwa research. Montesquieu and Marx knew little about Basarwa society, but theorists today do. And such middle-range theorists today, working on smaller theoretical problems than the grander ones of Montesquieu or Marx, are making good use of Basarwa data.
For example, the data provided by Polly Wiessner (e.g., 1982) on Ju/'hoan gift exchange helps theorists to develop more general models of economic relations. Ju/'hoan gift-giving or *hxaro* networks involve what is called 'delayed, balanced reciprocity': gifts between individuals, in both directions, but not at the same time. Yet the *hxaro* network overlies a system of 'generalized reciprocity' of rights to resources. In other words, those with whom you are in a *hxaro* relationship, exchanging non-consumable, movable objects like clothing or walking sticks, have a right to use your water and collect wild food in your territory. And you have such rights in their territory. The two 'spheres of exchange' are quite separate, but they depend on each other. A thorough knowledge of them helps us to understand both Ju/'hoan society and wider issues in the theory of economic relations -- issues which are applicable the world over. George Silberbauer's (1982) data on concensual politics among the G/wi has similar theoretical potential, just as studies of political processes of the *kgotla* have become important not just in Botswana, but anywhere that there is an interest in the nature of political processes.

Thirdly, *applied research*. Applied research, in its widest sense, involves the use of empirical findings and theoretical insights for solving real problems. As I have noted, this can involve application for the benefit of the community which *generates* the data, or it can involve application on behalf of the community which *receives* it. It is worthwhile to think of both these aspects as equally 'applied'. The former is obvious, and it is the more important: research among Basarwa should provide insights into Basarwa social relations, and these insights should help social scientists to advise government or NGOs on how to solve problems for the Basarwa. Or better yet, to advise Basarwa of our insights, so that they can solve their own problems. But the latter form of applied research, with application in the receiving community, culture or society, is more complex. The applied aspect is distant, even geographically distant, from the empirical data.

For example, Margaret Mead's (1928) apparently 'pure' research on South Pacific cultures in the 1920s and '30s proved to applicable to understanding of American social problems. She went to the Pacific to study problems of adolescent sexuality there. What she found was (first) a set of insights into the more general problem of adolescent sexuality, and (secondly) solutions applicable to such problems in her own, American, society. Her Samoan data turned out to be factually inaccurate. Yet this, in a sense, was irrelevant, because the inaccurate Samoan data on adolescent sexuality did nevertheless highlight issues relevant to understanding American
adolescent sexuality. Mead's applied anthropology is a famous example of that where empirical research in one place becomes applied research elsewhere.

Similarly, one of the reasons why Basarwa research has been important to anthropologists across the world is that it provides possible solutions to problems far from Botswana's borders. In North America, Basarwa are generally perceived as primitive, but there, 'primitive' childrearing practices, for example, are often perceived as better than modern ones. Basarwa customs are thought to be more 'natural' than American customs, and in American eyes this makes them superior to American customs. Such a notion may be alien to most Batswana, and to many Americans, but it is a notion which does at least partly account for the great interest, and indeed funding, that Basarwa research has attracted from North America. Many people believe that knowing the Basarwa, like knowing the Samoans, might solve America's problems.

I do not want to push this second form of applied approach too strongly, but a parallel in Botswana is worth considering briefly. Basarwa research is not just research on Basarwa. It is research in a microcosm of Botswana society. We do not need to accept American notions of nature and superiority; nor do we need to accept Basarwa as a cultural isolate. In many ways they are culturally distinct, but they are also mostly poor people who live in small communities. The understanding of small communities, as most any social scientist would agree, is a good first step towards the understanding of larger communities. This might be one way in which research on Basarwa problems can be 'sold' to a wider public in Botswana or elsewhere in southern Africa. Quite apart from benefits to Basarwa, research among Basarwa has potential benefits to a wider society, whether that society be that of North America or that of southern Africa.

Let me say one last word on the distinction between these two kinds of applied research. Research for the specific community under study will be, and should be, the primary focus of most applied research, but that does not mean it cannot also be applied research in the other sense which I have been talking about. You can kill two birds with one stone. Furthermore, applied research for the wider society always has a single advantage over narrowly-focused applied research: it is less open to political manipulation and may actually have more impact in the long run. Margaret Mead's publications on adolescent sexuality among the Samoans, especially those in women's magazines, probably had more impact on American society than any government guidelines could ever have. Admittedly, she was an exception. Other anthropologists would probably not stand much chance because they have not been involved in such titillating research as adolescent sexuality among the Samoans. But there is always the
chance that good empirical research, with a clear theoretical foundation, can be applicable both within the community it concerns and in communities far away.

Vice-Chancellor, Mr Chairperson, and fellow researchers: that, surely, is the best kind of social science.
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Introduction

The notion of 'development' was conceived in the 1940s. Its early use was expressed in negative terms: countries in the South were not yet called 'developing', but 'underdeveloped' countries. At that time, the concept was essentially global, rather than regional or local. Worst of all, in those early days, development was generally equated with economic growth alone, in a crude, essentialist way. 'Traditional' aspects of society were regarded as inferior to the 'modern' sector. Even whole societies were proclaimed to be 'backward'.

As development theory matured, notions of 'modernization' gave way to notions of 'dependency'. In the 1960s, development theorists became concerned with Third World 'underdevelopment' as an historical function of First World colonialism and domination in world trade. In this perspective, economic 'metropoles' each had their 'satellites'. In the 1970s, even anthropologists joined the bandwagon, with their similar notions of 'centre' and 'periphery'. Dependency theory became important in Third World academic and policy centres, while in Europe and North America 'modes of production' became a dominant theme. That latter theme came to dominate many quarters in South African anthropology too, during the final days of apartheid.

In my view, all these perspectives are inappropriate for anthropologists. Whatever merit any of them may have for assessing global economic or political relations, they all miss the point about development for the people who ought to be our main concern. In the 1970s and 80s, anthropologists and rural sociologists began to become more active in development work, and new, more people-centred approaches became prominent (see, e.g., Long 1977). These academics, and some planners too, came
to realize that local conditions, local needs, and cultural perceptions ought to be central to the practice of development. As Robert Chambers (1983: 168) has put it, our objective should be 'putting the last first'.

In Botswana, those on the so-called 'periphery', the Bushmen, are known officially as 'Remote Area Dwellers', or in Setswana Batengyanateng or Batho ba Tengyanateng (literally, 'those who are deep inside deep'). Yet, as one of them put it recently,

Ha e le gore ka tengyanateng gatwe re kgakala le Gaborone, Gaborone le ene o kgakala le rona. Gaborone le ene ke tengyanateng.

If by 'tengyanateng' it is meant that we are far away from Gaborone, Gaborone is also far away from us. Gaborone is also 'tengyanateng'. (Quoted in Mogwe 1992: facing first page)

We need to make the deep periphery the centre of our attention. Most anthropological and sociological approaches to development today do focus on the political economy of 'remote' communities, or at least would not preclude such a focus as being one central interest among others. Broadly, that is the approach I favour, but in this lecture I want to do something a little different. I want to explore modern development ideas in the context Bushman culture: to look at the relationship between ideas of development in distant Northern countries, and the practice of development, especially in rural Botswana and Namibia.

As an example of development ideas, let us explore the contextual utility of the present, official 'priority objectives' of the British Overseas Development Administration. We could use any reasonable set of objectives, but these are the ones I am familiar with. Over the last six or seven years, I have evaluated a number of Bushman-project applications for joint ODA/NGO funding. I cannot comment on the details of those projects here, but I will give some examples of other projects and programmes which have been set up to assist Bushman communities.

**ODA 'priority objectives' and Bushman culture**

The Overseas Development Administration has eighteen 'policy areas', of which nine have been designated as 'priority objectives'. These nine are:
1. economic liberalization
2. enhancing productive capacity
3. good government
4. poverty reduction
5. human development: education
6. human development: health
7. human development: children by choice
8. women in development
9. environment

The other nine, incidentally, are: illicit drug control, HIV/AIDS, urban development, private sector development, research, energy efficiency, sustainable forestry management, biodiversity, and sustainable agriculture (ODA 1993a). The last four of these result from the 'Earth Summit' held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992.

By their very nature, ODA's priorities are global objectives. They should apply anywhere, or at least in any country of the world. Whether they can apply in every community is another matter. However, I do believe that these priorities are compatible with Bushman culture. The problem is that Bushman perceptions of such objectives, and the meanings of these objectives in the context of Bushman culture, may be very different from their context in the planners' worldview. Let me take them in detail, one-by-one.

1. Economic liberalization. This is defined by ODA as that which 'promotes policy and institutional change designed to encourage the efficient operation of markets; reform and restructure public sector enterprises and institutions; and strengthen public revenue and expenditure planning and management' (ODA 1993a: 9).

At first glance, economic liberalization would not seem to be particularly relevant to development in Bushman communities. There is no internal 'economy' in the sense that most economists think of an economy. Most of ODA's official 'recognized activities' do not fit. For example, what is called 'policy and institutional reform' category (f), 'deregulation of commercial and industrial activity', is simply not a problem for Bushmen!

Yet of course there is an economy in the sense that anthropologists use the term, and it is worthwhile for policy makers and planners to understand such usages. More than that, this Bushman economy is one which, in its various diverse forms, has proved
highly adaptive to environmental influence and outside social pressures, as well as to internal stresses. It is often said that the hallmark of Bushman society, in general, is flexibility. Yet it would be too simplistic to see flexibility alone as the basis of Bushman economics. Bushman economic systems are also based on structures of exchange relations, which in a theoretical sense are more complex than those of capitalist societies.

What I mean by this is that capitalist societies have essentially one sphere of exchange, defined by the existence of money, whereas Bushman societies operate in terms of several separate but mutually interdependent spheres. Among the /Ju/'hoansi and the Nharo, there is a system known as hxaro or Ilai. This is a sphere in which non-consumable, movable property is exchanged for similar property, but always with a delay of a day, a month, or a year. The duration of the delay does not matter, but the fact of it does. This sphere of delayed but balanced reciprocity actually overlies another, related sphere -- that of generalized rights of access to resources, including water, firewood, and rights to hunt in one's exchange partner's territory. These combined spheres of exchange thus equalize access both to movable property and to natural resources. They also entail social responsibilities as well as economic obligations (Wiessner 1982).

Other Botswana Bushman groups have different mechanisms to accomplish much the same thing. For example, among the Kua of Kutse, there is a practice of long-term 'borrowing' between kin (Kent 1993: 496-97). Susan Kent's study of sharing among the Kua of Kutse also shows that sharing practices can remain important even after sedentization. At Kutse, meat is still the most important shared item, and it can be shared in diverse ways. Social aspects of meat sharing operate well beyond economic necessity, and it is culturally expected that meat will be shared, even if other goods are bought and sold (1993: 493). (See map, Fig. 5).

How would 'economic liberalization' be effected in such a case? Would it necessarily be a good thing? The ethos of sharing can remain alive after settlement, and even within development projects, although its nature may be altered, and 'liberal' economic strategies may emerge without any planning. For example, at Hanahai West in the early 1980s, meat was shared between Nharo of the same band cluster, but bought and sold across the boundaries of band clusters who would in the past not have lived in the same place (Barnard 1986: 49-50). At that time, these groups were living in separate hamlets, within this large Botswana government settlement scheme, but they were close enough geographically and distant enough socially for buying and selling arrangements to emerge.
Fig. 5. Bushman settlements and ethnic groups
An interesting and relevant debate on economic liberalization occurred in the 1970s. Elizabeth Wily argued that Bushman social organization exemplified principles of collective ownership and communal will, while H.J. Heinz argued that on the contrary it exhibited the incipient capitalist principles of private ownership and free enterprise. Each had interpreted their respective experiences at the !Xô settlement at Bere, where Wily had served as teacher and Heinz as benefactor and planner, as evidence for the equation of Bushman ideology with their own (see, e.g., Barnard 1992: 73-74, 243-44; Keuthmann 1994: 13-15).

Heinz established livestock rearing at Takathshaane in 1969. By 1971 he had moved a number of Takathshaane families to a new settlement at Bere, a few kilometres to the west. At his instigation, !Xô families from Okwa were also invited to join the scheme. The idea was simple: each person gets a cow; then you see how many cattle they all have at the end of the day! As it happened, Heinz's !Xô wife N//amkwa ended up with a large number of the cattle. She ran the local shop, where purchases were sometimes made with cattle. Apparently, both because of her status and because of her financial skills, she found herself in a difficult position in a community not yet ripe for that kind of economic liberalization. It is fair to say that the population of Bere as a whole proved to be neither successful capitalists nor good communists, in the usual senses of either word.

Today Bere is run by the Botswana government. The greatest problem with the scheme has always been the reluctance on the part of the residents to invest the time required to keep herds of animals. The small scale of livestock ownership also mitigated against subsistence by herding. Heinz was right to maintain that Bushman economics is predicated on individualism as much as on collectivism, but individual ownership of very small herds does not permit sufficient sales of livestock for the accumulation of capital, much less the maintenance of anything resembling a 'capitalist system'.

2. **Enhancing productive capacity.** This objective is defined by ODA as that which is 'concerned with promoting capital investment, productivity, technical progress, skills and technology transfer, in public and private sectors (including NGOs), in support of economic growth' (ODA 1993a: 10).

There is room for development efforts here. However, it is worthwhile to remember that foraging, when times are good, is far less labour-intensive than other means of production or procurement. Classic estimates of two to three hours per day in subsistence activities for Bushmen are probably low, but not that low. However, there is
little room for improvement of foraging strategies. Improvement in 'production' in a Bushman context will almost inevitably mean improvement in livestock production.

It is worthwhile to compare briefly a 'pure' foraging, or hunting-and-gathering lifestyle to one which adds herding to these means of subsistence (Table 2). The differences represented here are not just of techniques, but of way of life. Although the foraging is not lost when people settle or take up livestock rearing, it may be, gradually, transformed -- especially if livestock rearing becomes a full-time activity. For most Bushmen herding exists alongside traditional foraging, and probably has done so for hundreds, if not thousands, of years (Wilmsen 1989: 64-157).

Table 2. Two modes of subsistence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunting and gathering</th>
<th>Herding, hunting and gathering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of the environment</td>
<td>knowledge of herding skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moving around in search of food</td>
<td>moving around in search of grazing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chance of finding meat</td>
<td>guaranteed supply of meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing meat</td>
<td>sharing and selling meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lots of free time</td>
<td>longer working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>few possessions</td>
<td>chance to acquire more possessions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fewer worries about water supplies</td>
<td>more worries about water supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taking each day as it comes</td>
<td>planning for the future of the herd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sharing and reciprocity within Bushman communities must be seen as only part of a larger economic structure. The economies of nation states, or even regional councils (in Namibia) or district councils (in Botswana), are also only part of the picture. In between, very significantly, is the level of interaction between Bushmen and their pastoralist or agricultural neighbours. In Botswana, there is a custom known as the mafisa system. This is a practice whereby people with many cattle loan some to others to look after. The cattle owners are usually Tswana or Herero. The people who receive the mafisa cattle are generally less well off, often having no cattle of their own. Bushmen, in particular, fall into this category, as do many Kgalagari. While under their care, the cattle can be milked by the Bushmen, and the meat of any beast which dies naturally may be eaten. The owner might also give a calf in exchange for the labour Bushmen perform. Thus, the poor can acquire stock from the rich, while the rich free themselves of having to look after all their animals themselves. That is a somewhat idealized description of the practice, which does not always work as advantageously for the poor as one might hope (see, e.g., Hitchcock 1978: vol. I, pp. 297-99).

However, there is an alternative, which has recently been labelled the 'inverse mafisa system' (see Widlok 1994: 185-88). The Hai//om of northern Namibia are traditional foragers, but they do own goats and sometimes cattle. They regularly leave their livestock with the neighbouring Ovambo agro-pastoralists. This enables the Hai//om to move about more freely; and more significantly, it enables them to stave off requests for sharing within the community, because their wealth in livestock is deposited elsewhere. Without this system of excorporation (as Thomas Widlok calls it), Hai//om would be under great pressure to slaughter their animals. With both mafisa and 'inverse mafisa', the burdens of wealth are alleviated, and increased livestock ownership is made possible for both rich and poor. However, in the case of 'inverse mafisa', rich Ovambo get richer at the expense of Hai//om, because part of the deal is that Ovambo can make use of the animals and receive payment in the form of their offspring.

In terms of development projects, what all this means is that cultural perceptions dictate what is or is not appropriate economic behaviour. What is economically rational to an Ovambo may not be economically rational to a Hai//om. That is why they have evolved the system of reciprocity that they have. Any livestock project introduced into such a situation could have profound impacts on relations between people, both within a community and between communities. Or it could fail flat, depending on how it is introduced. We need to ask not just what is best in the long run for these people, but how the existing social relationships may, in the short term, be transformed. There are of course other kinds of social relationship I have not touched on,
such as relations between Bushmen and the owners and managers of large commercial farms on which Bushmen work or squat. All this is quite apart from considerations such as the availability of water resources and grazing, or the effects of livestock on game and veld food. In short, social relationships can be as complex as environmental ones.

Nor is there necessarily a conflict between wildlife and livestock. Attempts were made at Hukuntsi, in Botswana, as long ago as 1978 to herd gemsbok as if they were cattle, alongside cattle. The Bushmen there were sceptical, but the development officer’s enthusiasm (see Thoma 1978: 48, 61) was nevertheless a source of encouragement. The project had some success, and the individual concerned, Axel Thoma, later moved to Baraka, in Namibia, and near there sought to develop eland farming. The theory is, if you tag you eland it becomes yours, owned by your co-operative. Nobody else can shoot that eland, any more than they can shoot your cattle. Arguments have flared over eland versus cattle for some time in that area of Namibia, but the potential remains for some accommodation between those who favour cattle and those who favour gemsbok or eland. One question remains though: whether the cultural significance of eland might outweigh the probable commercial advantage of cattle. Such an issue can only be explored in consultation with Bushmen themselves.

3. Good government. According to ODA’s guidelines,

‘GOOD GOVERNMENT concerns the legitimacy, accountability and competence of the process of government, and respect for human rights and the rule of law. It therefore encompasses the legislative, administrative and judicial functions of government and the role of non-government institutions and individuals in relation to them.’ (ODA 1993a: 11, original emphasis)

ODA’s Social Development Handbook (1993b: 84-85; see also ODA 1995) lists seven broad headings, with more specific questions to be asked, to assess what is refereed to as the ‘institutional capacity of local level institutions’. 'Institution' means something different to an anthropologists and a development planner. In an anthropological sense, there is little question that many traditional Bushman groups fulfil all requirements without programme or project aid at all. ODA’s list is:

1. current status
2. representation
3. organizational structure
4. capacity
5. sustainability
6. usefulness to project
7. institutional development required

Examples of questions to be asked include, under *current status*: 'Do local level organizations exist? Why were they formed? What is their current function? How many people regularly attend meetings (men/women)?' (ODA 1993b: 84). The answers are: such informal organizations do exist. They are bands formed for protection, social control, and the utilization of resources. They function for these purposes today as in the past, although with changing external social relations and environmental circumstances, and internal changes where external pressures have forced change upon them. Meetings are attended by anyone who wants to attend, women and men alike. The Bushman band is, of course, probably not what ODA has in mind, but it does fulfil their definition. It is a social institution.

If there is one, the odd-man-out in the list is *sustainability*, not because this is not a very useful concept, but because ODA’s questions about it refer purely to financial concerns. ODA asks 'What are the group’s financial resources, both those generated by members and those acquired from outside assistance? Are they dependent on outside funding or are they acquiring the necessary capability to sustain themselves?' (1993b: 85). These, of course, are questions relevant to projects, but they are not relevant to the ability of Bushman bands to maintain collective control over resources, either naturally-occurring or provided by development aid. Bushman bands have, we must presume, always been successful, and it is partly their flexibility which makes them so. The formalization of institutions is relevant in a Bushman context only at a higher level of social division, the band cluster for example. Organizations such as the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia and the Nyae Nyae Farmers Co-operative function at such a higher level.

Importantly, the *Social Development Handbook* adds:

'. . . in some situations local level institutions will not exist, at least in a form which would enable them to fulfil project aims (e.g. farmer’s co-operatives may not be useful in irrigation schemes where *watercourse* based farmer groups are required). In such circumstances it is usually wiser to *build on existing institutions* and extend their scope, rather than encourage the formation of new institutions. (ODA 1993b: 85; original emphasis)
This could imply the use of existing band structures, or indeed smaller task groups or larger band clusters where these are corporate institutions (in any of the several anthropological sense of that term). I believe ODA's guidelines can be made to fit what happens in Bushman society, but only if we are open to seeing Bushmen society as having lesser formal kinds of institutions -- not if we see it as having no relevant institutions at all. This is certainly in the spirit of development planning generally.

For many decades, there has been an interest in Bushman rights as human rights, as opposed to civil rights. Since Botswana's independence (in 1966) and Namibia's (in 1990), the governments of those countries have been reluctant to allow Bushman any special privileges. The results of differential treatment for population groups in South Africa and in pre-independence Namibia have been too harmful, and the memory too strong, to bend in this direction -- even for the benefit of a small, disadvantaged minority. One of the major questions in Bushman development is: how far can one advocate special privileges? There are good grounds for such privileges. In particular, the use of land and the concepts of land ownership which Bushmen have, do not fit neatly into either traditional Tswana concepts of land ownership (for example), or the land allocation systems of existing governments.

In 1978, the Botswana government affirmed its opinion that Bushmen lacked land rights, an opinion apparently based on a mis-reading of anthropologists' writings (Hitchcock 1993: 303). With the great drought of 1982 to 1987, one might have expected that permanent settlement, then being encouraged by the government might have been effected. In fact, a number of groups still maintained traditional practices of changing residence seasonally. In 1986, the government introduced its Accelerated Remote Area Development Programme (ARADP). The Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD) agreed to pay for it, provided land rights were protected and Bushmen retained the right to choose their lifestyle. Ironically, this move took place at the same time the Botswana government began concerted efforts to remove Bushmen from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, and despite the fact that as many as 4,000 people have customary land and resource rights there (Hitchcock 1993: 303-04). The high population density at specific borehole settlements in the Reserve has been a problem at least since the early 1970s, but G//ana G//wi, Kua, and even Kgalagari (a Bantu-speaking group) have made effective use of the scarce resources of the Reserve during the drought of the 1980s and since (see, e.g., Valiente-Noailles 1993: 31-81).

The Nyae Nyae Farmers Co-operative has over a thousand members. It was established, with mainly private funding from the United States, four years before
Namibia's independence, and it continues to be the largest development effort for Bushman people. It has had difficulties, including well-publicised disputes among its expatriate staff. Also, cultural timidity about appearing to dominate others has made it difficult for indigenous leaders to put themselves into positions of power. There are, of course, leaders, and there always have been. Yet leadership among Bushmen is a different thing from leadership among many other peoples, because the active achievement of leadership is discouraged; and the skills which are learned, and the knowledge which increases with age, confer respect from others, not authority over them.

Although sadly it has been seriously affected by drought this year, Ju/'hoan country is nevertheless in a state which should be conducive to gradual improvement. The system of settlement is well established, with over 200 named territories still used for food-gathering, and generally not overgrazed. Livestock capacity can be increased through the provision of additional water points, and Ju/'hoansi themselves are actively seeking to use their traditional nlore system creatively, rather than just conservatively (Biese 1993: 68).

More research is needed, and some is in progress, on dispossessed Ju/'hoansi living south of Tjumikwi (the Nyae Nyae area) on white-owned farms and Herero-dominated areas. At the National Land Conference in 1991, a resolution was passed which accepted special protection for the nlore system of the Ju/'hoansi of the Nyae Nyae area. Yet legislation to protect communal land dwellers has still to be drafted, and the situation is precarious. NNFC members have managed to discourage the settlement of outsiders from the former Hereroland (Biese 1993: 59), but pressures on Nyae Nyae nlores are increasing with Namibia's new regional boundaries and with the repatriation of Namibian Herero from Botswana.

4. Poverty reduction. ODA says of this objective that its 'projects and programmes are designed to help the poor to meet their economic needs'. Such projects and programmes 'generate income, enhance livelihood security, help provide safety nets and provide basic social services' (ODA 1993a: 12).

Bushman society is commonly characterized as being based on sharing. According to Lorna Marshall,

They lived in a kind of material plenty . . . . They borrow what they do not own. With this ease, they have not hoarded, and the accumulation of objects has not become associated with status. (Marshall 1961: 243-4)
Both foragers and those who were recently foragers retain similar attitudes to wage labour, the redefinition of property rights, and the increasing dominance of the state, all of which are reminiscent of attitudes in 'purer', immediate-return, or hand-to-mouth, economies. The understanding of this foraging ethos is a problem not only of theoretical, but also of practical importance.

But first, we have to consider whether such an ethos is present or not. In recent papers, I have argued that, in general, it is (e.g., Barnard 1993; in press). As I have mentioned here, Susan Kent (1993) has found strong empirical evidence for the continuation of sharing practices, in spite of sedentization. However, Jiro Tanaka (1991: 130-32) has reported profound changes in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve, as people switch from pedestrian to equestrian hunting techniques. There, those who own horses can control the distribution of meat. With this, the egalitarian aspirations and practices Tanaka, Silberbauer and others have reported, are strained and break down. Tanaka's informants told him they longed for the days of their traditional egalitarian ideology. I believe both Kent and Tanaka are right. The differences between their reports are differences between Bushman groups. Plenty of work has been done on the diversity of Bushman groups in relation to environment, settlement patterns, kinship, and so on, but little comparative work has been done on the way different groups react to imposed and accidental economic change, including the efforts of relief and development workers.

I think all researchers would agree today: Bushmen are poor. Yet, as Liz Wily once put it, 'Bushmen are not poor until they become part of a larger society; poverty is a relative concept' (personal communication, 1974). Of course, in this sense, most groups have been poor for a very long time. A real question is: are they getting poorer, relatively-speaking, because of social development? It seemed so during the early stages of Botswana's Tribal Grazing Land Policy in the late 1970s. How can we ensure that those on the bottom of the social scale benefit proportionally better? One obvious way, in relief programmes, is to put grain into the hands of people without livestock or with only small herds. But how does one do this with development projects? Making ethnic distinctions is unacceptable to modern, enlightened governments, as at least one project in Botswana has found out, to its detriment.

It may be worth adding that poverty is relative in another sense too. Remember, the sharing ideology requires people to give things away. Thus it is not advantageous to accumulate wealth unless others are able to do so as well. Also, labour time and effort is valued in the sense that the least work effort is the best -- what we might call the 'inverse Protestant work ethic'. yet a corollary of this is that, when times are hard,
work increases. Another thing which increases is manpower. The traditional response to
drought in many areas is that children are pressed into service to forage for their
families (Hitchcock, Ebert, and Morgan 1989: 311). Women who would otherwise go
food-gathering once every two days go out every day. From a Western point of view, if
they could do this all the time they might be twice as well off, but the cultural value
placed on leisure time, as well as their sharing obligations, are inhibiting factors.

5. Human development: education. This policy objective is that which 'promotes in-
country education (including technical and vocational education) by improving the
capacity of an educational institution or system or through access to non-formal basic
education' (ODA 1993a" 13).

Megan Bieseke (1993: 58) has recently divided issues in human rights into four
categories: land rights, political rights, economic rights, and cultural rights. I have
dealt with some of these already, but cultural rights fall largely within the realm of
education, especially if we take (as I do) a very broad view of ODA’s notion of ‘non-
formal basic education’.

At Schmidtsdrift, near Kimberley, there is a Ju/'hoan and Kxoë population of
some 4,000. They consist of former South African Defence Force personnel and their
dependants, flown in from Namibia in 1990. In a recent article, H.P. Steyn (1994) has
drawn attention to the plight of the elderly among this community. Traditional customs of
caring for the elderly persist. The problem is that their role in educating the young has
been usurped. Both elderly men and elderly women complain of boredom, having to spend
much of the day in or beside army tents. There is no bush food to gather or teach the
young how to gather. Knowledge and experience have little relevance, and the young are
not interested in what the elderly have to tell them.

What I am trying to say is that, ultimately, education is not simply something for
the recipients of knowledge. For Bushmen, it is a process which unites the givers and the
recipients in a system of mutual understanding and reciprocity. At Schmidtsdrift and in
parts of the Kalahari, it does seem that the loss of traditional ways is causing problems
in such relationships. Those development experts who see education primarily in terms
of formal teaching, or of 'training trainers', would do well to consider also the impact of
education on existing social relations. Education needs to be responsive to cultural
rights, including the rights of people to maintain a benevolent, functioning social order,
where one exists. An educational programme which incorporates traditional teachers is
clearly better for all than one which merely replaces them. There is no reason why new
technical skills cannot be taught alongside older traditions, as in fact happens among former foragers in Canada and Australia.

Interestingly, a recent report for the Botswana Christian Council recommends a more child-centred approach to Basarwa (or Bushman) education than has been possible to date. Bushmen themselves have requested teachers who speak their language. But Alice Mogwe (1992: 32), who wrote the report, adds that: 'Those Basarwa children who are already in the education system could be encouraged to assist the younger children when they are able to do so.' 'This', she says, 'would provide them with positive role models who speak their language and with whom they would be able to relate.' Other recommendations of that report include exchanges between schools so that Bushmen and non-Bushmen can learn from each other, similar exchanges between Bushman schools in Botswana and those in Namibia, cultural education within teacher training, the use of traditional Bushman stories in teaching, and the involvement of parents in extra-curricular activities of schools (Mogwe 1992: 32-33).

6. Human development: health. Here ODA proclaims:

The HEALTH objective in HUMAN DEVELOPMENT is to obtain optimum use of limited resources in terms of increased relevance, effectiveness and coverage of health services, with particular emphasis on primary health care for women and children (ODA 1993a: 14).

Nutritionally, in times when rainfall is good, Bushmen have always fared as well or better than their food-producing neighbours. Although the calorie intake of foragers is low, the dietary balance created by such diversity in foodstuffs is beneficial. However, in times of drought, Bushmen have come to depend on handouts. Where they have permanently settled, alcohol abuse, venereal diseases, tuberculosis, and other health problems have increased. The discussion of health problems per se is beyond the scope of this lecture, but let us look briefly at possible improvements in health care as they relate to cultural factors.

There are two ways to see and improve the provision of health care. One is to look and see what is missing and then to provide it. If there is no clinic, build one. If it has no medical supplies, then buy some. If there is no family welfare educator, then appoint one. The second way is to look and see what is present in the existing health care system, then improve on it. Or provide health care along side it to cover what is missing, without damaging what does already exist. A recent survey of the Nyae Nyae area of Namibia,
where an Oxfam-funded medical programme is in place, found that eighty-two per
percent of households are actively engaged in traditional medicine (Botelle and Rohde
1994: 95). Herbal curing is practised in the majority of households, but the most
common form of curing is that of the medicine dance, which the authors rightly suggest
'should be considered a potential focal point for community health programmes and

The 1992 conference on Bushman development, held in Windhoek with
representatives from Bushman communities in several countries, adopted the following
health resolutions, most of which aim to provide what is missing, but some of which
focus also on existing structures or at incorporating the community into the health
process.

1) Governments should provide community based primary health care to each
community which includes:
   a) Health education
   b) Nutrition
   c) Childcare

2) Members of the San [Bushman] community should be trained as community
   health workers

3) Traditional medicine should be included in the development of the health system

4) The following facilities should be provided by governments:
   i) Hospitals, clinics, and mobile clinics
   ii) Overnight facilities at clinics for patients available at all times
   iii) Adequate transport in the form of ambulances, clinic vehicles, and mobile
        clinic vehicles
   iv) Special attention should be given to the transport needs of people in remote
       areas

5) When patients are unable to pay, government policy on the waiving of health
   fees should be enforced

(Regional Conference 1992: 16)
'Health care' can be interpreted more broadly still. Obviously it has a preventative aspect. This is not simply a matter of health education, much less providing food supplements and giving vaccinations. It can involve the prevention of the social causes of ill health. Causes of ill health can even include aspects of the development process. The borehole at =Xade, in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve comes to mind. George Silberbauer put a borehole there in 1959, but he always took the pump away when he was not there, so that the population would remain small. This was important, because if the population grew too large, not only would the water supply be insufficient, but the density of population would cause both the disintegration of social life and the rapid spread of diseases through the settlement. In 1965, Silberbauer (1965: 134-35) recommended that, instead, fifteen boreholes be drilled in order to stabilize G/wi and G//ana groups in the Reserve. This has never been done. The pump has been permanently fixed at =Xade since the late 1960s. A clinic, a school, and a shop were established there in the early 1980s. These alleviated social and medical problems in some respects, while creating a dependence on the water supply for newly acquired livestock, some malnutrition as a result of lack of veld foods, and the potential for the rapid spread of infections. The Botswana government’s efforts to resettle these people outside the Reserve did not help matters, as the small number remaining in the Reserve during the drought years of the 1980s regarded it as their land, which indeed it had always been. The population of =Xade grew to over a thousand in 1988, as the majority of the Reserve’s then inhabitants came together at the already overcrowded borehole (Hitchcock and Brandenburgh 1991: 28).

7. Human development: children by choice. This is defined as concerning 'strategies that promote the ability of women and men to exercise choice over when they have children'. The ODA guidelines also note: 'If women are enabled to exercise this choice fertility levels and birth rates in most countries can be expected to fall' (ODA 1993a: 15).

Bushmen traditionally give birth in the bush, not in the settlement or the hospital. However, in places this is changing. At !Kangwa, near Dobe in Botswana, there is now a four-bed 'birthing unit' provided by the Department of Health. Anthropologists have pointed out that, rightly or wrongly, this inhibits choice by preventing infanticide (Lee and Rosenberg 1993: 417-18). Clinical abortion is unavailable in Botswana, and in the past Ju/'hoan birth control depended on postnatal sexual abstinence and birth spacing through correct breast-feeding intervals. When I was living the Ghanzi district in 1970s, Nharo and IXo women in were very occasionally given birth control devices at
their request, but the doctor there told me that a far more common request was for devices to increase fertility.

All in all, however, 'children by choice' is less of a problem for Bushman women, or indeed Bushmen men, than it is for women and men elsewhere in the world.

8. Women in development.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT policy recognises and addresses women's roles and needs in all aid activities. The policy does not focus on women's needs in isolation but seeks to identify positive ways in which the asymmetrical relations between men and women might be shifted or changed. (ODA 1993a: 16)

The problem with this category, and this description, is that 'woman' is not always a terribly relevant concept in Bushman society. I shall come back to that point in a moment. First, consider those contexts in which 'woman' is a meaningful category, then let us look at the kinship context. What do women do? Obviously, women give birth. They nurse their children. They collect water and firewood. They gather vegetable foods, and they teach girls to do the same. In the medicine dance, women do the clapping and singing, while men do most of the dancing and trance curing. Beyond that, women are involved, to a great extent as equals, in the same social roles as men -- in sharing and giving, in quarrelling and gossiping, and in decision-making. Gathering activities are usually undertaken collectively, in groups of women, but the solidarity of women as women is not as strong as in agricultural societies.

So, what of the kinship context? Ultimately, Bushmen relate to each other not as women or men, but as members of specific kinship positions. Generally, each individual is some kind of kinsman to anyone else. Among !Kung-speaking groups, including Ju/'hoansi and =Au//eisi, and among Western Khoe-speaking Bushmen, including Nharo, Ts'aokhoe and =Haba, a name-relationship system ensures that even strangers can be so classified. Personal names cycle through the generations from grandparent to grandchild, and anyone with the same name is believed to be descended from the same namesake-ancestor as anyone else who bears that name. Anyone with the same name is, by definition, a grandrelative. Even non-Bushmen who stay for some length of time are given names, which fit them into the system too. Within such societies, there is no notion of a distinction between kin and non-kin (Barnard 1978).

Therefore, in many contexts, there is no such thing as a woman. Rather, a female person may be my classificatory grandmother, mother, sister, or wife. If a Nharo man
meets a female stranger, he will classify her as belonging to one of these categories according to the name of the woman, and the place of her nearest namesake in his own genealogy. If the stranger is called N/isa, and my mother is called N/isa, then the stranger is my 'mother' or my 'daughter'. Alternate generations are equivalent. If she is called G/ūā'n/ae, and my grandmother is called G/ūā'n/ae, then she is my 'grandmother' or 'cousin' or 'granddaughter, or indeed my 'father's sister' or 'sister's daughter'. All these relationships are equivalent. The importance of this is that it affects how people are supposed to behave in relation to one another. A parent/child relationship or a brother/sister relationship is relatively formal. A grandparent/grandchild relationship, on the other hand is informal. I can sit close to my 'grandmother', and 'grandrelatives' (in the widest, classificatory sense) are the only people who may marry. Remember, my grandmother, my cross-cousin, and their namesakes are all my 'grandrelatives' -- called tsxó or mana in Nharo. To put it bluntly, if she is my 'mother' or 'sister' I keep my distance; if she is my 'grandrelative' she is fair game. And, ideally, she will classify me in the same way.

Among Ju/'hoansi in Botswana, there has been a gradual shift from bride service to bridewealth as the means of formalizing the relationship of marriage (Lee and Rosenberg 1993: 415-17). The process began when young men returned from the gold mines with cash which they could use to purchase livestock. They would offer the stock rather than their labour, thereby enabling them greater flexibility in residence. Restrictions on hunting, food distribution through the drought relief programme, and increasing sedentization have all made the acquisition of wealth in livestock more attractive than it was in the past. Accompanying all this has been a greater matrifocality in childrearing, while at the same time a development towards a more patriarchal band structure, perhaps reflecting the greater incorporation of Botswana's Ju/'hoansi into the national culture of that country.

Ju/'hoan children raised in a sedentary environment do more work, travel further from their homes, and interact more in same-sex, same-age groups than those of nomadic times. Adults spend less time with their children, and children's care-taking groups have been replaced by peer groups. With sedentization, gender differentiation increases. Women stay at home more, and men are more likely to stay away, often to look after their newly-acquired herds. In such cases, a decrease in the status of women is a very real danger (Barnard 1992: 53).

Thus the situation with Bushmen differs from that in many other Third World, especially Asian, cases, where development is seen as a way to bring women out of a traditional pattern of subordination. With Bushmen, women's subordination is a
relatively new thing, and it is caused, at least in the instance I have mentioned, by a process which can be seen as a form of social evolution, if not social development in the narrow sense. The more general point to be learned here is that the traditional/modern dichotomy is too simple. A process of change may in itself have detrimental facets which need to be combated. An effective development strategy could be as much a matter of keeping up with change, and reversing its ill effects, as it is a matter of effecting change. Certain kinds of development strategy, such as meeting the harmful effects of sedentization, may even resemble strategies in relief work, where acute natural disaster or warfare cause the need to intervene.

However, permanent settlement need not necessarily create problems for women if there exist projects which focus on women, or which enable women to develop new skills. There have been many projects in this subcontinent aimed at developing craft production, needlework, and marketable skills for the literate, such as word-processing. Some of these (though not yet word-processing) have been introduced into Bushmen communities. One high profile effort is that of the Kuru Development Trust, in D'Kar, Botswana, which has fostered the production of clothing and of works of fine art, among other things. The clothing is sold in southern Botswana, and the paintings and prints fetch high prices in New York and London. Many of the clothing designers, as well as some of the best known artists, are women. It is difficult in such a project to provide equal benefits for unskilled, as well as skilled people, but the presence of women as new role models, as well as the expression of Bushman culture through their talents, are plainly positive elements in Kuru's programme.

9. Environment. ODA policy here 'aims to help developing countries tackle national environmental problems'. Furthermore, says ODA, 'it promotes the integration of educational concerns with the whole range of development objectives or involves the tackling of specific environmental problems or issues' (ODA 1993a: 17).

A 1988 review of Norwegian aid to Botswana (Granberg and Parkinson 1988: 310-20) identifies seven issues of environmental concern in that country:

1. the availability of water resources
2. overgrazing and land carrying capacity
3. wildlife conservation
4. wood and forest resources
5. the use of veld-products
6. the impact of mining
7. Urbanization aspects

What is interesting is that virtually all of these directly affect Bushmen and other so-called 'Remote Area Dwellers'. Even urbanization is relevant, as the presence of cardboard huts in Ghanzi and other towns suggests. The other six factors are ones which Bushmen themselves ought to have special input into, if development or conservation programmes are to be successful. As a Bushman delegate to Namibia's National Conference on Land Reform (in 1991) put it, 'Those who live on the land and know it well are its best protectors'.

In a report which takes that statement as its title, Andy Botelle and Rick Rohde (1994: 97) found some intriguing results to the question 'Who should control key natural resources?' (Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Direct user control</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veld foods</td>
<td>94 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
<td>0 %</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop/garden land</td>
<td>86 %</td>
<td>3 %</td>
<td>1 %</td>
<td>10 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grazing</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>19 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife/hunting</td>
<td>52 %</td>
<td>9 %</td>
<td>39 %</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>44 %</td>
<td>2 %</td>
<td>48 %</td>
<td>6 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Botelle and Rohde (1994: 97)

Universally (apart from the don't knows), the people believed that veld foods are the exclusive preserve of those use them, and not the government. In contrast, more respondents were happy to see water in the hands of the government than wanted it under
direct user control. This could well be because water is, nowadays, something which is provided by outsiders. Bushmen cannot drill their own boreholes, which of course they need if they are to take on the rearing of livestock. Perhaps surprisingly, even hunting was seen by 39 per cent as rightly under government control. This could reflect the fact that it is becoming much less important as a means of subsistence, or it could reflect the fact that the government has had controls on hunting since long before independence. Indeed, individuals in over 90 per cent of households said they hunted, including nearly as many young men as old.

I cannot emphasize the finding on veld foods enough. The very strong relation between the products of the land and the people who use it, who are its 'owners' or kx'ausi (as the Ju/'hoansi say) must be recognized. Nothing is more important to Bushmen generally than their land, and its natural products. That is why attempts to resettle Bushmen in both Namibia and in Botswana have met with such difficulty. It is also why development agencies, whether government or otherwise, cannot expect programmes to succeed unless they take account of the inherent association between a group of people and their land. To Bushmen the notion of a 'land' -- "nlore" (in Ju/'hoan) or nlusa (in Nharo), for example -- connotes not just the ground but what grows on it.

Of course, many in development realize this. There have been a number of attempts to assist Bushmen to make better use of the lands they call their own. There have even been suggestions of employing Bushmen, specifically, as game wardens, tour guides, and so on. Disputes between representatives of different government departments, in Botswana at least, over what to do about Bushmen in 'game reserves' are public knowledge. I need not rehearse the details of that or the environmental problems which afflict much of southern Africa here. I will only say that, in my view, there is nothing more fundamental to Bushman development than that their cultural perceptions of land and environment be recognized.

Also, what is true of the 'natural environment' is equally true of the cultural environment, or environment of settlement. Let me end with an example of that: Bagani, on the Okavango in northern Namibia (Fig. 4).

When I visited Bagani in 1991 there were 500 plots marked out of four hectares each. Of these 500, 170 were occupied, and 330 were empty, in spite of a food for work programme and an abundance of water and firewood. Each plot was numbered at 100 metre stretches along the road, with space for gardens back to the next road, 400 metres away. A school had been set up. The teacher was Owambo, and instruction was in Afrikaans. Two ethnic groups were represented, lXù and Kxoë. As the project co-ordinator put it, their 'chiefs' met regularly and there was a community council, but
members of the two language groups kept their distance from each other -- preferring to settle in different parts of the scheme. I am not going praise or criticise the details of that scheme here, but it is fair to say that such a thing is plainly not developed with Bushman culture (two Bushman cultures in this case) in mind. The entire idea of the settlement is alien to Bushman tradition. The demarcation and sizing of plots restricts the propensity of groups to form on the basis of close kin ties, and it inhibits the flexibility of movement which is important for social well-being and for preventing conflict. Bagani may eventually work very well, but ignoring Bushman tradition is a high risk strategy, especially when dealing with such a large number of people.

Conclusion

In my teaching on African development, and in my small class on Khoisan culture, there is a problem I set each year for the students. I call it the 'bag of money problem'. I tell the students to imagine that they are to be given a large bag of money with which to solve the problems of the Bushmen. I ask them to devise a plan to spend the money. The problem is much more difficult than it appears. None of my students has ever given a really full, satisfactory answer. Nor can I give you one either.

Any intervention has the potential for creating or accelerating cultural change. This is not always a bad thing, but it is a dangerous thing to play with. The recipients of development will not always be aware of what is happening to them until it is too late, but the planners and project managers should be aware of the potential consequences of their actions. There is no easier way to solve a problem than throwing money at it, but there are much better ways. The trouble is that such better ways elude detection. Pitfalls in them cannot easily be foreseen.

Development-oriented research among Bushmen has existed since the 1930s, longer than 'development studies' itself. As a recent paper by Janet Hermans (1995) shows, Bushman development aid has had mixed results throughout its history. Researchers, especially those employed by government, have had to tread a fine line between trying to persuade with strong arguments those who make decisions, and trying to keep them happy by telling them what they want to hear. With many Bushmen now themselves actively seeking a say in their development, processes of communication and consultation are changing. The role of social scientists in the development process with inevitably change too.
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