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Abstract

Over the last sixty years anthropological interest in San has focused on their status as hunter-gatherers and, more recently, as an economically and socially marginalised minority group. In this thesis, I examine the different ways in which this indigenous minority population in Botswana manage and negotiate their relations with one another and with the broader society in which they are embedded.

The research comprised eighteen months of fieldwork (April 2010 to December 2011) in Gaborone city, and a largely Naro-speaking village in Gantsi District in the west of Botswana. The participants comprised a small but relatively highly-educated cadre of elite San men who self-presented as advocates for San-related issues in the wider community but also San men and women in the towns and villages of the region. Early in the research process I recognised the need to make sense of the ethnography in terms of a variety of markers. Whilst this included what San actually said it also encompassed what they did and how they did it: that is their behaviour, dress and bodily techniques and practices – all of which I describe as voice.

The research intersects with issues of gender, language, culture, class, identity and self-representation in the daily lives of San. I emphasise the tensions that San face in their daily struggles for recognition as human beings of equal value in Botswana’s society. As the public face of this struggle, San advocates were in a difficult and ambiguous position in relation to the wider San community. As a consequence of this, I explore egalitarianism as a set of political and social relationships rather than as a ‘sharing practice’.

I identify a number of areas for further research, for example, to work collaboratively with San to incorporate aspects of what San called ‘personal empowerment’ and training. I show that the research has wider implications for other minority groups and indigenous people worldwide who have also been subject to highly politicised and overly deterministic definitions of their identity. My work suggests possibilities for working with emerging indigenous ‘elites’, who mediate
most visibly the contours of these categories of identity by purposefully combining, conflating and straddling these labels.
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Note on orthography

Khoisan languages include ‘clicks’. There have been up to twenty-eight different orthographies used to represent these sounds. I use two orthographies in this thesis. The first is the IPA system and the second is the Naro Language Project (NLP) orthography that was developed by Hessel Vissor. Below I show how the two relate to one another.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sound</th>
<th>IPA system</th>
<th>Naro Language Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dental click</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral click</td>
<td>//</td>
<td>tc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alveolar click</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal click</td>
<td>!</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal sound</td>
<td>~</td>
<td>~ for example ‘ã’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttural sound</td>
<td>(None)</td>
<td>o (underline)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I use the Naro Language Project (NLP) orthography for persons’ names. This is in line with the orthography used for Naro names in D’Kar. Note that there are no symbols for clicks in Bantu languages, and often on Omang’s (national identity cards) San had their names spelt with ‘x’ being used for any click sound. When I was taking the names for people for the mapping project (see Appendix 2), some San preferred that I take down the ‘Setswana’ spelling used on their Omang. Moreover, I have used the NLP orthography in Chapter Six for the way that the initiation is described in Naro. However, I have also used the IPA system when comparison with other San ethnography is needed. For instance, in spelling the names of Khoisan groups (G//ana, G/wi, etc.), and to keep with the continuity with Barnard’s seminal work on ‘universal kinship classification’ I have chosen to use the IPA system for /au (avoidance) and g//ãe (joking) distinction. This will help the reader to follow the references that are made to past literature.
## Glossary

### Naro

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Naro</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dtcoagdxoo</td>
<td>D’Kar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>düü</td>
<td>eland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>düü gxoo,</td>
<td>eland bull</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dxae guu</td>
<td>(lit.) female grown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g//āi,</td>
<td>joking partners, kinship term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>!au,</td>
<td>avoidance partners, kinship term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ncoakhoe</td>
<td>Red people/person</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Setswana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setswana</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basarwa</td>
<td>Setswana word for San</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Batswana</td>
<td>People of Botswana (pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>botho</td>
<td>A person who has a well-rounded character, who is well-mannered, courteous and disciplined. It links to ideas of humanity, dignity, and respect. Literally it means personhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combi</td>
<td>mini-bus taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daga</td>
<td>marijuana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kgagiso</td>
<td>Social harmony or peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kgosi</td>
<td>Chief/king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kgotla</td>
<td>Local Chief’s court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kraal</td>
<td>Enclosure for animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morafe</td>
<td>A distinct group within a Setswana-speaking tribe, who have a chief and a particular bounded land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morama</td>
<td>A type of legume that is commonly gathered from the bush by rural peoples. It is often called a ‘nut’ due to the nutty taste it has after roasting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omang</td>
<td>National identity card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Setswana</strong></td>
<td>National language of Botswana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tswana</strong></td>
<td>Pertaining from Setswana-speaking culture or language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tuck shop</strong></td>
<td>A small shop selling basic goods such as sweets, cigarettes,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of abbreviations

BA Batchelor of Arts
BDP Botswana Democratic Party
BKC Botswana Khwedom Council
BMC Botswana Meat Commission
BOCODOL Botswana College of Distance and Open Learning
CKGR Central Kalahari Game Reserve
DRC D'Kar Reformed Church
DRCC D'Kar Reformed Church Council
FKP First Peoples of the Kalahari
KFO (Kuru) Kuru Family of Organisations (or just ‘Kuru’) the umbrella term for a group of ten San-based NGO’s. The majority of these NGO’s have their offices in D’Kar, except for one which is based in Gantsi town.
MA Master of Arts
NGO Non-governmental organisation
NLP Naro Language Project
OSISA Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa
PTA Parent Teacher Association
RADs Remote Area Dwellers
RADP Remote Area Development Programme
RCSS Research Centre for San Studies
SGL Special Game Licence
UB University of Botswana
UDC Umbrella for Democratic Change
UN United Nations
UNWGIP United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples
ZCC Zionist Christian Church
Chapter One

Introduction

There has been extensive anthropological research on various groups of San (for e.g. Barnard 1992; Barnard 2007; Marshall 1976; Widlok 1999; Valiente-Noailles 1993) and the history of San groups is similar to many indigenous peoples across the globe. San have ‘lived on the fringes of Tswana society’ (Stewart et al., 2002:2), have been subjected to discrimination, prejudice and marginalisation as their ancestral hunting land has been taken away due to mining projects and the management of natural resources taking precedence. Some have been relocated (often forcefully) into a sedentary lifestyle and today live heterogeneously, occupying a ‘wide spectrum of social, economic and political positions’ (Hitchcock et al., 2006:1). Living in six different countries, San can be pastoralists, hunter-gatherers or hunter-gatherer-fishermen and many now working as herdsmen or labourers for other ethnic groups (Barnard 1992:3; Diekmann et al., 2014:3). Notwithstanding the successes of some San individuals in higher education, San have more generally struggled to compete socially and economically with those who speak Setswana and English, the dominant languages in Botswana.¹ Despite variations between individuals and groups, all of the San groups share a history and current experience of marginalisation. In more recent history San ‘voice’ has been heard in international fora after San aligned themselves with other indigenous peoples in the world.

This thesis examines the different ways in which a marginalised indigenous minority population in Botswana use voice in social contexts where their social, legal, political, economic and linguistic status is often questioned by the majority population. I foreground how daily interactions for San are shaped by non-recognition of being human beings of equal value, yet I do not focus on ‘rights’

¹ Setswana is the national language of Botswana which is from the Tswana language group within Bantu-speaking peoples.
discourse or practice. I examine the ways in which individual San use voice to negotiate difficult encounters and make their ways in the world within the broader society in which they are embedded.

Voice reveals, reproduces and creates social relations, structures and meaning (Weidman 2014:38). In this thesis I use voice to describe not only what people say, but also what they do, the use of their body and their actions. It includes their practices as well as the things that they do not do. A central claim of this thesis is that voice is heard and understood differently by speakers and audiences/witnesses/listeners, and that these differences impact recognition and misrecognition within and between social groups.

My analytical framework partly draws from language ideology (Chapter Five) which emphasises dominant forms of speech and language that underwrite power relationships between groups in society. In doing this I move beyond Charles Taylor’s (1994) conception of misrecognition as being about individual identity, and include both Nancy Fraser’s (2000) and Pierre Bourdieu’s (2000) representations of misrecognition which link individual expression within their wider structural contexts. For Bourdieu (2000) misrecognition is,

> an everyday and dynamic social process where one thing (say, a situation, process, or action) is not recognised for what it is because it was not previously ‘cognised’ within the range of dispositions and propensities of the habitus of the person(s) confronting it (see Bourdieu 2000). Instead the thing is attributed to another available realm of meaning, and, in the process, interests, inequities or other effects may be maintained whilst they remain concealed. (James 2015:100)

What is being claimed here is that different logics and frameworks lead to alternative understandings and meanings, and may lead to either non-recognition or misrecognition. Minority groups are often ‘disadvantaged by the cultural codes of the dominant society’ (Dick 2011:24). This may relate to ideas of ‘progress’, ‘civilisation’ or ‘culture’ in which dominant groups have ideas about what is entailed in these processes and do not recognise minority groups’ understandings of ‘progress’, ‘civilisation’ or ‘culture’.
For Fraser (2007:20) misrecognition refers to ‘distinct species of injustice’ which relate to ‘parity by institutionalized hierarchies of cultural value’ but also, crucially, in terms of distributive injustice within the economic sphere which ‘prevent(s) some people from participating on a par with others, as full partners in social interaction’. ‘Participatory parity’ means that all adults are recognised and included within these institutional spheres. Here misrecognition is linked to participation (or not) in institutions and social structures. Yet we know that ‘challenging institutionalized structures of power cannot succeed without efforts “to transform ways of thinking, self-conceptions, and cultural categories”’ (Dick 2011:28, inner quotation cited from Kauffman 1990:71). Culturally and socially dominant frameworks are appropriated to make sense of non-dominant beliefs or practices. Hierarchies of these frameworks become normalised, and the modes of talking, acting and doing, i.e. what I describe in this thesis as voice, are regulated and judged using the dominant framework to interpret them. This in turn leads to a lack of participatory parity as non-dominant ideas and bodies are unrepresented in institutions. Here we see how dominant groups hold power over non-dominant groups as their ideologies become normalised and non-dominant ones are erased, ignored and/or devalued, and this leads to misrecognition through misunderstanding.

Two initial experiences helped to inform this research. The first followed a visit to Botswana in 2010 where I was able to see the work being undertaken in the recently opened Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS) at the University of Botswana. The RCSS offered academic, financial and emotional support for San in higher education. San who were part of the San Youth Capacity Building Project and who enrolled in higher education with the support of the RCSS, had personal life trajectories that contradicted most starkly with the negative stereotypes associated with them as ‘stupid’ or ‘backwards’. In many ways I was aligning my research with minority (indigenous) elites, i.e. with those who in some sense occupy a relatively high position in wider society (Gowricharn 2001:159), but who come from a minority ethnic group. These are not the ‘power elite’ that Mills (1956) has written about in that they are not occupying positions of high political or economic office. Yet amongst
other San, they occupy higher positions in large part due to their levels of higher education and their increased potential to successfully gain employment. Notably it is possible to be ‘elite’ without being an advocate. However, I use San ‘advocates’ and San ‘elites’ interchangeably as in this research all San advocates interviewed were also San elites.

By assisting San to gain learning positions within education the RCSS were addressing a major issue of San exclusion from education and this highlights the need for an ethnically targeted national project. Of note is the absence of government-endorsed ethnically specific groups/projects in Botswana which can be understood in the context of the ‘One Nation Consensus’, a rhetoric used by the government to claim that all citizens are the same. Yet the RCSS focused on one particular ethnic group, suggesting that San peoples’ lack of access to education is being addressed. The RCSS also highlighted how San were asserting their voices: through being educated and visible in the capital city, Gaborone.

The second experience came in 2011 during a game drive at Kutse Game Reserve. I turn to this experience now in order to orient this thesis towards voice and to highlight some of the key challenges surrounding the misrecognition that San face in using their voice.

In the beginning there was protest

Abraham, a forty-year-old Naro-speaking San man from Gantsi, was an artist and we met serendipitously at his studio near Gaborone during the first week of fieldwork. Abraham and I decided to take a trip to the Kalahari and go on a safari game drive with our non-San friends, a female artist, Lesedi (24, Setswana-speaking) and a male artist, Peter (32, Kalanga-speaker). We joined four others on this safari drive including a young well-dressed Batswana couple, and two older Batswana men. ² The

² Batswana is a Setswana word meaning ‘the people of Botswana’, in the plural form.
government-employed Wildlife Ranger Mpho who took us on the drive was a well-built non-San Motswana man.\textsuperscript{3} He wore a pair of expensive Ray-Ban shades and a large cowboy style sun hat. He gave Lesedi and I, the only ‘single’ women present, a casual elongated look over the top of his shades. To me, this showed how confident he felt in his position as a Wildlife Ranger, a position that provides a steady wage and job security which is often influential in gaining the affections of women.

During the drive we asked Mpho questions about the animals and he answered with ease and pleasure. As an inquisitive (and naïve) anthropologist I decided to ask, ‘So where are the Bushmen [San]?’ As though he was offended, Mpho quickly dismissed my question by saying, ‘there are no Bushmen [San] here’. I replied, ‘but I read that there are a few hundred Bushmen [San] living inside the [Central Kalahari Game] Reserve.’ My question was contentious as it inferred that I expected Bushmen to live in the same place as animals, and I was not sure how he would take this. Mpho quickly became aggressive, raising his voice to explain that: ‘the government is trying to move them out…give them education… they need civilisation’, and he added, ‘they need development’.

The tone in the group had shifted and had become tense. At this point Mpho stopped the vehicle as it was time for a fizzy drink that was provided as part of the safari. The discussion was now taken up by the two older male Batswana members of the safari group. One of them asked, ‘our government is trying to provide education for all of us….don’t you think everyone is entitled to education?’ Given their gender and age, these older men had a higher social status than a young woman like me. I very bravely replied, ‘Yes. But it depends on what kind of education you’re talking about’. However, my approach was not taken seriously, ‘that’s a different issue. We are talking about the issue if everyone should have the opportunity for education’.

\textsuperscript{3} Motswana is a Setswana word meaning ‘a person of Botswana’, in the singular form.
Although I agree that access to education should be universal, I am aware of cultural nuances within education, the use of language, the hidden curriculum and prejudice and discrimination that all impact the experience of education, especially for minority groups. However, by now I felt overwhelmed by the confrontation with these older and socially more powerful men. I left my un-articulated point as it was and feeling a little defeated, I remained silent.

We all stood at different points around one side of the vehicle where the cool box containing the drinks was resting on the warm sand. Mpho declared to us all that the reason San are still living deep in the bush is because of their ‘stupidity’ since the government is trying to help them yet they are ‘refusing’ to accept this help. At this point, Peter, our male artist friend retorted, ‘you know, my friend here [points with his head and uses a slight hand gesture towards Abraham] is one of them [is San]’. Mpho turned to look at Abraham and appeared a little shocked. It did not seem like he was expecting to hear that. He continued, ‘that’s okay, you’re the sensible one. At
least you understand, you’re living in the city wearing clothes not like the others who take off their clothes and start running around after the animals.’

Mpho defined himself and other ‘normal’ city-dwelling people who wore clothes, had jobs and who were educated, as being ‘superior’. He drew on a primordial perception of San as being ‘backwards’, ‘difficult’, ‘stupid’, and an image of them being naked and animalistic too. However, at the same time he also identified Abraham as not-really-like-the-others, and thus suggested that he was ‘better’ than the others who were still stupid and backwards. This kind of distinction could be divisive as it encouraged Abraham to agree with him, thus creating a division between himself and other San. This alerts us to the easy use of stereotypes about San and the dehumanised way in which they are treated, and also reveals the complexities of relations within Botswana.

Abraham said nothing. Instead he quickly and effortlessly climbed up from the sandy ground onto the bonnet of the 4x4 safari vehicle. He was calm and measured in his movements. We all stood looking up at him as he took off his big boots, then he steadily undid each button of his shirt. He peeled it off and stood topless. He loosened his belt and let his trousers drop into a pile at his feet. He was naked except for his underwear. His hands rested on the elastic of his underwear, his legs were apart and his eyes looked into the far distance across the Kalahari landscape. It was a stance that told us he felt proud and free to ‘run after the animals’ if he chose to do so. This was a powerful image. His audience was silent as we waited to see what he would do next. Abraham turned his head to look at us all on the ground and a broad grin swept across his face. He stooped to pull up his trousers that lay around his ankles, scooped up the rest of his clothing and boots, and climbed down off the bonnet. Lesedi, Peter and I rejoiced and slapped each other’s hands in celebration of Abraham’s defiance. There was no comeback to his response.
Reflections on the protest

I knew that this was an important moment in my fieldwork and so retold it to my Ph.D. supervisor. While he was mildly surprised, he also informed me that he had heard of a ‘naked protest’ by San before. Clearly this protest was part of a wider dialogue for San, southern Africa, and across the world too. I will break the experience down in order to understand the context of this conflict more thoroughly.

Discrimination against San in Botswana is pervasive, and it riled Mpho and the safari group into a heated debate. Mpho succinctly bound ethnicity, place of residence and subsistence practices into a negative stereotype about San while he simultaneously attempted to devalue San culture. Moreover, Mpho and the other Batswana on the safari found it difficult to talk about ethnic and cultural difference beyond a modernisation perspective that follows a fairly linear development trajectory, within a liberal discourse of equal rights and opportunity. This reflects the perspective taken by the government and citizens of Botswana.

Abraham viscerally drew us towards the difficulties for San voices to be heard above the strong stereotypes. Here Abraham’s body used performativity to ‘speak’ in a way that did not use orated language. Through his naked body, and through the performance of undressing and his stance, Abraham actively and powerfully responded to the situation. Naked bodies have been used in protests all over the world, by different people for different causes. In Uganda, for instance, old women protested against land reform by undressing (Ware 2015), and by undressing the ‘protesters’ actively make themselves vulnerable through revealing the fragility of their body(ies). Being naked strips away any defence, leaving that person literally bare. What is supposedly the weakest aspect of any person, their vulnerable unclothed nakedness, is a source of strength. Undressing symbolically defies attempts at coercing or persuading that person away from how they imagine themselves, as it clearly demonstrates their will to be who they are in their totality.
Moreover, for San being naked reappropriates a symbol (their ‘nakedness’) that has been used primarily to pejoratively devalue or undermine the status that San hold. Galinsky et al. (2003) write:

> Given that appropriate means “to take possession of or make use of exclusively for oneself,” we consider reappropriate to mean to take possession for oneself that which was once possessed by another, and we use it to refer to the phenomenon whereby a stigmatized group revalues an externally imposed negative label by self-consciously referring to itself in terms of that label. (2003: 222).

By using his body Abraham’s voice was loud and clear. Instead of passively accepting the negative meanings of the labels espoused by Mpho, which relate to broader sets of negative labels used in Botswana about San, Abraham rejects the damaging meanings. By reappropriating this label he imbued it with positive connotations, and thus sought to renegotiate the meaning of the label from something hurtful to something positive and empowering. Instead of remaining silent, and effectively allowing himself to be removed from the group (of San), Abraham challenged the way in which the group (San) was being perceived and judged (by non-San). At the same time he showed solidarity with San who were, according to Mpho, ‘not like him’, as he rejected Mpho’s attempt to differentiate him from other San.

Yet the impact of this kind of action could be seen as delicate: while Abraham defiantly showed solidarity with and pride in San culture through a reappropriation of nakedness, did his wordless action foster and build understanding between the groups, or did it further solidify stereotypes in the eyes of his audience? Since he used a common essentialised symbol as the backbone of his protest, Abraham’s message might also have had the effect of further reifying San culture in the eyes of the safari group. Could Abraham’s action be misrecognised as an insistence of being ‘difficult’, rather than as an act of self-preservation and pride in the social and cultural group which he identifies with? This kind of balance is something that other minority people have faced, and for instance there are ongoing debates about the success of the reappropriation of, for example ‘nigger’ by African Americans (Anderson 2010), or
‘slut’ to address a culture of victim-blaming in cases of sexual assault (‘Lauren and Georgia’ 2011).

Nevertheless, Abraham’s voice spoke loudly even when he was vocally silent. Indeed silence has been part of the tactics employed by San in dealing with conflicts which cannot be worked out using the preferred method - talking. Talking has been identified as central within San communities (Guenther 2006: 241-261). In situations where talking through conflicts was not possible (for whatever reason) Polly Wiessner comments that Ju/'haoansi ‘voted with their feet’ (2014: 14029), and would often simply physically leave situations. A silent yet bodily action is sometimes heard most loudly. San in villages where there are mixed ethnic groups are often treated badly by non-San. A number of San told me how San often leave a settlement when non-San move in, and migrate to places where there is no one else to cause conflict, and this is also substantiated elsewhere in the literature (Motzafi-Haller 2002:158). Here the action of moving away - speaking with their feet - speaks loudly about the difficult and compromising living situations that San find themselves in and the desire to be free from those kinds of relationships.

In situations where talking has no effect, then bodily action through walking away, moving locations or in the case of the game drive, undressing, is how voice emerges. The body speaks in ways that talking does not as it changes the terms of the argument or discussion. During the game drive it was clear that a discussion about education and development was not possible as my attempts to address this had been dismissed. Abraham changed the terms of the debate from being about education and development, to being about his life and the lives of other San who, through simply inhabiting their bodies which are identified as ‘other’, face discrimination, negative labelling and often attitudes of disgust from the majority population. This was a naked protest against negative portrayals of San and action towards positive reappropriation and active self-empowerment of identity. The body is a powerful vessel through which voice emerges, even (or especially) when vocally silent. This thesis is orientated around this phenomenon, where the ‘voices of the voiceless’ are
the focus of attention, and bodies and action as well as speech, become central to the study about voice for minorities.

In the rest of this chapter I contextualise the thesis theoretically. I discuss and outline the key ideas that my thesis tackles, which include voice, recognition, indigeneity and egalitarianism. Here I visit the major authors to orient the theoretical foundations of my work. Other themes that run through the thesis include indigenous elites, identity, power and language, and these emerge within the discussions of the major ideas stated above.

**The Kalahari Debate**

What became known as *The Great Kalahari Debate* of the 1980s and 1990s was largely concerned with the identity of San in southern Africa. What emerges from this debate as a productive basis for my thesis, is the necessity of the heterogeneity of San experience, identity and voice (McCall and Widerquist 2015:22). The above story showed that identity-based positioning is central to contemporary politics. Defining San as an ‘underclass’ or as ‘isolated’ and ‘pristine’, limits the possibilities for emerging and diverse San identities to be central to research. Moreover in this debate, the viewpoint of San themselves was not sufficiently reflected (Takada 2016:6), however since then attempts have been made to transcend the Kalahari Debate and explore San and their agency (e.g. Widlok 1999; Takada 2015). My work recognises that both approaches taken in the Kalahari Debate (cultural and political-structural) can be appropriated in ethnographic research in order to support the emergence of multiple San voices.

We move away from a debate based on identity politics that has often been founded on reified understandings of cultural and social groups, and towards using both political-structural as well as cultural-theoretical underpinnings to inform an analysis of complex and multiple ethnographic observations. Rather than constructing San as victims, either of the political-economic structure (a revisionist
view), or of cultural oppression (a traditionalist view), both the political/economic as well as cultural aspects are important in San self-representations. This is the view that I take forward in my work. The use and propagation of ‘identity politics’ is the very mechanism of essentialism (Dick 2011: 30) that creates the conditions for recognition and misrecognition. Yet identity driven justifications are often employed when minority groups pursue political goals (Dick 2011: 19).

The Kalahari Debate distinguished two main approaches. The first was the ‘traditionalist’ perspective led by Richard Lee, which foregrounded the isolation and cultural uniqueness of so-called culturally and ecologically ‘pure Bushmen’ who were ‘unpolluted’ by contact with others. Indigenous claims that are criticised for being essentialist, are often rooted in the ‘traditionalist’ perspective (Sylvain 2014:255). Traditionalists tended to romanticise San by reifying their culture as a link to our past as human beings.

The ‘revisionists’, pioneered by Edwin Wilmsen (1989), focused on political economy and were influenced by Marx. They defined San as a social and economic underclass who have long been in contact with outsiders. This was in direct opposition to traditionalists who depicted San as being outside of exchange relationships other than between themselves. However, the revisionist argument had some flaws, for instance focusing too much on economics and flattening the diversity of the historical circumstances (Lee 2003: 90). The criticism of the revisionists was that they too homogenised San identity, but as an underclass of dependents. This served to reinforce a singular narrative of San experience as much as the traditionalists.

Nevertheless, the revisionist perspective shifted the academic debate and ‘traditionalists’ accepted that they had reified ‘pure’ San over other San (Barnard 2007:110). Following this, ‘traditionalists’ agreed that although some San groups were autonomous and lived in isolation, other groups of San have been engaged in trade, cattle and exchange, have been in subordinate positions to non-San and also engaged in interethnic marriages (Lee and Hitchcock 2001:257). This was the beginning of understanding the heterogeneity of San experience which has paved the way for
academic debate to open up to a variety of possibilities for San in contemporary ethnography.

This shift in perspective was welcome as there has been a decrease in foraging/gathering practices, alongside an increase in domestic food production, wage earnings and welfare for San (Saugestad 2001:83; Takada 2015:167). Indeed in Gantsi District, and in D’Kar specifically, hunting and foraging practices are minimal, while many San subsist through growing beans, maize, animal husbandry, and depending on government programmes for ‘drought relief’, old age pensions or for orphans or those considered ‘destitute’. This shift from casting San as part of isolated, autonomous groups, to connected, diverse interrelated people is reflected in my work.

Biesele and Hitchcock (2011: 63) note that Ju/'hoan San are in a transition phase as they move to a mixed-subsistence economy. San are participating in social and political life outside kinship units which in part upheld ‘the rules by which most Ju/'hoansi were living until recently…and for which generations of the children were socialised’ and which ‘were embedded in the demands and opportunities of a foraging relationship to their Kalahari environment’ (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:60). More recent changes from the ‘old ways’, as Elizabeth Marshall-Thomas (2006) explains, of egalitarian social and political organisation comes at a time when there is a need to develop ‘a wider social form than the extended family group’ (Biesele and Hitchcock 2013: 63). Yet, regardless of these changes Biesele and Hitchcock state, ‘the hunter-gather habits of the past are still in evidence in areas relating to economic organisation, authority and decision-making’ (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011: 63). Evidence of the persistence of egalitarianism comes from their examination of the political organisation at Nyae Nyae Farmers’ Cooperative in Namibia. Some challenges emerge as:

The lack of formal governmental structures among the Ju/'hoansi meant that the move toward representational democracy was something of a challenge. There was a certain discomfort with the idea of specific individuals having the right to speak for others. The egalitarianism inherent in the Ju/'hoan system
dictated against individuals accruing power or authority. As a consequence, the leadership issue was of critical concern. (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011: 84)

There have been shifts in the political structure of San in Namibia and Botswana in order to gain voice in national fora to secure and participate in government services (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011: 139). Generally, San want access to schools, medical care and water.

In D’Kar in Gantsi District one of the most successful projects that the NGO engaged in was to help groups of residents apply for communal farm land, showing that this is an important issue for this community.4 The success of this project reflects the interests of the residents more widely, which is to raise livestock and to secure services and schemes that are offered by the government. D’Kar residents have knowledge of how to look after and breed cattle as they have a long history of working on Gantsi farms (Guenther 1979:1986). Even though the government encourages San to participate in farming activities, San have been largely excluded from owning land which ultimately limits their participation, and maintains their exclusion from the dominant society.

Gantsi San have been documented as the most ‘acculturated’ groups of San. This was articulated by Guenther (1979) who distinguished ‘farm bushmen’ as those who had been exposed to non-San culture and who were then a different ‘type’ of ‘Bushman’ than those who lived in the bush. This rather crude distinction suggests a clear delineation between groups and gestures towards the author assuming that there is an ‘authentic’ San identity as hunter-gatherers, which today is challenged as being prescriptive, and also falling victim to tendencies to essentialise ‘culture’ as bounded or fixed concepts. Later Guenther (1986) changed his perspective to understand all Naro San in Gantsi District as a cultural group. Yet ethnographically

4 The top five population centres in Gantsi District are; Gantsi town 14,809; Charles Hill 3,591; Nojane 1,958; Tsootsha 1,848; and D’Kar 1,668. 10,044 people in Gantsi District were living outside of a village on farms (Republic of Botswana 2012).
it reveals the history of San in this area as being engaged in non-hunting and gathering lifestyles and living in diverse ways for decades, if not longer.

‘Acculturation’ suggests a process of cultural loss. San in D’Kar often expressed their fear of losing their culture, and of young people not knowing their culture, or that there was a need to keep a record of their history so that future generations could remember their cultural history. San are involved in the production of identity politics, and note its contours and boundary-making markers as places and areas of social life that need to be protected from the process of acculturation. Yet at the same time San also attempt to work beyond the boundaries of identity politics and rally against the essentialised stereotypes held about them. However in anthropology, there was a shift to move beyond essentialising stereotypes as a foundation of our work, noting that individual and group identities are constructed as a plurality, and are fragmented and fractured and constantly in the process of transformation (Hall 1996). Yet for people themselves, and the organisations that represent them, these still remain important markers for identifying themselves and (against) others. However, ‘[a]ll efforts to detail a group’s collective identity are bound to fail because no single definition can capture the heterogeneity of all those who count as group members’ (Dick 2011: 30). Tensions arise as ‘identity becomes a bounded marker of authenticity’ (Dick 2011:30) and suggests that those who do not see their life experiences reflected in this shared identity are excluded.

The government has attempted to encourage San to move from areas that are described as ‘remote’ - where it is difficult to provide government services - to less remote areas where schools, clinics and other government services have been provided. An argument I heard that was made by one San person in response to this kind of policy was that the label ‘remote’ was designated to describe places that have no government services, but that the only thing that defines ‘remote-ness’ is the government’s ‘unwillingness’ to build or develop certain areas of the country. Places that are more populated by San tend to be less developed. San tend to have to wait
longer to be allocated residential plots of land through the normal process of land boards, and are less likely to be allocated land for cultivation or cattle posts.

What was always present within the conception of what it is to experience the world as San, was the struggle against discrimination that San face in everyday social, political and economic aspects of life. Accordingly, one of the key tensions running throughout my thesis is the relationship between San and their non-San neighbours and fellow citizens. In general this relationship of mistrust is accented by attitudes of disgust, disappointment and frustration. This suggests how a struggle against discrimination from non-San is part of the political subjectivities of San.

Since these ‘San issues’, which will be discussed in Chapter Three, are a point of contentious politics in Botswana, aspects of daily life for many San that are not politically motivated, are drawn into the political domain through identity politics. This is where what was once the private realm is being drawn into the public-political realm (Dick 2011:26). Being San, for instance speaking Khoisan languages as we will see in Chapter Five, has come to represent a political act. Being San and acting in a San way in public, can be antagonistic. The actions and speech – voice - of every San person has the potential to spark contentious discussions, or heated debate as shown in the opening vignette. For those ready to take this on, there is a whole game to play using the boundaries of identity. However, in playing like this there is a danger of believing in these essentialisms, and of trapping oneself in the contours of these ‘identity politics’ through consciously and/or unknowingly reproducing them.

Recent themes in San research

There are a number of theoretical angles within San literature including structuralist approaches such as social ecology, linguistics, social evolution, and social change but also post-modern perspectives such as biographical research, and a focus on gender (Shostak 1981). Some of the major topics that have been the focus of academic attention include kinship (Barnard 1978:1980b), subsistence practices, for instance
hunting and gathering or wage labour, settlement patterns, land, healing (Katz 1982; Low 2015), religion (Guenther 1999) and myth, including folklore (Guenther 2006) and rock art (Lewis-Williams 1981), and egalitarianism in sharing and leadership (Widlok and Tadesse 2005). In more recent times there has been diverse research, for instance on mobility, child-rearing practices (Takada 2010, 2015 chapter 5), hunting skills, as well as a focus on the political and advocacy work of indigenous peoples and minority debates in relation to identity politics and recognition (Guenther 2003; Lee and Hitchcock 2001; Takada 2015).

Some have written about the best ways to approach development and education for San (Braam le Roux 1998; Hays 2006, 2009a, 2009b), which is often policy oriented. My work concerns politics and I critically engage with an assumption held by many San that that education strengthens San voice. Chris Low (2008:162) wrote about the wider and not always positive implications of education for healing. His research comes from the perspective of San who perceive that ‘education kills tradition’ and ‘school is the thing that takes our culture away from us’ (Low 2008:164). He writes that formal schooling threatens San medicine as it challenges forms of ‘indigenous knowledge’ and encourages a reduction in the ‘world of possibilities’ for healing. Yet at the same time he writes that San perceive that school is needed in order for San to write down their culture before it is lost. He also writes that a lack of education exacerbates San exclusion from the positive effects of participation in the wider political economy of southern Africa (Low 2008: 164). These two positions reveal the ambiguous effect of education for San and the need to investigate from both sides, both from the angle of those with formal education as well as those without. My work partly focuses on the ways formally-educated San voices are mobilised.
Culture

In this thesis I use the term ‘culture’ not as a tool for defining absolutely the differences between groups, but rather to constitute a structure that is used by people to designate boundaries between people. I am interested in the use of the term as it was reflected upon with people’s ideas, feelings and thoughts about their own customs and language. Culture emerges through language, kinship, ritual as well as morality or attitude. Like all categories, identities and ethnicities, culture is referential: culture has never been bounded, self-contained or self-sustaining. Rather, culture is produced as part of wider processes and so to assume that there is an ‘authentic’ (and then, by suggestion, also ‘inauthentic’) culture, is to disregard the ‘normal social condition’, where no cultural group is the ‘sole or even principle author of its own existence’ (Sahlins 1999:411).

While Kuper (2003) highlights that in South Africa ‘culture’ was used to designate ‘race’, the basis of the separatist and discriminatory political project of apartheid, ‘culture’ nevertheless remains important for claims made by citizens (see Seldon 2014 for the persistence of Afrikanerdom in SA). As Barth (1969:9–10) suggests, ‘culture is nothing but a way to describe human behaviour’, and he relates this to ethnicity which is ‘categories or ascription and identification by the actors themselves, and thus have the characteristic of organizing interaction between people’. Culture and ethnicity are concepts that are often used together, and are used by people to identify themselves and others around them. Ethnic identity is part of a dialectic process ‘incorporating internal as well as external opinions and processes’ (Takada 2015:161). As Takada (2015:162) highlights, the ‘proper locus for the study of ethnicity is through local activities within which the wide range of aspects of ethnicity is situated’. My work follows this perspective as I study everyday interactions to inquire about culture, ethnicity and identity.

Post-modernists and structuralists have, at different times, advocated for getting rid of this term, ‘culture’ (Abu-Lughod 1991; Kuper 2003) because it suggests an essentialised view of the world. However, Sahlins (1999:410) noted that just as
anthropologists sought to abolish the term, paradoxically the world is turning towards the concept of culture: people seek to define themselves as part of distinct cultures. Sahlins (1999:410) warns against defining this phenomenon as ‘resistance’ to broader globalising forces, such as capitalism, as what people are after is the ‘indigenization of modernity, their own cultural space in the global scheme of things’. Comaroff and Comaroff (2009) suggest that San, like many others, are engaged in producing, commodifying, and defining culture - both their own and others - but that commodification of culture is not part of its own demise. Rather, boundary making and defining, a dialectic of similarity and difference, is the ‘normal mode of cultural production’ (Sahlins 1999:410). Likewise, the process of producing culture relies upon, and indeed is built within, structures of difference and similarity which requires the bounding that is often described as ‘culture’.

Although culture is no more or less the project of indigenous peoples as it is with any others, with indigenous peoples there are often simultaneously overt political projects to recognise injustices against them and to advocate for positive changes for them. Within these political claims, cultural identity has become part and parcel of recognising the people who make these claims as ‘legitimate’. Thus, presenting what is sometimes described as ‘authentic’ cultural identity is often favourable in these contexts.

The complexities of the representing ‘San culture’ have been carefully teased out in Sapignoli’s (2009:9–2) work that describes the way in which anthropologist Silberbauer was a witness for San in a high profile court case. While sticking to giving an accurate report, Silberbauer had to present cultural continuity between the past and present in order to present ‘authentic’ claims for San to continue living in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR).

Yet reasoning that San are ‘traditional’ can be used against them. For instance, this argument was used by the Government of Botswana in 2010 to claim that they did not need to provide boreholes in the CKGR as San can find water in the same way that their grandfathers used to (Sylvain 2014:256). Essentialist claims were used to
back up the government withdrawal of services for San based on them being ancient people who do not need or want ‘modern’ services or tools, such as education, guns for hunting or boreholes for water.

Steven Robins has also experienced tensions between political engagement and theoretical commitments when producing a report on San in South Africa. He explained that while it was ‘accepted practice to debunk essentialist “bushmen myths,”’ he was ‘uncomfortable with using sophisticated anthropological modes of deconstruction’ to undermine San (Robins 2004:92 cited in Sylvain 2014: 252). Here culture is then a set of signifiers that are used to make claims for and against minority ethnic groups, and although I understand culture is in a constant process of change, the term is frequently employed by people around the world to designate differences and similarities between groups. Culture is an important way in which human beings make, create and maintain identity. This becomes even more so in a situation where a group of people is struggling for recognition based on cultural identity.

**Voice**

Voice is central to social and political life and is inseparable from its articulation within a social world of other actors, who are both present and absent in any given context (Keane 1999:273). Voice is multiple and contextual and within a single group, or even a single person, there are a number of voices. Voice is where the socio-cultural and the political connect to the individual as in its expression, voice reveals, reproduces, and creates relations, structures and meaning (Weidman 2014:38). This locates voice within a broader system of social and political articulations in overlapping and contested spaces. These articulations are manifested through, as Webb Keane suggests, ‘numerous ways of speaking’ or as Judith Butler says, through ‘speech acts’ - the performative act of speaking in which we ‘incorporate’ the reality that is around us by enacting it with our bodies. Through speech we participate in every day, we absorb and reiterate articulations from around us and in doing so
produce and reproduce our realities. The body and the way it is used also produces the social. Voice is concerned with both speech and bodily action.

Social and political articulations are revealed through animating speech using the body to make and create situations in which the speaker is heard. In order to be heard, the body of the speaker must also be readable. Merleau-Ponty (1962:150) emphasised that ‘spoken word[s]’ are not just the transfer of representation but rather consist of expressive gestures:

the spoken word is significant not only through the medium of individual words, but also through that of accent, intonation, gesture and facial expression, and as these additional meanings no longer reveal the speaker’s thoughts but the source of his thoughts and his fundamental manner of being. (Merleau-Ponty 1962:150)

This suggests that in speaking we are not only orating words which have meaning, but we also imbue meaning through the way we perform the speech. For instance, the speaker must be in the right place, in front of the right audience, speaking a particular language, using acceptable words and standing in the right place in order to be validated, legitimised and ultimately heard and understood. Research on voice then, is more than just about what is said, as it is also about how the speaker presents themselves and puts themselves in a position to be heard. It is also about how the speaker reflects on their position within society and how they negotiate the terms of their participation.

Yet, indigenous bodies, Povinelli (2002) writes, are under scrutiny as they are viewed as being vile or offensive. The ability for a person with an indigenous body to act autonomously is curtailed by the social checks that are made on her/his body, a body that is perpetually ‘out of place’ (Douglas 1966). Through an exaggeration of difference between people within society ‘a semblance of order is created’ (Douglas 1966: 4). Thus, the indigenous body, in being separated and demarcated as different is part of the overall social structure that requires these differences to maintain hierarchies within the larger system. In other words, the sometimes radical othering of indigenous minorities not only reflects the social structure but is also an integral part of its maintenance. Like this, for an indigenous person to transgress their social
position is difficult, if not impossible, within the current structure as their body represents not only themselves and others but also a whole system.

Voice is often equated strongly with difference and often this relates to agency, representation, power and authority of ‘having a voice’, and is often to do with ‘claiming one’s voice’ in a ‘politics of identity’. Research on voice ‘often directs attention to the diverse processes though which social identities are represented, performed, transformed, evaluated, and contested’ (Keane 1999:271), and voice is often only used as a ‘key representational trope for identity, power, conflict, social position and agency’ (Feld et al. 2004:341; Weidman 2014:39). Yet, this focus on identity is often separated from the material qualities of the voice ‘in the sense that they are produced through bodily actions and the training of bodies’ (Weidman 2014:41). Studies that focus on the materiality of voices and vocal practices often occur in linguistic anthropology and these are often set aside from the social/political work of identity-based projects, which suggests they do not coincide.

Yet, the productivity of voice as an analytical category is to attend to voice as both a ‘set of…material and literary practices shaped by culturally and historically specific moments’ as well as ‘a category invoked in discourse about personal agency, cultural authenticity, and political power’ (Weidman 2014:38). Like this, voice is more than the language used, the speech pattern employed or the prominent linguistic features, and is about the way in which the speaker talks, how they stand and the forms of social symbols that they use and appropriate in order to be heard. Voice is as much about being heard or recognised as it is about speaking. It is as much about language as it is about action.

In Botswana the numerous San languages, known as Khoisan (more on this later), are phonetically complex, and use a number of ‘click’ sounds. Non-San often find that their untrained bodies are unable to produce these sounds eloquently. These clicks are a source of ridicule by non-San who sometimes poorly imitate random ‘clack-ity-clack’ noises as a way to demonstrate their rather negative perceptions of these languages and their speakers. Making these noises alerts us to one way in which
Khoisan languages are identified, and erased from public social life – through ridicule. There is a general lack of desire for non-San to learn Khoisan languages too, and a general rhetoric is that they are ‘too hard’ to learn. Yet what it demonstrates is their lack of ‘bodily technique’ (Mauss 1992) in producing and reproducing these sounds. Mauss explains that bodily techniques and bodily actions are imitated which have been successfully performed by people who are perceived as having authority over the imitator, and who the imitator has confidence in (Mauss 1992:73): ‘The action is imposed from without, from above, even if it is an exclusively biological action, involving his body’ (Mauss 1992:73). Body technique is shaped by social and political hierarchies.

Mauss (1992:73-73) continues by explaining that it is a ‘notion of prestige of the person who performs the ordered, authorised tested action vis-à-vis the imitating individual’ which reveals that there is a psychological element as well as a physiological element. There is an ‘ensemble of techniques of the body’ which are not just assembled by the individual, but also through their education, their society and their place in that society (Mauss 1992:76). The way the body is used maps onto the broader social and political structures that are found within that society.

Being San is to be indigenous and different, and this is mapped onto the body through ‘techniques’. Firstly, language acquisition delineates a Khoisan speaker from a non-Khoisan speaker through the actual language which uses a different set of mouth techniques to make at least four ‘click’ sounds, guttural as well as nasal sounds. These techniques are placed within the broader socio-political landscape in which San have a low position and so rather than these bodily (mouth) techniques being copied or imitated by ethnic and linguistic others, they are ridiculed or dismissed as being ‘too hard’ to learn. This reinforces the hierarchical and unequal ways in which society orders the techniques of the body.

Yet the only thing preventing bodily imitation is the psychological aspect of learning a so-called ‘lower’ language. Learning this language would mean learning a particular set of bodily techniques, which would be to invert and confront the social
structures which teach a dominance of Setswana techniques of the body. More often than not, Khoisan speakers learn Setswana and speak it mixed with Naro (Chapter Six), and the use of Naro or other Khoisan languages is restricted in public as Setswana is the dominant language of the nation.

However, even when San speak Setswana language (and/or English), they speak with an accent that reveals their particular set of learned ways of using the mouth to make sound and language. Being San is written into the body and emerges through the techniques of the body. In Chapter Three Tshidiso will explain that through learning someone else’s language he learns to lose himself. Having the body and the way it is used dismissed by the broader society, has a powerful effect on identity and self-image, and thus has the capacity to shape self-representation.

Secondly, we also see how voice is manifested through bodily technique beyond language throughout the thesis. For instance in the opening vignette, Abraham’s uses his body to reiterate and reappropriate his ‘naked’ body as a powerful and positive point of identification. By using a bodily technique that was seen as being ‘primitive’, i.e. when Mpho derogatorily says that ‘Bushmen’ ‘run around naked with the animals’, Abraham performs his nakedness to nullify and invalidate the claim of superiority made by Mpho - that being clothed and living in a city is purportedly better or more civilised. In Chapter Seven Cgase, Ncabase and Khan’xa will actively imitate bodily techniques that have historically and culturally been identified as non-San, for instance living and working in the city or abroad, wearing particular clothes, gaining body fat and learning to speak different languages and in linguistic forms that are recognisble as ‘Christian’ or ‘educated’. This ensemble of techniques confers particular statuses on those who display or perform them and thus connect to social and political hierarchies.

To have a powerful voice that can be recognised within a dominant social context requires a particular status within that context. Like this it may appear necessary to display normative and dominant bodily techniques to make voice carry weight.
Voice and essentialism

There are issues in relation to how individuals speak on behalf of or ‘for’ the group, i.e. how do individuals represent the group? This also resonates within research when thinking about and reflecting on the way in which researchers represent the ‘researched’ (this latter issue is considered in Chapter Three). In a political climate that is based on identity politics, it is arguably in San peoples’ interest to build upon a homogenised voice for political clarity. Yet this use of ‘strategic essentialism’, i.e. to homogenise identities and to build upon key tropes, could be understood as ‘an insincere presentation of an identity’ (Sylvain 2014:252) for the purpose of ‘a scrupulously visible political interest’ (Spivak 1993:3). Strategic essentialism is often at the expense of hearing heterogeneous voices.

Yet we know that:

Every speaker has available numerous ways of speaking that are associated by virtue of linguistic ideologies with different character types, professions, genders, social statuses, kinship roles, moral stances, ideological systems, age groups, ethnicities, and so forth…these may be expressed by virtually any linguistic contrast, including lexical or language choice…variations in fluency, phonology, or syntax. These permit speakers to claim, comment on, or disavow different identities and evaluative stances at different moments. (Keane 1999:272)

Voice is a way for a social actor to enact or perform their identity and to use their own agency. In different contexts their voice may sound different, or may change. Voice is multiple for any single actor. Hill (1995) suggests that we should not be looking for the ‘real self’ represented in any single voice, as the self is dispersed over multiple voices and is in the gaps between voices too. Even when there is a single agent, there are many different voices used in order to be heard.

This suggests that there might be a contradiction between voice, which benefits from a clear and strong and to a certain degree, essentialist voice, and the heterogeneity of voices with the possibilities for diverse identities and action (Sylvain 2014:258–259). Some anthropologists value strategic essentialism as inspiring creative forms of resistance (see Sylvain 2014:252 for a discussion on this), yet elsewhere it has
been argued that this offers a false dichotomy, one that distorts the ‘lived vitality, diversity and complexity of contemporary expressions’ (Gagné and Salaün 2012:385). Ultimately, this kind of essentialism is only useful in particular contexts, especially relating to law-making where clear boundaries are needed to order to make policy, yet in everyday life the fluidity, multiplicity and diversity of experiences is abundant, and likewise the voices and their messages are diverse. Strategic essentialism, I suggest, reduces the possibilities for the diversity and multiplicity of identity as the essentialisms become part of the broader self-narratives that people take on as their own.

While there might be a certain degree of necessity for essentialism, other consciousness movements (for instance the Black Consciousness movement in the United States of America) pushed for the redefinition of the actual terms of the discussion, and this was called the ‘Black aesthetic’: a set of linguistic, musical and creative processes that were distinct from the majority culture. Thus, if the terms of San identity and possibility are maintained within the dichotomy of essentialist claims, heterogeneous voices and the potential that this has in the politics of identity is overlooked.

When San activists speak up to protect their rights, they may jeopardise their status as being San which is the basis of their claim (Levi and Dean 2003:26). They can face a problematic contradiction: as San engage with and are ‘successful’ in ‘non-San’ cultural and social forms such as formal education and employment which help their voices to be heard, they risk being assimilated, or at least being perceived as assimilated, into another culture. San who speak up risk being viewed as ‘inauthentic’ by San, or as ‘illegitimate’ in their claims by non-San observers, participants and commentators. This can result in claims being ignored and also becoming justifications for exploitation (Hitchcock 2015: 263). Sylvain (2003: 112) notes that San who have a formal education are no longer seen as ‘San’ by other San, but when they come to find a job, which inevitably means being employed by non-San, they still carry the same ethnic status as before (Mazonde 2002:65) and so still find it hard to
gain employment. These kinds of contradictions shape San experiences. This alerts us more broadly to the potential difficulties for San who have an education and who are identified from within as well as outside of their communities. For San who have been successful in education their position becomes ambiguous: at the same time being ethnically San, a lowly ethnic group in Botswana, they are educated, which often carries a positive connection to being responsible, intelligent and ‘modern’.

**Axes of voice**

The striking thing about voice is the different axes that can be mobilised in order to be heard. In thinking about indigeneity, Anna Tsing (2007) notes that there are cross-national connections that ‘form semi-autonomous axes of indigenous voice’ but that these axes do not always complement each other (Tsing 2007: 41). As such, local indigenous voices might become at odds with international axes of voice.

In the case of Botswana, Suzman (1999) understands that Survival International’s advocacy interventions overshadow local and national attempts to build social and political relations between San and the majority. The axis of indigenous rights, as used by Survival International, and the axis of minority and majority politics in Botswana have not always complimented each other. Internationally the rights of San as indigenous peoples have been recognised, but nationally San are not differentiated like this. Contemporary politics in Botswana maintains a discourse that all ethnic groups are the same, while at the same time maintains a majority and minority divide that respectively discriminates positively or negatively. Moreover, the image of San in Botswana has become complicated through international advocacy as many Batswana see this as an attempt to defame Botswana within the international community. Even when it is only a small percentage of the San population who actually actively engage with these NGOs or with the international indigenous movement, all San are viewed as being disloyal, ungrateful and held in contempt by the majority of society for this kind of action.
**Indigeneity**

There are a number of international organisations that are driving an indigenous agenda such as the United Nations and the World Bank. ‘Indigenous’ as a concept and terminology has been developed through international discourse in law, anthropology and politics. It has mainly come about through discussions at United Nations indigenous conferences and working group meetings (Niezen 2003: 4). The international indigenous movement ‘aspires to promote and protect the rights of the world’s “first peoples”… [an] estimated three hundred million people’ (Niezen 2003: 4).

Yet there are different definitions of ‘indigenous’, for instance the World Bank has a five point checklist, the ILO convention 196 holds self-ascription as a fundamental criterion, and the UN Draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) speaks of self-identification and membership to an indigenous community or nation. However, there is normally a consensus on the following: to be the first people, i.e. the descendants of those inhabiting land at the time of the arrival of other groups; to be a non-dominant minority group within a state structure that carries cultural and social characteristics that are alien; to have or to have had a cultural difference from the majority, and; to perceive difference from the majority, and to self-define as indigenous (Saugestad 2001: 43).

‘Indigeneity’ relates to the structural position of minority people within a nation. Often experiences of state-led forced settlements, relocations, political marginalisation and attempts at cultural estrangement shape this relationship. While it is not a necessity to be marginalised in order to claim an indigenous status, those groups that gravitate towards this powerful international structure and politicised concept are often those who have experienced a significant loss of land, language and culture, and often sit on the peripheries of nation states. There is certainly a sense that indigeneity has political traction when linked to marginality. Niezen (2003: 13) writes that indigenous identity draws on the experiences of collective suffering which also supports the idea that indigeneity and marginality are intimately linked. The concept
of indigeneity addresses structural inequalities as well as cultural and linguistic marginality. Its appropriation is useful in a political and practical way to change the situation for those people who have had the least power in society.

The term ‘indigenous’ helps to identify groups who are disadvantaged for the purpose of positive discrimination. Indeed indigenous groups are often seen as the ‘most’ disadvantaged after having their land, language, and cultural rights stripped away by other groups within their local and national vicinity. Many indigenous groups have been eradicated. However, it only takes a brief look at the history of Canada to note how national governments who were once encouraging assimilation and incorporation, now talk about repatriation and resolution in order to right the wrongs inflicted on the original people of those lands.

Yet Sidsel Saugestad writes:

one of the paradoxes of the modern world is that at the same time as the struggle against apartheid and racial discrimination...seems to be coming to an end, the need for positive discrimination of groups in disadvantaged situations...is becoming more visible. (2001:42)

Liberalism is the idea that bases the relationship between citizens and the state on individual equality and thus equal treatment and Sidsel Saugestad seems to suggests that ‘liberalism’ has been/still is being re-defined. There is a need for unequal treatment so that disadvantaged groups are assisted in ways that are different to the majority of the population, as not all people begin from a level playing field. Structural inequalities cannot be addressed fully unless the attitudes and cultures within the structures shift, i.e. individual ‘empowerment’ is a superficial attempt to re-orientate contemporary and historically loaded power differences.

Furthering this line of inquiry, Povinelli (2002) asserts that within a liberal multicultural context (her focus is in Australia) there are limits to the acceptance that minority and/or indigenous peoples receive. Indeed she writes that the bodies and practices of Aboriginal Australians are ultimately ‘repugnant’ within mainstream Australian society. Their difference as indigenous peoples will always be marked, which suggests that no matter what Aboriginal people do, the degree of their
integration into white culture, or their appropriation of ‘whiteness’ will never result in them being fully accepted. The degree of their recognition will always be measurable (and so thus never equal), and difference is constantly being defined through daily practices which are manifested in small or large acts of discrimination. The structure of ‘white’ liberal society can only stretch so far, and this reveals the ‘cunning of recognition’ for minorities who struggle against these limits of their acceptance in the wider society.

A critique and counter critique of indigeneity

Adam Kuper (2003) has been the most vocal in opposition to the use of indigeneity as he argues that its use is merely another term for ‘native’ or ‘primitive’, and therefore that it carries associations with being ‘backward’. For Kuper, indigeneity does not address the imbalances between groups as it treats some groups as more deserving of assistance than others. He highlights that cultural distinctiveness is central to indigenous claims, yet draws attention to some groups who consider themselves to be culturally distinct, and who claim autochthony but who are excluded from claims as indigenous, such as Afrikaners in South Africa (see for instance, Seldon 2014:17–21). Kuper notes that the discourse of indigeneity hypocritically engages groups in reifying themselves as ‘primitive’ while at the same time as more special or deserving than others. For Kuper, indigeneity advocates for a separation that is similar to the policies of Apartheid South Africa and to right wing agendas.

Kuper’s (2003) argument is based on some of the undeniable complexities of indigeneity, such as the disjuncture between indigenous identity narratives and lived realities, like the claim for land by Native Canadians who live in suburban areas of the city (Povinelli 2002: 13). This disjuncture runs through my work in the lives of the San who have higher education and who live in towns, as their daily actions appear to contradict their ‘indigeneity’. An example of this was when I was giving a lift to a self-proclaimed San advocate, who told me how important meat-eating was to San
people. He told me about the sacred rituals around hunting and eating meat. There were certain dances, he told me, that San perform when they kill an animal in order to give thanks for that food. It was important to him that he explained this to me as he particularly accented the sacredness of hunting and eating.

With that, he promptly instructed me to pull over at the side of the road so he could buy himself a can of coke and ‘fat cake’, a common roadside snack made by Tswana-speaking non-San people. A fat cake is deep fried bread and is much like a European doughnut, but without sugar. This was certainly not meat, the sacred food he was just telling me about, and although there is a ‘ritual’ around the cooking and eating of these common belly-fillers, there did not seem to be much in the way of ceremonial feasting here. Given the weight he had just conveyed towards the sacredness of eating in his words just before we stopped, guzzling this fat cake and slurping down a coke made it easy to think of this as highly contradictory. Yet for him, there was no contradiction in engaging in this kind of consumption while at the same time advocating for San based on ‘traditional’ and sacred aspects of life.

Here my assumption that San leadership would be consistent with the ‘traditions’ and cultural practices that founded the claims they made, was shaken and so later in the year I suggested to this same man that there was a disconnection between what San advocates say and what they do. He told me that ‘this is something that we are working on’, suggesting that this was not the first time this had been mentioned to him. Building arguments for recognition based on identity politics that rely on the practices of, for instance, sacred feasting, can be easily misunderstood when being espoused by contemporary indigenous actors who claim to speak on behalf of their people, but who do not necessarily carry these traditions within their daily lives. Kuper’s position on this is that this disjuncture between narratives and practice delegitimises the indigenous rights movement.

However, this seems rather flippant on (both my part and) the part of Kuper. The history of indigenous people is one in which powerful others have actively discriminated against indigenous people based on race, subsistence,
location/territory and language. Now at a time when there is support for small populations of people to make claims against oppressors based on the same delineations, Kuper has decided that the use of these terms of discussion is unjust. Indeed, my own initial reaction to the fat cake experience above reveals the cunning of this kind of argument, yet delving deeper it is clear that framing the struggle around identity will always bring this issue to the surface. Here are the limits of identity politics, where the framing of the debate is at the same time its limiting factor and one that can be used against those making claims as it is used to positively make claims in the first place (Francis and Francis 2010).

Alcida Rita Ramos writes in response to Kuper’s (2003) critique of indigeneity:

His discomfort with the term “indigenous” is understandable, but to say that its usage by “the indigenous peoples movement” is a euphemism for “what used to be termed ‘primitive’” is to blame the conquered for the conqueror’s bad language. (Ramos’s comment in Kuper 2003: 397)

Blaming indigenous rights campaigners and indigenous peoples themselves for using the international frameworks to fight for their own rights ignores the broader systems of power that created a need to use such a category. Kuper’s argument suggests that we should not be using indigeneity at all, however ignoring politically significant differences between groups is problematic as it ‘sustains minority group oppression by hiding it from view of the power relations that privilege some’ (Dick 2011:24) over others. So rather than suggesting that all claims are illegitimate, it is best to think about indigeneity as:

a political term that encompasses all those whose ‘histories, habitats and lifeways distinguish them from dominant ‘national’ populations’, and it is an identity that ‘provides people with a way to defend local cultural practices and worldviews through political mobilization. (Levi and Dean 2003:8)

Historical imbalances mean that indigeneity and rights are a practical and political necessity as they build strength and power for otherwise relatively small and powerless groups to make claims. San, like other groups in Africa have drawn inspiration from the definition of ‘indigenous’ as a political and legal category (Pelican and Maruyama 2015: 49).
However, using normative identity politics as a framework is not the only way to make claims. Other minority group movements, such as the Black Consciousness movement in the USA, emphasised redefining black and ‘blackness’ in positive ways to emancipate black people from slavery as historically black was identified with being ‘bad’, ‘unholy’, ‘dirty’ and ‘worthless’. San struggle to emancipate themselves from what some San call their ‘colonisation’ by Tswana people (also see Nthomang 2003), in which they are viewed as lesser than the majority.

The effects of being structurally and socially positioned as ‘inferior’ runs throughout my entire thesis. For instance, in Abraham’s story Mpho’s superiority was marked, and in Chapter Three Tshidiso will talk about ‘losing himself inside himself’ while at school as he had to learn someone else’s language and culture as his was eradicated from use. Chapter Four will focus on a young San woman’s internalisation of inferiority through Grace’s story. In Chapter Five language mixing will be seen by some as the only way forward, suggesting a sense of defeat and inevitability of the kind of society that will come. Yet for others, the use of Naro language is a form of resistance, revealing how being positioned as ‘inferior’ helps to shape the actions that are manifested. Chapter Six will reveal that the main issue that women face is not being allowed to continue the practice of female initiation due to the school withholding permission for the girl to leave school. In all of these experiences the influence of being valued as inferior is wide reaching, and although there are resistances to this dominant structure, there are other times when the negative effects of the pressure that San are under are revealed in the assimilationist ideas that San hold and the values that they seek for themselves. There is often a sense of moving away from their past, towards the future and this process means, for many, to reject many aspects of their cultural past and to reach towards a ‘normal’ Tswana way of life. In Chapter Seven Khanx’a feels he has to ‘prove’ himself to non-San by raising cattle and being educated and employed. Here we see how San are actively seeking to be recognised by non-San in institutions of work and education, which suggests a movement away from the valuation of San institutions and education.
Minorities are measured against a normative perception of humanity, and for anti-colonial writers such as Fanon, normative perceptions of ‘whiteness’ become internalised within the consciousness of oppressed black people. The black person becomes alienated from both their society and their own body as the outside white world and their own perceptions of themselves in relation to this normative ‘whiteness’ are discordant with their own body and experiences as a black person.

Some parts of the indigenous movement seek to value indigenous cultures and practices over others in order to change the idea that indigenous minority practices are less valuable. Potentially this could be seen as ‘dangerous’ by those who the status quo serves as they reject the ‘relations of power and cultural codes that support their oppression’ (Dick 2011:24). So where these movements are heard the most easily, e.g. as Kuper points out in advocacy NGOs such as Survival International, more ‘radical’ assertions are used and these are often articulated in essentialist terminology. Steven Robbins agrees that mainstream activists often essentialise their ‘clients’, although he notes that this is ‘without necessarily discrediting their political projects. Indeed, such rhetorical strategies often make for effective activism’ (Robbins 2003: 398). For Robbins more radical positions are needed in order to make an impact.

So it is not that Kuper does not have a point, and indeed the ‘naked protest’ above raised questions about how Abraham’s appropriation of essentialist notions of San culture as ‘naked’ would be read and understood by non-San in the safari vehicle. Yet what is missing from Kuper’s theoretical argument is the lived daily struggles for indigenous people – that is, the ethnography. In reappropriating symbols that are used to negatively stereotype, as we heard through Abraham’s eloquent voice on the game drive, San are like other minority groups who can take a degree of control over the production of meaning. There is action led by international ‘indigenous’ movements, and there are also on-the-ground forms of action that people partake in every day. The latter draws on the experiences of collective suffering which has been identified as part of an indigenous identity (Niezen 2003: 13). This thesis is concerned with everyday, mundane actions and experiences, rather than the exceptional
experiences of San who for instance, present in UN fora and contribute directly to the international discussions about indigenous people. This work provides a rich ethnographic contribution that reveals why international assistance is sought in the first place, and what it is like to live in situations where the cultural, linguistic and social value of your group is undermined on a daily basis. This thesis presents ethnography that oppressed, occupied and/or colonised (indigenous) peoples around the world could identify with.

**Representation and minority elites**

A politics of identity has shaped current debates and is the focus of new social movements all across the world (Dick 2011:24; Sökefeld 2008:18). While the trajectories of each movement are particular in their own context, what emerges is the reification of identities that relate to class, ethnicity, religion, race and which intersect through language, culture and gender. These politics reproduce themselves as both dominant and non-dominant groups often engage in the same challenge – to define themselves according to a set of characteristics that have come to symbolise their identity.

Minority or indigenous elites’ positions are often contested as being ‘inauthentic’. Eisenburg and Kymlicka (2011:4) have warned us about the ways in which ethnic minority elites can manipulate cultural projects and that the politics of identity and recognition can potentially entrench existing intragroup hierarchies as members seek to silence and encourage particular ‘authentic’ behaviours over others:

> societal elites and ethno-political entrepreneurs aimed to construct identities that strengthened the group’s loyalties within and redrew societal borders by infusing…a sense of exclusive belonging. (Ágústsson 2011:81)

Identity politics requires a positive identification of the characteristics and traits of a group, and so anyone not displaying those particular characteristics can be deemed ‘inauthentic’ and can become ostracised by the group. This suggests that the projects of minority elites might have more to do with the interests of the elites who are...
pushing the campaign than with the fate of the minority group. For instance, Ágústsson (2011:84) goes on to write, ‘it might be possible for elites to label their own communities as outsiders themselves in order to strengthen in-group attachment and identity, and thus strengthen their power base’. ‘Authenticity’ can be used to strengthen group cohesion, at the same time as bolstering stronger in- and out-group relationships which help to strengthen the hierarchies of elites within these minority groups.

A broader question that links to a rights discourse is also evoked here:

Does the recognition of indigenous rights really enfranchise a ‘people’ or does it benefit a small elite?...the emergence of the new indigenous movements was related to....internal differentiation among indigenous peoples and...the rise of a new generation of indigenous intellectuals. (Salman, Puig, and van der Haar 2014:254)

Minority elites may feel ‘emboldened and encouraged to exert pressure on their members to respect tradition’ (Eisenburg and Kymlicka 2011:4). Indeed elites may silence critics internal to the group who are seen as disloyal and thus internal hierarchies are entrenched. It can also create separatism through an ‘us and them’ mentality, as anyone who does not show certain characteristics is shunned as being ‘other’, and as being unqualified to comment on the characteristics of the group, as they are ‘outsiders’. This mentality often hinders groups from drawing on commonalties with other groups who may experience very similar forms of oppression, as the focus is only on particular aspects of the group identity which excludes others, for instance focusing on San puts less emphasis on being part of a wider group of minorities in Botswana.

There is also a risk of co-option, whereby elites within the minority group may be co-opted to work for the government. They are given token positions of power and prestige that hide underlying issues of assimilation and exclusion of the minority group (Eisenberg and Kymlicka 2011: 5). This can undermine the needs of the group through foregrounding the rights and achievements of individuals. Yet since ethnic minority elites are those who bear a different culture from the majority population, their difference is often noted as issues to do with cohesion are common. Gowricharn
notes that even when minorities are culturally assimilated, their descent still acts as a barrier to their full integration within the broader society. Skin colour is one way in which difference is noted and although it can be neutralised to a certain extent through education and behaviour, minorities are still set apart from the majority.

San experiences of identity politics and cultural difference are set within the context of minority and majority politics in Botswana. For those who are part of a minority group, an inability to challenge interpretations oppresses them as their sense of worth, self-esteem and overall individual and social identities are violated (Ghosh and Abdi 2004:25–26). In order to break from the social stigma associated with being San in Botswana, San negotiate their minority position which is messy and full of multiple concerns and voices. San redefine their own minority identit(ies) in relation to the majority groups and so:

By examining the collective representations of social, political, economic, and cultural boundaries as refractions of domination, struggle, negotiation, accommodation, reciprocity, and resistance, anthropology now plays an integral role in exploring the politics of cultural identity as a means for comprehending, reproducing, and transforming social relations. (Levi and Dean 2003:28)

There is a need for public institutions to acknowledge cultural particularities (Gutmann 1992:5), yet the onus is often on ‘those who are different to cross the distance between their realities and the dominant consciousness’ (Ghosh and Abdi 2004:26). It is San themselves who take on this project, rather than the non-San majority. My work is with San whose voices and political action cross this distance, and whose experiences are not confined to domination, though neither are they removed from broader hierarchical structures as Abraham’s ‘naked protest’ demonstrates.

A theoretical question that is rooted in minority debates and the politics of recognition concerns liberalism. A liberal discourse foregrounds an equality-of-rights framework. This was evident in the opening vignette in the ways that members of the safari group articulated a liberal value to everyone’s equal right to education. Within
this liberal rhetoric, group claims based on identity can be rejected as everyone is supposed to be the same, or at least ‘no different from us’. Kuper (2003) has argued that claims for granting special circumstances to people who assert a distinct cultural identity favour one group over another and are anti-progressive and illiberal (Kuper 2005:207). Indeed, we noted earlier in this chapter that Povinelli (2002) has highlighted the conundrum within liberal states to maintain sameness alongside difference.

However, I contend that the demands for recognition of particular groups come from a need to ‘secure cultural context to give meaning and guidance to their choices in life’ (Gutmann 1992:5). There is a need to address poverty, discrimination and prejudice, and until indigenous/minority voices are heard in all areas of state and national structures, this is unlikely to shift. The recognition of and support to maintain cultural distinctiveness is part of the obligations of liberal democratic states. The power differentials that have historically marginalised and discriminated against certain groups can be addressed through policies and projects that make dispensations for particular groups over others.

**Power, recognition and voice**

Voice as an analytical tool helps to address anthropologists’ concerns with power and representation as voice is used to ‘speak back’ to structures of power (Feld et al. 2004:342). Often it is powerless groups whose need to have and claim voice is most pertinent and this is reflected in investigations about how, for instance, the ‘subaltern’ speaks (Spivak 1988). Indigenous groups have often been in positions of less power in which they want and need their voices to be heard, and San all over southern Africa express sentiments of powerlessness (Hays 2002:76). Minority and indigenous peoples often need and want to be heard/to be recognised so that lawful, social and political mechanisms might be able to ‘right’ the ‘wrongs’ that maintain systems which they are often at the bottom of.
Voice is relational and indeed having and claiming one’s voice often emerges in situations where a person or group needs to be heard or recognised by another often more dominant group or person. The broader social and political relations between groups affect the way in which voice can be used. The way we speak, our voice, is an expression of collective social, cultural, religious and political identity (Weidman 2014:43). Voice reveals and reproduces societal structures and social and political identities that are stratified through class, ethnicity, gender and age. Language carries symbolic power, and Bourdieu (1991) has shown it is through actions, behaviour and language that social position is negotiated. Power in relation to social categories is constantly being created and recreated culturally and symbolically through an interplay between the agency of actors and the structures in which they are embedded.

Issues of voice relate to power and hierarchy, or as Keane (1999: 272) says, ‘articulations of macro and micro scales of power’. Hirchman (1970: 30) has defined ‘voice’ as:

Any attempt to change rather than to escape from, an objectionable state of affairs, whether through individual or collective petition to the management directly in charge, through appeal to a higher authority… or through various types of actions and protests, including those that are meant to mobilize public opinion.

Here voice is ‘various types of actions’ which suggests that it involves what is said as well as what is done (speech and action). Social stratification, in part, affects the way in which voice is used, and Hirchman (above) also suggests that voice can be defined as part of a power struggle with those ‘below’ using voice to raise concerns ‘above’ in order to change a situation.

Using ‘minority’ voice in ‘majority’ spaces

This thesis deals with, as Povinelli (2002) writes, the complications of minorities being part of a broader social network, in which there are competing ideas about how to act. Competing ideas come when minorities are required or expected to
‘authentically’ perform their alterity, while at the same time engaging in the broader economic, social and cultural aspects of the society (Povinelli 2002:3). In this case the minority group is also an indigenous group, yet in the national context their status as indigenous is unrecognised, and recommendations from international indigenous peoples’ policy recommendations, such as the ILO 169, have yet to be ratified in Botswana.

In relation to indigenous groups, or indeed minority groups, being heard often goes hand in hand with becoming confident within non-indigenous/dominant spaces, and using voice (speech and action) that is outside the context of indigenous/minority communities and the indigenous social rules. The political and socio-economic systems of those in power often seek to quieten, disqualify and delegitimise indigenous/minority voices in order to maintain the status quo – whatever that might be. The emergence of indigenous/minority voices might be seen as a danger to the functioning of society, while at the same time, in becoming heard, indigenous voices might be ‘diluted’ or ‘de-indigenised’ and undermined as they seek appraisal from non-indigenous majorities. For instance, Povinelli (2002:3) writes that indigenous Australians were at risk of feeling - in their words - ‘silly’, as they were unable to reconcile the competing obligations from indigenous and non-indigenous social-political orders. However, while for indigenous San in Botswana there was not a discourse about ‘silliness’, there was a discourse about being ‘lost’, or of ‘losing oneself’, which suggests that there are also difficulties here with dealing with similar kinds of competing pressures to be and identify as being different, but fitting in with Tswana culture too.

Reconciling competing obligations is particularly acute for people who are obliged to present and perform an authentic culture in a broader and ongoing set of negotiations which are based on identity politics. For instance, Povinelli (2002: 13) writes that there are ‘instances of…fundamental and uncanny alterity….for example land claims by indigenous people who dress, act, and sound like the suburban neighbours they are’. She goes on to write that often ‘indigenous persons struggle to
inhabit the tensions and torsions of competing incitements to be and to identify differentially’ (Povinelli 2002:13). To identify as being different becomes a political assertion, and being different leaves one open to ridicule.

Recognition: Being heard

Recognition is a key aspect of indigenous and minority peoples’ movements and goes hand in hand with voice as it is concerned with the reception of voice or in other words, the way that voice is heard. Indigenous people experience a fundamental need to define themselves after sustained and historical discrimination against them. I investigate recognition on a societal level, on the level of everyday interactions that are suffused with experiences of marginalisation. How do San make themselves heard on a daily basis, within everyday interactions with non-San?

Although my focus is on recognition on a societal level, recognition is often used to discuss economic and structural injustice and for instance, Saugestad described issues relating to recognition as involving ‘unequal distributions of power’ and interventions to achieve distributive justice (Saugestad 2004: 35- 40 cited in Sylvain 2014:258). Struggles for recognition are often framed around how minorities can gain state recognition of rights to self-determination, resources and cultural protections (Sylvain 2014: 258). Recognition is often legal, and is about making claims for indigenous peoples’ land and their access to water, amongst other things, which is more generally about legal access to human rights.

Yet when there have been economic reforms that have seemingly ‘aided the cause of autonomy and cultural rights’ (Salman, Puig, & van der Haar 2014:5) they have:

in actual fact restricted the opportunities for a more equitable access to resources and power, making ineffective whatever promises about self-determination had been made. (Salman, Puig, & van der Haar 2014:5)

Salman, Puig, and van der Haar (2014:292-293) write that ‘redistribution and recognition’ are not mutually exclusive, and that an examination of both can be
productive in thinking about the intersection between ethnicity and class. Similarly, Sylvain (2014:258) convincingly argues for ‘sincere’ projects of recognition that move beyond only achieving redistributive goals, i.e. those that seek not only to rebalance wealth, but also to take the project of the ‘genuine recognition’ of identities seriously. The ‘rights’ discourse is tied to indigeneity as the main structural framework that is used within the international forums to affect (legal) changes, and many scholars have used this framework as the basis of their work (cf. Hays 2011; Hitchcock, Sapignoli, & Babchuk 2011; Lee 2003; Solway 2002). Yet in this work a ‘rights’ discourse is held in the background as the thesis closely interrogates the perspectives of San as they navigate their interpersonal relationships with San and non-San. While some San do draw from the indigenous rights discourse, most orient themselves in more national or local contexts and points of reference. This affects recognition in so far that we move from thinking about recognition of rights, to thinking more broadly in terms of recognition on a societal level: moving from thinking about law to thinking about interpersonal relationships.

**Recognition and identity**

Charles Taylor (1994) outlined how recognition is important as it is related to identity, which he defined as ‘a person’s understanding of who they are, of their fundamental characteristics as a human being’ (Taylor 1994:25). According to Taylor, identity is ‘partly shaped by (mis)recognition or its absence’, and that: ‘non-recognition or misrecognition can inflict harm, can be a form of oppression, imprisoning someone in a false, distorted, and reduced mode of being’ (1994:25). Identity for Taylor is not only constructed from within ourselves, but also through a dialogue with others. Identity is always referential where the meanings given to identities are made in context with others. Recognition by others is a necessary aspect for all human beings to fully realise their own identities.
However, as subsequent critiques have pointed out, constructions of ethnicity, race, or national identity do not take place in a cultural vacuum, as a result of the political manipulation by unscrupulous elites. They are successful because they latch onto a historical, cultural context which gives them an emotional resonance (Geschiere and Jackson 2006: 3). Hence my insistence on the historical contingency of these imaginaries.

Identity is central to indigenous peoples’ struggles across the world as defining people as indigenous can allow them to access leverage for their human rights, via indigenous rights. While ‘blood and soil’ are the key ingredients for essentialist claims to identity, for constructivists, all identities are imagined and are historical and so are in effect fictive, mutable and vulnerable to deconstruction (Field 1999:195). However, this is not to say that socially constructed identities are any less ‘real’, or as is pertinent in indigenous debates, ‘authentic’, but rather that they are intimately linked to wider processes, and are multiple. For instance, Butler (1990:6) writes about (gender) identity:

If one ‘is’ a woman, that is surely not all one is; the term fails to be exhaustive, not because a pregendered ‘person’ transcends the specific paraphernalia of its gender, but because gender is not always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts, and because gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual, and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities.

Lee (2003:99) writes that for San there is ‘an ongoing attempt to find their place in…society’, and that there are racial, class, ethnic as well as internal divisions to navigate. This supports Butler’s perspective about the diverse nature of identity construction that is rooted in historical and social processes. Moreover, there are also multiple layers of marginalisation and so to not recognise the difference between groups is to deny the different ways that San experience discrimination in relation to other ethnic minority groups. My work articulates various components of identity that are part of social being (Levi and Dean 2003:28), for instance ethnicity, language and culture as well as educational level, which all contribute to the formation of identity for San.
Egalitarianism

Within scholarly work a foundational characteristic of San sociality is egalitarian social organisation (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011: 51; Lee 1982: 53-54; Tanaka 1980: 94; Woodburn 1982). I initially approached my work by reacting against this claim as I viewed it as fuelling a romanticised ideal of hunter-gatherers as pristine people. However, during the course of my work I have reconsidered my position, and in this thesis I question what egalitarianism might mean from the vantage point of voice. It is noticeable that egalitarianism is often conceptualised based on economic and exchange practices. I contend that a focus on voice requires consideration of political, rather than economic aspects of egalitarianism.

There is no single theory that explains egalitarianism in all of its forms and theories do try to accommodate variability within egalitarian societies (Kent 1993; McCall and Widerquist 2015:22). However, often central to the idea of egalitarianism is the absence of ranking or stratification (Tanaka 1980: 93), which contrasts with centralised political organisation that is dominant in formal political office in contemporary nations. Egalitarianism is thought of as being found in all aspects of society, for instance ‘generalised reciprocity’ (Sahlins & Banton 1965) and sharing possessions (Tanaka 1980: 94), food consumption (Marshall 1976: 295-303; Wiessner 1982), a universal naming system in kinship (Barnard 1978), levelling techniques or ‘reverse domination’ (Boehm et al., 1993), and a leadership style that humbles the leader. Egalitarianism is sometimes associated with basic human societies and links have been made to animal behaviour (for instance see Boehm et al. 1993; Tanaka 1980: 152-3). Links have also been made between egalitarian practices and risk management mechanisms (McCall and Widerquist 2015:23, 26; Wiessner 1982), in which food sharing and the *hxaro* system were central to maintaining cooperative relationships.

Discussion about egalitarianism often starts with a reference to James Woodburn’s (1982) seminal paper in which he focuses on egalitarianism in ‘immediate return societies’, which includes San. The basic characteristics of
egalitarianism offered by Woodburn (1982: 345-445) and which have been widely accepted are:

1. Mobility and group membership flexibility.
2. Relatively equal access to potential means of coercion.
3. Relatively equal access to economic means of production.
4. Sharing.
5. Intolerance of material accumulation.
6. Exchange of material objects.
7. Lack of political authority or leadership. (McCall and Widerquist 2015:27)

There is also literature on egalitarianism in ‘delayed return’ societies (e.g. Riches 2000), where delayed return societies are those in which there is a return for labour over time or where valuable assets are held and managed in way that ‘has similar social implications to delayed yields on labour’ (Woodburn 1982: 432). Woodburn writes that delayed return in hunting and gathering systems include four main types of assets:

(1) Valuable technical facilities used in production: boats, nets, artificial weirs... which are a product of considerable labour and from which a food yield is obtained gradually over a period of months or years. (2) Processed and stored food or materials usually in fixed dwellings. (3) Wild products which have...been improved or increased by human labour...wild food-producing plants which have been tended and so on. (4) Assets in the form of rights held by men over their female kin who are then bestowed in marriage to other men. (Woodburn 1982: 432-433)

For Woodburn, delayed return systems are not egalitarian to the same extent as any of the immediate return systems. Therefore, the contemporary economic, social and political relationships that San are engaged in, including reliance on wage labour or dependency on government to buy food from shops, poverty, as well as increased sedentisation, expanding group sizes (more on this below) and different experiences and success rates in terms of access to education, language and work, suggest that we can question the extent that egalitarianism is being maintained.

Egalitarianism is not a ‘natural’ human state, but rather it emerges in societies that maintain social checks through pressure on those who stand out to share, or help each other out. These mechanisms that maintain an egalitarian society are strict, and
as such societies have been described as ‘fiercely egalitarian’ (Kent 1993: 290, Lee 1979: 244). There is a need for constant vigilance by members to make sure that the values of ‘egalitarianism, cooperation, sharing, reciprocity, generosity, [and] sociability are maintained, while at the same time, the individual’s personal autonomy and fulfilment are safeguarded’ (Guenther 1999:56).

Gulbrandsen (1991) has noted that the practice of ‘fierce egalitarianism’ shifts when former foragers become sedentary, and when foraging practices are no longer the main way in which the society operates. When groups become sedentary in villages or settlements, the accumulation of property is no longer constrained by a nomadic lifestyle (Cashdan 1980: 116). However, Kent notes that it is not being sedentary that shapes egalitarianism, but it is also employment practices:

it is not the fact of being sedentary per se that is altering women's egalitarian status with men among the !Kung and Nharo…but the assimilation of new ideas about work and gender from their agro-pastoralist, Bantu-speaking neighbours. (Kent 1993: 491)

For many scholars then a shift from foraging alongside sedenterisation marks a move towards a delayed-return system, dependence, a loss of autonomy, and more broadly this suggests a society that might be less egalitarian than an immediate return system.

The literature suggests that sedenterising reduces egalitarianism, and that increasing community size (Dunbar 1993) may require an additional organisational structure from outside the community, rather than coming from within the community’s own societal structure. San now live in larger village structures where a different set of organising principles can be observed than in previous ethnographic accounts of smaller-scale egalitarian societies.

Formally nomadic groups of San are now sedentary and engage in and depend on non-foraging forms of subsistence. For instance, Draper (1975) writes about Ju/'hoansi in Ngamiland District and Guenther (1979) about Naro in Gantsi District as ‘Farm Bushmen’ who have been sedentary for even longer than Ju/'hoansi. Naro San have been in close relationships with white farmers, Herero and Setswana speaking people for a long time. In particular, the village where I spent nine months
was D’Kar, which has a very close road link (40km) to Gantsi town. The village also houses a missionary church and an NGO headquarters, and so the traffic of people from international places has been relatively high in comparison with other Gantsi settlements and villages. D’Kar and its residents have been exposed to ideas as well as structures and institutions that come from delayed return societies.

Katz, Biesele and St. Denis (1997) show that the trance dance is integral to the potential to heal social and emotional pain. This is crucial in reliving the emotional pains of living in a strongly egalitarian society and any threats to reciprocal systems are mitigated through healing rituals and so restore social harmony. However, Guenther (2005) notes that recent commodification of this dance has ‘occurred in tandem with the decline of sharing practices’ and that this has undermined the maintenance of egalitarian social systems (McCall and Widerquist 2015:32). This suggests that commodification of this dance, which mirrors a general shift towards tourism and other wage labour dependency, suggests a move away from egalitarianism as the healing practice no longer functions with the same purpose.

However, Barnard (2004) notes that ‘fierce egalitarianism’ for sedentary San is not contradictory. He notes that the flexibility and adaptation of San societies is reflected in this process:

Khoisan systems of thought possess contradictions like this; these contradictions are what makes for flexibility and adaptation. This…is…a good reason to see the transition to settled existence as one which makes use of principles inherent in Khoisan thought and not one which is simply antithetical to Khoisan life. (Barnard 2004: 10)

Barnard helps us to think about cultural history alongside contemporary shifts and changes, and alerts us to the idea that although there might be accumulation there may also be ‘egalitarian’ practices too.

However, based on his observation that parents beat their children, something that is specifically noted by le Roux (1999) as being absent from San egalitarian social life, Khanx’a (who we will meet in Chapter Six) claimed that he does not see egalitarianism in San communities. In D’Kar, a report (Bollig et al. 2000) suggests that
the community has been stratified and non-egalitarian in social structure for a while. Part of my thesis supports the claim that although D’Kar is ‘weakly egalitarian’ as they lack ‘any major differences between individuals in terms of material wealth, social status, political power and coercive authority’ (McCall and Widerquist 2015: 28), some San research participants are not practicing egalitarianism. They differentiate themselves from other San, for instance through the use of the English language or through being ‘established’ with a house, a wife and family (Chapter Seven). Hierarchies are part and parcel of the ways in which contemporary San societies are organised, and are also part of how San self-identify, and to a large extent the levelling techniques in terms of redistribution of resources and the limitation of social status do not coerce these San advocates to conform to expectations of egalitarianism in terms of their economic and political activities (McCall and Widerquist 2015:28).

The analysis that I make throughout this thesis is open to the possibilities of social change, and focuses on those who embrace change towards delayed return values, more than some of their San contemporaries. For instance, in Chapter Seven Cgase talks about intentionally wanting to ‘break out of the shell’, and seeking things outside of the village. This suggests the acknowledgement of a desire to move away from his cultural past, which may include egalitarian practices, towards a system that is part of the culture of the majority population in Botswana. However, at the same time Chapter Six suggests that there are also practices of egalitarianism that are ongoing within San communities and through specific performances of culture, such as the dùù (female initiation), egalitarian practices are being maintained.

I contextualise these changes within the broader theorisation of egalitarianism to raise questions in relation to indigeneity, identity and the use of voice. Voice is particularly interesting as its use is often understood within a framework of competition that is outside an egalitarian ethos of equality and conflict avoidance (Chapter Four). Being outspoken is an important part of the role of an elite indigenous advocate, but moreover using voice is more than speaking out, and also encompasses
everyday action. Yet as advocates work in the realm of politics, there is an added element where these advocates are looking to be recognised, not by their own people - those people they are claiming to speak on behalf of - but look outwards (to Tswana-speaking people) to validate and legitimise their voice. Ultimately the recognition of their voice rests with non-San, which serves to reinforce the power hierarchy that maintains the majority/minority position in the first place.

In a two-fold way, this is challenging. Firstly, in trying to become heard San voice (speech and action) has to change so that Tswana–speaking people can recognise it as something legitimate to listen to. However, the paradox of this action is that San voice is not recognised with the same weight as non-San voices, regardless of the sound, quality or content of that voice. Secondly, by changing the quality, sound and content of the voice so that it can be recognised means making changes that employ aspects of another cultural identity in order to gain legitimacy. In doing this the identity carried by that voice is, to a greater or lesser extent, silenced from its public expression. Like this there is a ‘dilution’ of the minority voice and the extent of the alternative identity that it can carry is compromised as it must fit in with majority ideas of what is acceptable. In relation to egalitarianism, a changing voice means moving towards non-egalitarian modes of talking and behaving which although might be noticed more by people outside, will also change the tone, quality and message being communicated through that voice.

**Voice and egalitarianism**

Voice, as we have already suggested encompasses both speech and bodily action. The body also shapes voice in how it sounds, what it looks like, the clothing being worn, linguistic style, accent, as well as where the body is while speaking and who the audience is. Voice is linked to recognition in that recognition is about hearing voice. Again, here it is about the way in which the audience can see and hear the speaker and what kinds of social, political and cultural efficacy that voice carries. This
relates to the dominant and non-dominant ways of speaking, acting, looking and sounding, which tends to eradicate non-dominant voice. Indigeneity and what it means to make claims for recognition in the legal rights domain is as much about looking and sounding ‘correctly’ indigenous in order to be heard/recognised within these fora, as it is about the experience of being marginalised outside these fora. For indigenous voice to carry weight, it is to be rooted in experiences of socio-political and economic marginality. At the same time the rhetoric of cultural uniqueness runs alongside this. These two key markers are used by indigenous actors to make claims internationally and nationally.

Leadership is a central characteristic within egalitarianism where acephalous leadership (having no leader or chief) is used as a term to fundamentally frame these societies (Leonhardt 2006:91). An egalitarian political structure has been equated with anarchism (Barnard 2004). In relation to leadership and decision-making, Biesele and Hitchcock (2011:51) write that decision-making and leadership for Ju/'hoan has been linked to land, resources and kinship:

This means that hereditary “owners” (kxaosi) or stewards of n!oresi [resource areas] have collective decision-making and conflict-resolution powers, and family groups have claims to specific nlore areas through their relationships with the “owners.” (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011: 51)

However, the need for political organisation and leadership has emerged, especially with regards to relationships with outsiders, which have often been tense and fraught in issues including land and wealth, but also with issues of autochthony and indigeneity (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011; Leonhardt 2006).

The Ju/'hoansi have a strongly entrenched ethic of not speaking for others and insist on including everyone, young and old, in the loop of communication in order to avoid hard feelings. They also feel strongly that to minimize possible mistakes in judgment on the part of a few people, the larger the number of people involved in decisions, the better. Thus, the one who leads best is actually the best facilitator of group decision-making. (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:117)
Making decisions in this egalitarian society means hearing all voices and coming to consensus-based decisions (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:5). This means giving space for all voices.

Boehm et al. (1993) write about the leadership style of egalitarian societies as being a ‘reverse dominance hierarchy’, where instead of the rank or position being dominant the rank is itself dominated by the group. Boehm et al. (1993) suggest that egalitarian systems do not oppose leadership but on the individual level have a ‘love of autonomy’ and also hold group values or ethos highly so that, ‘difference between individuals is only permitted insofar as they work for the common good’ (Godelier 1986, pp.109–110). As such, Boehm et al. (1993) ask when does the reverse domination hierarchy reach systemic breaking point and assume an orthodox form?

Competitive behaviour is at odds with egalitarian societies, and the person who stands out becomes a target for envy, jealousy and hostility (Tanaka 1980: 112-113). This point has been a concern that surrounds formal education for San, as formal schooling fosters and supports competition which undermines and compromises values within an egalitarian society (Hays 2002: 70). My thesis partly focuses on leadership as many of my research participants were ‘San advocates’ who were not necessarily ‘egalitarian’ in the way that they led - their position was not dependent on the society deciding their role, and many were self-named advocates who imagined themselves in their own particular role. These San advocates took a stand, and did so out of their own desire to stand. This kind of self-aggrandising action was what used to be stamped out using ‘levelling techniques’ which were the social checks and ramifications that this kind of behaviour was curtailed by (Lee 1969).

We know that often those who have the ‘loudest’ indigenous voices are indigenous ‘elites’, who also have the most contested voices. Elites often straddle ‘modernity’ as associated with non-indigeneity and ‘tradition’ as associated with being culturally unique and ways of life that are no longer available (hunting and gathering) and are otherwise excluded from other forms of subsistence practices or wage labour and formal education.
Voice is particularly interesting as it is often set within a framework of competition that is outside an egalitarian ethos. Being outspoken and speaking in the right way to the right people is an important part of the role of an elite indigenous advocate. Yet as advocates who work in the realm of politics, there is the added element of recognition. Elite advocates are looking for recognition not from their own people - the people they are claiming to speak on behalf of - but look outwards, e.g. towards Tswana-speaking people, to validate and legitimise their voice. In a two-fold way, this is challenging. Firstly, in trying to become heard San voice (speech and action) has to change so that Tswana-speaking people can recognise it as something legitimate to listen to. Secondly, a potential issue noted with recognition is that often there is a limit to the recognition given. Being recognised can sometimes involve changing voice so that the audience can ‘hear’ it better, yet this does not guarantee recognition.

Moreover, San indigenous elites are often concerned with ‘speaking out’ and being the ‘voice of the voiceless’, and to make a stand against the dominant rhetoric and to address the long historical system that has held San in a perpetual state of economic and political powerlessness. Yet the notion that San are inherently ‘voiceless’, is used by some elite San advocates in order to position themselves as the conduit for that voice, and to speak on behalf of other San who they see as not speaking for themselves. Yet what we have already learnt about the way Biesele and Hitchcock (2003) have positioned Ju/'hoansi San as having ‘a strongly entrenched ethic of not speaking for others’, then this speaking on behalf of, even if it is San actors doing the speaking, still maintains a hierarchical, rather than egalitarian structure.

In Chapter Four I will discuss an incident where Grace’s aunts told me off for being overtly outspoken towards a woman in Gantsi town who was in my view unnecessarily nasty to my San friend. I was told by my friend’s aunts that this was not the way to behave and that it was better to be calm, to keep quietly to myself and to allow people to behave badly without telling them anything. She explained that this is what they do in these situations. I was told off as my reaction was not part of
how they wish to act in the world, and they did not want me to be doing that either. I never did it again. The way I dealt with that confrontation was not, in their eyes, the correct way to behave. This suggests that San avoid confrontation.

Yet simultaneously voice, which addresses the conflict between San and non-San, is currently being led by San who ‘speak out’, which is to do things quite differently to how their parents and grandparents behaved. Conflicts are not always peaceful and there is evidence of violence between San in egalitarian societies (Lee 1979: 8; Morris 2014: 124). Hxaro [Ju] or //ai [Naro] exchange reciprocity and sharing practices are thought to have helped to avoid conflict (Morris 2014:121). Gifts were exchanged amongst hxaro partners, family, friends and neighbouring groups, and stories of gift exchange would reinforce actual sharing practices too (Morris 2014: 123). If there was unresolved conflict, San would ‘speak with their feet’ (Wiessner 2014: 14029) and would move away to join another band (Guenther 1999: 136-138) – in other words, avoiding conflict. Forms of conflict resolution involve talking – and listening – but this has not been possible within the dominant structure that supports Tswana-speaking people over and above non-Tswana speaking people.

I understand the relationship between San and non-San as being a conflict, and since talking has been ineffectual or impossible, the latter option of moving away and avoiding conflict is the preferred route for many San, which is also what places San elite advocates in a contentious position to this egalitarian ideal – they choose to be outspoken and confront the conflict situation. At the same time, this phenomenon and desire for San to speak for themselves, is set within a history where San have been spoken for by different kinds of third party actors, such as anthropologists, researchers, activists and NGO spokespeople. It is little wonder that San wish to occupy these positions themselves. So while it is not the concern of this thesis to condemn San who choose to speak out, as Adam Kuper may do, I raise points of concern and analysis about this position and the way voice is used for recognition, and I do so by rooting my analysis in egalitarian ways of making decisions.


**Gender and voice**

Literature on San is renowned for revealing differentiated, but egalitarian gender relationships within San communities (Barnard 1980:122; Marshall 1976:176; Shostack 1981). Leacock (1978) articulates an argument that different functions of the sexes does not imply inequality, and she bases her argument on methodological and ideological biases towards class-based societies with respect to classless (egalitarian) societies. Leacock (1978) asks us to reimagine egalitarian gender relations from the perspective of an egalitarian system rather than generalising a teleological and unilineal view of social evolution that assumes that all women are subordinate to men. Informal leadership served to make equal the divide between men and women. For example, both men and women could be leaders of territories (Dieckmann et al. 2014:563) and although women generally gathered and men hunted, there was no stigma attached to the inverse. San societies in the past also did not have a concept of private property and so women could not be seen as being owned by men (Sylvain 1999:39). Yet in situations where former nomads and former foragers now live relatively sedentary lives in villages, attend government schools, convert to Christianity, and engage in wage labour, how do these groups experience gender relationships? Deickmann et al. (2014: 563-564) write:

> In many aspects of their lives, San women today find themselves in positions of inequality which are a legacy of colonialism, and which position them disadvantageously compared with other, more dominant, ethnic groups.

San women have more in common with other rural women than with their forbears as the role of women diminished after San lost their land, and meant they were dependent on wage labour. Men were generally engaged in this labour, and this meant that the previous equality between women’s and men’s work was restructured around such shifts.

Yet Heike Becker (2003:6) notes that often ‘very real gender issues’ have been neglected due to ‘the myth of a timeless and coherent San society with a high degree of relative gender equality’. Similarly, Anne Soloman (1992: 232) writes that
‘insufficient attention has been paid to the predominantly negative stereotypes of feminine gender and that the notion of egalitarianism fails to come to terms with the complexities of San gender organization’ (also see Felton and Becker 1999:5). Bollig et al. (2000:97) reported that in D’Kar there has been an ‘increasing gender power differentiation’ and solidifying of gender roles (also see Becker 2003:18). This suggests that gender is an underdeveloped aspect of the studies of egalitarian societies. My work contributes to the understanding of gender through the experiences of San women (Chapters Three and Five). My research indicates that gender is an important marker that San use as part of their identity, and supports the claim that more attention needs to be directed towards building further understanding of gender in San studies, and in egalitarian societies more generally.

This is especially salient when thinking about egalitarianism alongside ‘voice’. San ‘leaders’ tend to be men. Although there were some prominent San women too, access to them was more limited. Moreover, there is a gendered aspect of the ways in which San voice carries in everyday life. This emerges in Chapter Four as there are numerous attempts to quieten Grace’s voice while she spends time in the town of Gantsi.

Of the three prominent San women who had similar educational and employment credentials as the male ‘advocates’ that I know about, one refused to talk to me, one became ill and we ceased interviews, and the other only became known to me a long time after I already knew her husband. This latter woman was working full time and was a long way from where I was living. San women were yet to occupy prominent positions in relation to public forms of representation. Female San voices are not heard clearly in the public domain. Gender is a further dimension of voice to consider throughout this thesis, as there is a gendered experience of both speech and action. Although we know that men and women have different roles, and in egalitarian societies these are meant to be equally valued. A gendered experience of public voice may add to or even re-orientate what we know about egalitarianism and gender.
Research Questions

The overarching question in my thesis is: How do San experiences of misrecognition help us to understand voice and egalitarianism? Within this is a set of research questions that this thesis sets out to answer:

   a) How are San voices being heard and recognised?
   
   b) How do San mediate between a public perception of who they are and their own self-representation?
   
   c) How do different groups of San—young, old, advocates, community leaders and community members—position and identify themselves in their own communities and within the wider Botswanan society and culture?
   
   d) How do San negotiate their relationships with non-San?

Chapter outline

Chapter Two continues from here and contextualises Botswana in relation to its history, economics, and politics and also in relation to its population. In Chapter Three I discuss the research process, which highlights the political contentiousness of working with San. This emerges from San themselves, and from the broader structures in Botswana. Moreover, I outline ‘San issues’ which were the pervasive problems that San themselves identified and are the focus of attention for San ‘advocates’. I also reveal some of the critiques and expectations that researchers face when working with San, showing how San are working from past representations, and are wary of researchers. The chapter exposes the position of San as being ‘inside’ academia but only in so far as being a ‘subject’ (and therefore in a particular power relationship), and I suggest that some San narrate their own position as powerless within this structure. The broader set of power dynamics between researchers and ‘the researched’ are revealed and discussed in this chapter, bringing into focus the
issue of representation and voice in the research process but also revealing how pertinent voice and representation are to San themselves.

Chapter Four begins in D’Kar village where many San are part of both village life and town life. In this chapter I follow Grace, a San woman, who balances education, work, kin and her leisure time and I focus on ways in which a female San voice is silenced when Grace is not allowed to speak or express herself in non-San spaces. I focus on the discrimination that San face in everyday life in nearby and ethnically diverse Gantsi town. The chapter orientates the thesis in terms of understanding what discrimination is, and what is at stake for San. I focus on the overlapping relationship between ethnicity, language, gender and social hierarchies. I begin to unpack the particularities of San identity and relate this to egalitarianism. Grace’s family members suggest that confrontation is not how they wish to approach the challenges in their daily lives, which follows an egalitarian model of conflict resolution. The difficulties for a public San voice are revealed alongside the lived experience of being a minority group in Botswana. Although all San struggle for recognition in society, this chapter suggests that women may face different types of discrimination that also needs to be accounted for.

Botswana’s majority/minority politics are reflected in language policies and in Chapter Five I understand language as symbolic of these wider politics. The chapter is framed using language ideologies as it maps the history of the region through language. It suggests how language ideology and power use are mapped to one another, and how this shapes whose voices are heard more easily. Language is often used as a marker of difference and it is part of how San use voice in their struggle for recognition. I focus on Naro-speaking San in D’Kar, a multi-lingual village, and reveal the competing perspectives that San hold in relation to one another, to organisations and projects in the village, and to national policies on language. The chapter also contextualises Naro language in relation to other Khoisan languages and it historically maps NGO efforts to promote Naro. I focus on the tensions around how language should be used, and in which contexts. I draw out conflicting ideas about
language use where it is seen as a practical form of communication, the carrier of identity, as well as a tool of defiantly resisting attempts to subordinate San voices in Khoisan languages.

In Chapter Six I focus on marginalised people who are often thought of as victims of acculturation, instead actively producing their culture through a female initiation. This is riddled with seeming contradictions as a young woman is able to have her initiation as well as stay at school. I draw on key symbols, including the eland, clothing and ‘fatness’ to show continuities from the past. Yet changes to the practices in the initiation seem to reflect the broader experiences of San who, in lacking voice in the broader society, have incorporated cultural symbols of the dominant groups in Botswana into the initiation. Clothing signifies a different set of ideas as the bodies of women in the initiation were more likely to be covered with clothing than their grandmothers were when they were young and undergoing initiation. Here the initiation was an event in which young women’s voices reveal changes in attitudes towards traditional practices. At the same time, the effects of being ‘voiceless’ in the broader society emerged as this was the first time that a San family was given permission by the school to initiate their child. Outside the village we learnt that San women’s voices were ineffectual, ignored, or sharply extinguished (Chapter Four), while here inside the village women’s voices are heard, respected and affect change. However, more broadly this chapter raises questions about who benefits from San political action, as it reveals the tension between being culturally distinct (initiation) while also participating in the wider society (school).

In Chapter Seven there is a focus on the San voices that are publically heard/visible externally to the San in-group. It is the voices of San men who have education and employment and who travel outside of the village and are ‘advocates’ both in terms of being role models for San as well as being the ‘visible’ and ‘acceptable’ face to non-San. I explore San masculine ‘modernity’ through employment, education and the travel of San who live in Gaborone and other places beyond the village. This is in response to San who are moving away from a marginal
position and are perceived as ‘inconvenient’ (Saugestad 2001), or who are seen as ‘children’ who are not full persons. Rather, these San present themselves as ‘modern’ and capable people in that they are knowable and recognised by the government. They are shifting the boundaries of possibilities for San as they have jobs, education, and narrate their lives as a series of choices. This chapter moves beyond Chapter Six by mapping how San imagine and narrate their own projects of becoming socially prominent people. San use their voices for political action, while also making a living. San are redefining their own limits and here employment, travel and being a spokesperson are tied into affiliation and membership within the church.

Although these men are making changes to what San can achieve, at the same time they are shrouding these changes in rhetoric that mirrors the dominant ideologies about language, education, marriage and employment. As ‘advocates’ with intentions towards gaining recognition, to what extent does ‘proving’ themselves in this way change their voice to distort, co-opt or ‘dilute’ their ‘San-ness’. Ultimately, even with a show of skills associated with Tswana-speaking people, San still have very small pockets of society where they are accepted, recognised and respected. The main place that San find they have a voice is within their own communities as role models.

I conclude the thesis in Chapter Eight by discussing advocates. Voice, representation and recognition were all part of the role of an ‘advocate’, however there was a lack of clarity about what advocates do and what constitutes advocacy. Nevertheless, San sought to represent themselves and have their claims, identities and desires recognised by the majority non-San population and within government institutions.

The thesis will reveal that San voices are multiple and contested both within and outside their own communities. The role of indigenous elites as being the voice of the voiceless raises questions. First of all, when voice is used specifically for the purpose of recognition, the speaker/actor is already in a particular position of power – that of being a recipient of another’s acknowledgement. This means that their voice
is subjected to being orientated within the acknowledger’s framework for understanding the world. Secondly, in order to be heard more clearly or loudly the speaker naturally gravitates towards doing, being and sounding in ways that the audience can understand. Ultimately voice then shifts to being more aesthetically pleasing, more ‘likable’ to the audience. While this is often how interactions between humans are, for San this shift in voice is what they describe as part of a struggle for their own recognition, as in changing their voice, San explain that they ‘lose themselves’ by ‘speaking another person’s language’. Many San are worried about losing their culture and want to maintain their language and traditions (Chapters Five and Six). Yet those San in the public sphere who are politically leading this struggle do so using the same frameworks that are critiqued by San for being oppressive and marginalising San voice, suggesting that the hierarchies that have served to supress San voice in the past might be re-produced by San elites.
Chapter Two

Context of Botswana

In the previous chapter I theoretically contextualised the thesis and in this chapter I extend this to include the broader context of Botswana. The particular historical and socio-political position of San in Botswana is multifaceted and includes national policies in independence which have helped to frame the relationship between the state and its citizens. Policies about land and language highlight and cement an ethnic ‘majority-minority’ divide, which lays the foundations for a hierarchy of ethnicity in which San are placed at the bottom.

From independence to the present day

Botswana gained independence from the British Protectorate on 30th September 1966. Botswana operates as a liberal democracy and since independence there have been democratic elections every four years. The country is predominantly Christian, and a Christian rhetoric is common in public and private spheres. For instance, prayers are said at the beginning of public meetings (Dahl 2009: 26), and members of households will talk about God, and of His kindness, and will probably also attend weekly church services (for ethnographies on Christianity in Botswana see Klaits 2010; Werbner 2011). ‘African’ beliefs and religions as well as witchcraft accusations are also common in the public sphere, though are not officially recognised by the government. Botswana is 582,000 square kilometres in size and has an estimated population of 2,024,904 (Republic of Botswana 2011a:1). The population has increased by almost two percent since 2001, which points to a diminishing growth rate (Matambo 2012:7). Botswana still has one of the lowest population densities in the world (Hanemann 2005:1).

The 2011 census reports that there are officially forty-six ‘villages’ in Botswana, each housing 5,000 persons or more. This is an increase from only twenty-
seven villages in 2001 (Republic of Botswana 2011a:2). A ‘village’ socio-spatial setting is part of a wider political structure of the tribal *morafe* (distinct group within a Setswana speaking tribe, who have a chief and a particular bounded area of land). Those who lack a permanent home village and who ‘moved around in the bush’ as San did, are seen to be similar to wild animals and are excluded from the social realm including the government, court, village life and the *kgotla* (local chiefs’ court) (Motzafi-Haller 2002:164). Within the dominant culture, the village represents a safe and ordered political space, and a way of exercising control over people through controlling the spaces where they live (Sewell 2001:68). San are brought into village centres yet are deprived of any social status when they get there (Motzafi-Haller 2002:164). This suggests a continuation of a dominant ideology that villages are ordered spaces that are under the Tswana chief’s control, and that San, regardless of whether they reside there or not, are not ordered, and are not welcome.

Botswana has a young population, with approximately thirty-five percent of people below the age of fifteen (Republic of Botswana 2009:7), and a life expectancy of fifty-four years (Republic of Botswana 2009:7, 10). Free provision of antiretroviral (ARV) drugs has helped to reduce the HIV/AIDS rate, although nineteen percent of the population between eighteen months and sixty-four years old still live with this virus (Statistics Botswana 2013:4).

Botswana boasts the world’s largest inland delta, a vast area with surface water, as well as the savannah of the Kalahari. The Okavango Delta, which became a UNESCO World Heritage site in 2014, is located in the north of the country and the Kalahari is spread across two thirds of the country to the west and into Namibia (Government of Botswana 2009:267). The most densely populated areas are located in the east where the soils are more fertile. In the west of Botswana is Gantsi District, where the majority of San live, and this is where I spent nine months of my eighteen months of fieldwork (Figure 2).
In 1962, Ngwato leader Seretse Khama set up the Botswana Democratic Party (BDP). The party won the 1965 election and have remained in power ever since. In the 2014 elections, after my period of fieldwork, opposition parties formed an

---

5 When passing through Gantsi town three different spellings are used; Gantsi, Ghanzi and Ghansi. Even the Republic of Botswana website uses different spellings (see Ministry of Local Government 2011a), and on this map the Ghanzi spelling is used. I have chosen to use Gantsi because San participants and friends were proud to tell me that the name came from a Naro term, ‘gan-tsi’ which they explained means ‘big-bottom’, and which is understood as ‘beautiful woman’.
umbrella coalition, ‘Umbrella for Democratic Change’ (UDC), which took a record number of parliamentary seats from the BDP. Of the fifty-seven parliamentary seats, twenty-nine are needed to secure power. The UDC took fourteen seats, showing considerable voter power towards change. Although the 2014 elections are an indicator of a shifting political voice, all political campaigns are self-funded unless they are part of the ruling party, and so party politics largely remains the domain for the elite who can afford to run campaigns.

The first President, Seretse Khama (President between 1966 and 1980), set about a nation-building project centred on unity and oneness. Nation building took on a ‘majoritarian project of cultural nationalism’ (Werbner 2002b:676), that has been described as the ‘One-Nation Consensus’ which involved a process of ‘Tswanification’ (Werbner 2004:38): ‘Put simply it was a process of building a nation through the assimilation and co-optation into the Tswana state of minorities’ (Mokopakgosi 2008:298). This project favoured unity and assimilation to create a homogenous Tswana nation. Other African nations engaged in similar projects and much of the drive during this time of independence was to ‘recapture African culture and history’ from colonial governments, who had ‘mutilated and reinvented’ culture and history in their own interests (Askew 2002:13). In 1970, the President of Botswana stated: ‘We should write our own history books...because...a nation without a past is a lost nation, and a people without a past is a people without a soul’ (Parsons 2006:668). Drawing on ‘African’, and specifically Tswana, rather than European or colonial ways, this statement called for recognition of a different history and for the re-writing of books and literature within this new independent paradigm.

Yet more recently Parsons has noted that ‘history’ has been neglected in favour of ‘culture’: the President’s statement is now commonly remembered as ‘a nation without a culture is a nation without a soul’ (Parsons 2006:669, my emphasis). Kelly Askew (2002) focuses on how culture, and specifically traditional dance and music, has been used within nation-building projects. The first President of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, declared that culture is the ‘essence and spirit of any nation’ (Askew
yet Askew understands the construction of national identities in the same way as any other identity: as a shifting, dialogic process. National identities are constructed within a mutual process from both citizens and state and there is also room for ‘cultural’ performances to take on their own political trajectory, rather than following what was state-led (Askew 2002:270–271). In independence, political and national identities were re-formed and negotiated during a time of official concern with authenticity and tradition, and culture became objectified (Askew 2002:277). Music that was positively viewed as ‘modern’ culture in pre-independence was, in the newly independent Tanzania, condemned for its very ‘modernity’ and Westernization, and became undesirable (Askew 2002:276). The ideological underpinnings of the state were ‘disjunctive, fragmented, and internally contradictory’ which was mirrored in the ways that culture and music were being objectified (Askew 2002:281).

In Botswana’s project of nation-building there has been a cultural-linguistic emphasis on being perceived as ‘the same’, and like in Tanzania, state policies and ideologies also take on unexpected, fragmented and contradictory political trajectories. I worked with San, who are ‘less privileged’ citizens in Botswana, and I have noted the multiple and sometimes internally contradictory ways in which culture, tradition, ethnicity and authenticity are negotiated (Askew 2002:12). For instance, Botswana has been particularly wary of using ethnic or racial terms in state policy (Parsons 2006:676) due to the political climate in the neighbouring countries of South Africa and Namibia that until relatively recently practised Apartheid: a system of institutionalised racism (Hays 2000:28) that has become a ‘synonym for oppression, the restriction of some people’s liberty and potential for the sake of a reprehensible belief in the superiority of those with white [different colour] skin’ (Seldon 2014:19). So while the colonial government had been federal - giving different rights to different groups - in independence there was a shift towards a centralised
government whose liberal democracy extends basic rights equally to all citizens (Werbner 2002b:676).

An unintended consequence of having ‘one nation’ was the suggestion that multiple ethnicities do not exist, or as Saugestad (2001:72) writes, ‘non-racial’, which has led to the exclusion of non-Setswana speaking ethnic groups. While this helped to forge a strong unified nation and national attitude (Werbner 2002b:676), some sacrifices to the traditional structure of governance had to be made. For instance, tribal interests in land and minerals were ceded to the state to be managed for the public good, and politically the hereditary advantages of the chief were to be minimised, which affected the chief’s autonomy over the allocation of tribal land (Motzafi-Haller 2002:90; Werbner 2002b:676). Moreover, the one-nation consensus was difficult for ‘minority’ groups whose traditions and figures of authority or structures of authority were excluded from participating in the broader national polity.

‘Minority’ and ‘Majority’ in Botswana

As part of the 1933 Chieftainship Act, British authorities officially recognised eight ‘major tribes’ in Botswana: Kgatla, Kwena, Lete, Ngwato, Rolong, Tawana, Tlokwa and Ngwaketse. Only these groups have a paramount chief installed in the House of Chiefs (Proctor 1968:59–60). Although the parliament is the only legislative house, the House of Chiefs was established to act in an advisory capacity. Being represented in the House of Chiefs means having the culture and identity of your ethnic group officially recognised. Those groups who are not represented in the House of Chiefs are labelled ‘minority’ tribes and so do not have their language or cultures officially recognised. As Jacqueline Solway puts it, ‘ethnic equality is fine as long as Tswana tribes are “more equal” than others, and the Tswana language and culture are the ones to which others assimilate’ (2002:716). Thus although there is a rhetoric of
equality, this is only in relation to majority/minority politics which is the dominant structure.

Francis Nyamnjoh (2004:42) notes that there has been an upsurge in tensions and claims for sectional interests. Onalenna Selolwane (2000) linked this to the maturity of the nation which means there is no longer the same fear of destroying the national unity and stability. One of the most intense minority debates came in 2000 after the ‘Balopi Commission’ reviewed the Constitution in relation to ‘tribal matters’ (sections 77, 78, 79) (Nyamnjoh 2006:90). Specifically it addressed inequality between the majority tribes who are represented in the House of Chiefs and the lesser minority tribes who are not. Werbner (2004:45) explained how the legality of the Balopi Commission was challenged and clear sides were drawn between minorities who called for ‘unity in diversity’ - to uphold the cultural rights of minorities - and majoritarians who used a liberal ‘equality of opportunity’ rhetoric as their counterslogan. The outcome was a court case in which a compromise was settled upon. Although neither side was reported to be particularly happy, it brought the debate to public attention and showed two distinct approaches to the issue (Solway 2002:212; Werbner 2004:31, 44).

In 2002, minority issues became intense once more, this time over the relocations of San and Kgalagadi from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR). The CKGR was created by the British colonial government in 1961 on the recommendation of anthropologist George Silberbauer, who at the time was the Bushman Survey Officer and a District Administration official in Gantsi District (Sapignoli 2009:310). The purpose of the CKGR was to protect the livelihoods of around 5,000 inhabitants who were full- or part-time hunter-gatherers and small-scale agro-pastoralists (Sapignoli and Hitchcock 2013:66). However, in 1988 the government began ‘encouraging’ inhabitants to leave the CKGR, and pressure was increased in the late 1990s. Reports suggested underhand tactics, such as turning off the water supply, which forced people to move in search of drinking water (Motlogelwa 2015 b). In 2002 the government increased efforts and tipped over water
storage tanks, halted food deliveries and withdrew the remaining social services (Julie Taylor 2007:3).

In 2002, some CKGR residents fought a court case against the government for unlawful removal of citizens. In 2006, these residents won the right to remain living in the CKGR. However, this has been a victory with limited success since ongoing issues have arisen. For instance, while claimants have been granted access, their children born after 2006 and other people whose names are not on the original case do not have access (Julie Taylor 2007:5). These latter people must apply for a permit to enter for only one month at a time. Moreover, since the government has denied the people who returned to the CKGR the right to obtain water, it makes it very difficult to live there (Sapignoli and Hitchcock 2013:62). The story and their fight continue to the present day.

The case of the CKGR relocations is symbolic of the San struggle in Botswana and much of the recent literature about the San political (and legal) struggle has been about the CKGR (Hitchcock et al. 2011; Pelican and Maruyama 2015; Sapignoli 2009). The CKGR court case drew media attention and raised awareness about San both nationally and internationally. San have the backing of the United Nations Indigenous Rights Working Group and international advocacy NGOs such as Survival International. Other minority groups in Botswana do not have this kind of international support. Attracting outside support has brought negative international attention to the country, which is deemed inappropriate and even unpatriotic by many Batswana.

The Kalanga and Yeyi have also formed strong cultural organisations, and have pushed for linguistic and cultural revitalisation and preservation of their cultures (Solway 2002:723). However, Werbner (2002a:680) writes that the San struggle has tested, ‘perhaps most severely, the very limits of social justice and democracy in Botswana’, as their struggle has been more contentious and has impacted on the image of the nation more than the struggles of other tribal groups. Other minority elites in Botswana have had more success in terms of raising
awareness of their struggle. Kalanga have built a robust structure of institutions that support their language and culture. This has in part been successful due to the long history of relative wealth and high levels of formal education for Kalanga. Kalanga elites are also part of the political elite in Botswana which puts their minority claims on a different scale of potential success than San whose relative wealth and formal education is low. That is not to say that Kalanga minority claims have been met fully, though it has meant that these claims come from a more powerful place, and are more likely to be heard, though not necessarily accepted and put into the constitution.

The CKGR is a complex case that highlights government-led discrimination against San in relation to land, and a sinister aspect to the relationship between San and the government as mistrust shapes both sides. For instance, in 2011 residents of CKGR boycotted the national census, as they were upset after being excluded from voting in the national elections in 2009 (Bushmen Boycott 2011; Gaathobogwe 2010; Survival International 2010). However, what also emerges from the CKGR case as an example of the San struggle is the power invested by citizens and the government in the legal system.

Indeed, disputes in Botswana, including minority disputes, often end up in court (Leon van de Reep 2012; Nyati-Ramahobo 2002:698; Solway 2002:723), as the law serves a basis from which to make claims. Pnina Werbner’s (2014) book on the Manual Workers’ Union in Botswana illuminates the depths of the functioning democratic system in Botswana. In 2011, there were massive government-worker strikes with five public service unions joining together. It was the longest and the biggest strike to date involving 100,000 workers, lasting more than eight weeks and was dubbed ‘the mother of all strikes’ (Pnina Werbner 2014:17). The strike played out in court, which follows this long tradition of Batswana ‘living their lives in courts’ (Gulbrandsen 1996:105) and builds upon a widely documented history of Batswana accessing the court system (Comaroff and Roberts 1981; Kuper 1970; Schapera 1938, 1956).
The government eventually defeated the Manual Workers’ Union after not meeting the demands for a fair cost-of-living wage, however the discourse in and around the strike took a moral trajectory: the government was seen by the public as being immoral and as not living by the ‘national values of dialogue and kagiso (peace and harmony)’, and, ‘failing to recognise the plight of the low paid’ (Pnina Werbner 2014:224). Here, well-organised, passionate and bureaucratically knowledgeable citizen groups legally mobilised against the government. This demonstrates the seriousness with which the national principles are upheld by ordinary citizens who are determined to protect Botswana’s ‘...tradition of democracy, freedom of speech and egalitarian values’ (Pnina Werbner 2014:205). During 2011, there were other cases of government corruption brought to public attention, further supporting the value of transparency and accountability in Botswana.

The government workers’ strike took place during the first few months of my fieldwork and illuminates the context in which claims continue to be made in Botswana - through official, lawful channels. Almost two decades ago, Hitchcock and Holm (1993:305) wrote that the domination of San has been structured through the bureaucratic state, and as such ‘survival’ in this context means building political organisations that can confront these structures. Today, the strength of Botswana’s legal/bureaucratic system still informs the perspectives taken by San actors who work within these systems to affect change. Knowledge of and a desire to work within the current system is highly desirable, if not essential, when making minority claims in Botswana.

**Language policy**

Officially there is a dual lingual policy in Botswana, although the population of Botswana is multilingual (Batibo 2005:1–3), i.e. there are many languages spoken by the population. The eight majority tribes in Botswana speak dialects of a Bantu language that are collectively known as Setswana (see first entry in Table 1 below).
These dialects are intelligible to Setswana speakers. Setswana is the ‘national language’. Everyday life is carried out in Setswana, for instance in shops, when visiting government offices or at the post office and it is used as the language of instruction in schools. English is Botswana’s ‘official language’, which is used in formal written governmental and business dealings and at some official events. English is taught in schools and academic assignments and exams are written in English. Language signifies social and ethnic hierarchies in Botswana, whereby minority groups speak non-recognised languages.

Languages not officially recognised by the Government of Botswana are represented in Table 1 as ‘no status’. Non-recognised Bantu languages include Kgalagadi (Shekgalagari), Mbukushu, Herero, Yeyi (Shiyeyi) and Kalanga (Ikalanga) which are spoken by people who are non-San (see Table 1). These languages and the corresponding ethnic groups occupy a more dominant position in relation to San. However, linguistically and ethnically these groups are still perceived by Setswana speakers as being hierarchically lower than the eight main Setswana speaking tribes.
Table 1 labels non-recognised Khoisan languages (i.e. languages spoken by San) as ‘Sesarwa’, a Setswana term that ignores the diversity of languages actually spoken by different San groups. *Sesarwa* is the term used for any languages which are distinguishable through the ‘clicks’ that are evident in speech. The use of this term is indicative of the difficulties in identifying and representing San voice in Botswana.

Linguists delineate three Khoisan language families: Khoe-Kwadi, Kx’a, and Tuu (Table 2). The Naro speaking San population is the largest group, encompassing nearly twenty percent of all San who mostly live in Gantsi District (le Roux 1999, chapter 2, page 8). The participants in this Ph.D. research predominantly speak Naro, G//ana, G/wi or Khwe in their homes. However, San often speak a number of languages alongside their ‘mother tongues’ including Ju and Nama but also Afrikaans, Setswana, Herero, Kgalagadi and English (see Chapter Four). So although San are heterogeneous where each Khoisan language group represents a different ethnic and cultural group, they are often viewed as homogenous and are treated as such in Botswana.

I have demonstrated how San are represented differently depending on the context. For instance, internationally San are regarded as ‘indigenous’, although nationally they are seen as a ‘minority’. Moreover, although they are heterogeneous, they are often understood as being ethnically and culturally homogenous. This alerts us to the complexities of representation and identity for San and the following section focuses on naming as a way to further reveal difficulties in the politics of identity for San.
Throughout history, San have been named and grouped by outsiders, and the terms Basarwa, San, Nqakhoe, Bushman, Khoisan, Khoe, Khoi, Kua, Khoekhoe and Hottentot have all been used. ‘San’ is an overarching term that denotes former hunter-gatherer communities and includes several different ethnic groups with distinct language and dialects. In general, San individuals identify themselves according to their ethnic group, for instance Naro, G/wi, G//ana, Ju/hoan and so on, rather than ‘San’ or ‘bushman’ which are externally given terms (Dieckmann et al. 2014: xiii, 3). Apart from the terms that are given by outsiders, there are no over-arching terms for all ethnic groups of San in Khoisan languages. San individuals intermittently use both these external terms, which further complicates this issue of naming. Though this is a partial response to this complicated issue, I have decided to use ‘San’ in this thesis.

### Table 2

*Table of Khoisan languages spoken by San in Botswana, adapted from Barnard and Boden 2014:6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Khoisan language family</th>
<th>Language groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Khoe-Kwadi</td>
<td>Kwadi (extinct, from Angola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tshwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Khwe (e.g. Bugakhoe and //Anikhoe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G//ana (and G/wi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Naro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nama-Damara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hai/hom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≠Aakhoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kx’a</td>
<td>Ju (e.g. !Xun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≠/Amkoe (≠Hoan and Sasi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuu</td>
<td>Taa (e.g. West !Xoon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>!Ui (N//ng)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in this research speak these Khoe-Kwadi languages, although the dominant language spoken in the village of D’Kar is Naro (in bold).
because the research participants come from diverse ethnic groups. When I introduce each participant in the thesis I make reference to their linguistic and ethnic group.

Throughout my fieldwork I approached my research participants with this issue of naming and the question often incited a heated response which was notable from the way that their voices strained as they spoke about San. San themselves often interchangeably used Basarwa (and the singular form of this, Masarwa), Ncoakhoe, San, Bushman and Kua to describe themselves and likewise, scholars often use a combination of these terms in their work (e.g. Lee 2003; Saugestad 2001). Yet all of these terms are problematic for different reasons, and below I outline some of the issues and the accompanying images carried by the labels. In labelling and naming, the social identity of San has shifted and changed over time (Guenther 1980; Sapignoli 2009).

San is a term that originally comes from a Khoekhoe word which means ‘food gatherers’ and it has derogatory connotations such as ‘rascals’, vagabonds’ or ‘robbers’ (Hahn 1881:3 cited in Barnard 1992:8). During conversations in the field, research participants used the term San to describe themselves and to define their struggle. For instance, at the opening of the Research Centre of San Studies (RCSS), the speaker, Kuela (45, G//ana speaker), asked for audience participation to pronounce ‘San’ correctly (with what sounded to me like a longer ‘aar’ sound in the middle, S-aar-n). Another San participant, Murugan (35, Khoe speaker), said that using different names for San groups is something that ‘we will tackle later on’. For Murugan there was a greater need to build upon a unified group identity, at this time as San. So while there were some San who oppose its use, I have chosen to follow the lead of the RCSS, Murugan and Kuela and throughout this thesis I use the term San. In the future I envision that the use of group names will become more important within the struggle that will be led by San.

Khoisan is another commonly used name that was coined in 1928 by Leonhard Schultze who conducted a biometric study on San populations. For a long time it was
taken as a cultural and linguistic label and following Barnard and Boden (2014b) I use Khoisan when talking about the languages spoken by San.

Basarwa is a Setswana word that carries negative connotations towards being ‘deeper than the deep’ or people of the past. It is the term used by the government and is in common use by Batswana. It connotes people who lack ‘Tswana qualities’, for instance, Setswana language, resources, and cattle (Saugestad 2001:65). Until the early 1970s the word ‘Basarwa’ did not exist. Rather Basarwa were called Masarwa (which is in the noun class for trees, brushes, and other ‘things’). A school child suggested the change, and it was subsequently adopted by the government (Barnard personal communication). Government policy has sought to provide those who lack ‘Tswana qualities’ with things such as villages, cattle and education. However, these ‘developments’ are administered in ways that mirror the values carried in the majority Setswana speaking culture. Minority groups view these policies as assimilationist (Chebanne 2010a:91) in that they seek to incorporate and supersede minority cultural values. During fieldwork, San often framed their struggle as being between themselves and Setswana speaking non-San by whom they felt dominated. As a way to move away from a Setswana defined label I have chosen not to use the term Basarwa in my work.

Bushman is a term that has come from the Dutch word Bosjesmans. It carries with it negative connotations towards someone who is inherently living in the bush, and thus outside so-called ‘civilisation’. The image of ‘Bushmen’ has changed over the centuries ‘From Brutal Savages to Harmless People’ (Guenther 1980), and this has been linked to European and American notions of race and ‘natural man’: discourses that are bound up with colonialism and imperialism (Gordon 1992:4–6). There have been some attempts to reclaim this label by anthropologists (Barnard 2007; Guenther 1999; Suzman 1999). I dislike the use of this word because to non-San and to academic readers who are uninitiated in the plethora of literature on San and the nuances of the different names, it conjures up a derogatory image of ‘short’, ‘tribal’ and ‘backwards’
people. This conflicts with the ways in which my research participants wished to represent themselves.

Other terminologies such as Khoe, Kua and Ncoakhoe are words from Khoisan languages and are used by San themselves. When I arrived in Naro speaking D’Kar, Jude (75, Naro speaker) and his son Moses (25, Naro speaker), two key research participants, explained that they prefer to use ‘Ncoakhoe’. They explained that Ncoakhoe is a Naro word that means ‘red people’ (plural) but is also used in the singular, ‘red person’, and it is a term that encompasses San from all language groups and geographical locations. However, this term was only used by those who are part of the Naro linguistic group, and moreover, some Naro speaking people disagreed about those who were encompassed. Some said it meant only Naro speaking people and not San from other linguistic groups. Since I have worked with San from different language groups and geographical regions, there are issues with using Ncoakhoe. For instance, Moses explained that G/wi and G//ana speaking Kua (from CKGR) refute that they are ‘red’, although he said it was ‘obvious that they are the same as me’. He touched the skin on his face, brushing it gently as he spoke, connoting skin tone as a marker of his identity that would back up the use of San.

For Moses there was a need to define San as a whole group by using a Naro word to do so. However, he appeared to subsume the voices of Kua who, from his perspective, refuted their ‘redness’. I could not help thinking how the negation of these different names, and the insistence of the acceptance of one overarching term, could undermine the project of self-determination. Indeed, including many voices in one harmonised identity is never easy or successful as often ‘plurality rather than unity…characterise[s] social contention’.

Though there is an assumption that ethnically and racially defined communities have an advantage in acting collectively, indigenous movements have a host of divisions and internal differences that complicate efforts to forge larger ‘imagined communities’…the process of creating…political subjects involves many thoughts, many hands, and many voices. (Lucero 2008:3)
Sometimes fragmented social movements have been more politically effective than unified efforts (Lucero 2008:4). Moses and Jude appealed to the assumption of an ethnically defined community that has racial elements to its description (being ‘red’-skinned). It was beneficial to have a unified label, yet the horizontal voices - those of other San - were dismissed, as Moses’ interpretation of Kua being ‘red’ was ‘obvious’. While no name is perfect, the overwhelming desire for many research participants to be unified through the use of an overarching term defines the way in which they imagine themselves within the struggle. Politically they can align together, standing against non-San.

**Economic growth**

In comparison to other southern African counties, Botswana has achieved economic stability. The World Bank has given it the status of an ‘upper-middle-income’ country. This economic stability has assisted the development and sustainability of the welfare system and social developments. Nevertheless, the aim has always been to privatise government provisions over time. In this section I briefly look at the three main industries in Botswana: mining, beef and tourism.

At independence Botswana was one of the poorest countries in the world (Mokopakgosi 2008:295). Many people relied on employment in South African mines to provide financial stability that could not be guaranteed in Botswana (Millennium Development Goal Report 2004:16). In 1967, shortly after independence, diamonds were discovered and the Government of Botswana has, in collaboration with the UK-owned DeBeers Corporation (collectively called Debswana), successfully profited from their extraction. Between 1969 and 1970, government revenues increased by almost seven-hundred percent (Harvey 1981:7). In 1975 the government secured a fifty percent shareholding agreement with DeBeers Corporation (Parson 1983:46, 52). Diamonds, and other mineral mining, has continued to form the financial bedrock for the government’s finances. In 2012, DeBeers transferred diamond aggregation
activities to Botswana from the UK, which means that rough diamonds are now cut in Botswana, diversifying the production base in Botswana (Bank of Botswana 2012:76).

The government has also forged strong international relations with outsiders, which have been crucial for Botswana’s coherent and sustained development capabilities (Harvey and Lewis 1990). For example, the renegotiation of the Southern African Customs Union Agreement in 1969 drastically increased the revenue from exports. International relations have also helped to secure export demand for beef to the EU market and helped to promote Botswana tourism.

By far (with a difference of P10,000 million) mining attracts the largest amount of foreign investment in Botswana, and the industry is still growing (Bank of Botswana 2012:80; Formson 2011:7). The main diamond deposits are in Oprapa in the east, although mining prospecting continues for diamond, copper, nickel and silver too. In 2011 the copper/silver mining company Hana Mining Limited was prospecting land in Gantsi District that reached into Ngamiland District, in an area that is named the mining ‘banana belt’ due to its curved trajectory across the land. A new diamond mine opened in 2012 and another two are due to open soon (Bank of Botswana 2012:65). The Gantsi town Council Chairperson during 2011 explained to me that the government was, in his words, ‘clever’, as they allowed people to live on the land but anything in the soil, beneath the ground, belongs to the state. Any individual or group claims to these resources are unrecognised, and the minerals are extracted by the government for the good of the nation. Mining is sometimes cited as the reason that San are relocated from land (Saugestad 2006:5).

Although the diamond sector normally contributes about a third of GDP - over seventy percent of export earnings which equates to over fifty–five percent of total government revenues (Government of Botswana 1997b) - in 2009 there was a

---

6 In 2011 the exchange rate was approximately 1 Pula to £0.086, or 11.55 Pula to £1, and so 10,000 million Pula was approximately £865.2 million.
reduced demand for Botswana’s ‘traditional exports’, which includes diamonds, copper-nickel and beef (Government of Botswana 2009:49). This reduction in export demand came in response to the global economic crash. The main diamond mines were closed for four months, between January and mid-April 2009, and full production was not resumed. There were also falls in export receipts from copper-nickel (-81%) and beef (-25%) (Government of Botswana 2009:49). GDP shrunk by eight percent in 2009, though the economy then picked up and in 2010 there was a nine percent growth. Between 2011 and 2013 there was an average growth of five and a half percent (The World Bank 2015).

The Government of Botswana is the largest employer in the country, employing just over thirty-three percent of the workforce. The government’s plan has always been to (eventually) privatise, but the privatisation agenda adopted in 2000 has not really materialised (Siphambe 2007:12). Nevertheless, the private sector employs approximately thirty-two percent of the workforce, including agriculture (14.1%); parastatals (3.5%); and the informal sector (16.5%) (Siphambe 2007:5).

Although agriculture is a major economic sector, the majority of rural households cannot rely on agricultural production for their survival (Motzafi-Haller 2002:56). In 2011 and 2012, between twenty and twenty-three percent of the population were recorded as living under the poverty datum line (Central Statistics Office 2011:1; Government 2012:i; Republic of Botswana 2011c). The rate of unemployment is also quite high at almost eighteen percent of the population (Central Statistics Office 2011:5). More employment opportunities are found in urban areas. Living and working in a rural ‘cattlepost’ (moraka) is for low-status people who do not have high-paying jobs. Urban centres offer more lucrative employment opportunities and residence in urban villages, rather than rural settlement areas, is associated with social order and citizenship (Motzafi-Haller 2002:135).

Setswana speaking people have traditionally been herders, and cattle are first and foremost the ‘people’s wealth’. There are between 2.5 million and 2.8 million heads of cattle in Botswana, meaning that there are more cows than people. The
largest meat-producing area of the country is Gantsi District and it is estimated that seventy-five percent of all beef for export to Europe is produced there. Most Batswana own at least one or two heads of cattle. Individual and family wealth is often measured locally by the number of cattle owned. Cattle are also an officially recognised form of measuring individual wealth, or lack of wealth. For instance, the government has a ‘destitute programme’ which is available to those ‘without assets (resources defined as cattle, or other livestock…’)’ (Republic of Botswana 2010b). The label ‘without assets’ has been quantified as, ‘possessing not more than four livestock units’, or a person who earns ‘less than P120.00 (approximately £10) per month’ (Republic of Botswana 2010a). Cattle are an important marker of wealth that is recognised by both citizens and the government.

Most people keep their cattle at a cattlepost which is a rural area normally with basic amenities such as water and a drop-toilet for basic sanitation (not usually equipped with electricity). Usually a younger boy or man of the family will live there, or a hired labourer or ‘herd boy’ will be brought in to tend to the cattle daily. The cattle owner will make frequent trips to the cattlepost to check on the animals and to bring supplies as and when they are needed. San are often hired as labourers at cattleposts and though they are often allowed to use the milk that is produced by the cows, their job is low paid and holds a low social position. The government-run Botswana Meat Commission (BMC) regulates the national beef industry and the health of cattle so that they are in line with EU directives. The BMC is the main slaughter company in Botswana. In 2012, exports of beef rose by thirteen percent. The government provides money to citizens to help them become farmers, and it is thought that since Batswana have traditional knowledge of cattle, this is a good area of the economy to develop in order to ‘boost household incomes’ (Government of Botswana 1997a:37).

7 This information comes from the Kweneng District Council and Kgatleng District Council, and I assume it is the same in all districts.
Finally, a high-end tourism market has been developed mainly for safaris but also for some cultural tourism. Manufacturing actually contributes more GDP than tourism, but tourism is often cited as the third-largest industry and accounts for five percent of Botswana’s GDP. San engage directly in tourism activities and ‘Bushmen’ are a tourist attraction used in Botswana Tourism literature to attract visitors, for example:

Desert walks with the San people, who share their ancient way of life that masterfully and respectfully exploited the food and water resources of the desert. (Botswana Tourism Organisation 2013)

The image of San is used in photographs, and in Gantsi District many commercial farmers have diversified their beef industry and offer tourist lodgings and often game drives and bush walks with San. San perform traditional healing dances, story-telling, and traditional fire-making with sticks for paying tourists.

Tourism encourages a positive international reputation of Botswana responsibly managing the wild flora and fauna. President Ian Khama has made significant efforts to maintain and conserve the natural environment. For example, fishing and hunting require Special Game Licences (SPL) and in 2010 and 2011 the government restricted the number of SGLs granted. In 2014, there was a total ban on hunting. The average citizen cannot legally hunt at all and this raises concern for San for whom hunting is a ‘traditional customary right’ (Hitchcock et al., 2011:71). Trophy hunting is open for tourists who can, through certain tourist companies who have been licenced, pay between £5,000 and £50,000 to shoot an animal (Suzman 2001:50).

While San are used as part of the government’s strategies for tourism, they are also left out of opportunities to work in the sector. Moreover, tour operators have been given permission to open a lodge in CKGR, near to the settlement where San who were part of the CKGR court case live. The lodge supplies water, electricity and game drives on delicate ecosystems that paradoxically the government refused to supply to those who want to live there (Hitchcock, Sapignoli and Babchuk 2011: 77).
National principles

Botswana set their own precedent of state-provided services that foregrounded ten year universal education, and a welfare system that provides, amongst other things: a pension for those over sixty-five years old; money to households who look after orphans; and a ‘destitute programme’ that supports those incapable of working, and/or who are very poor. Five national principles are used as a foundation for the development in Botswana: democracy, development, self-reliance, unity and botho (Government of Botswana 1997a:4). They are derived from ‘Botswana’s cultural heritage’ and are designed to promote kgagiso (social harmony or peace). Botho is a Setswana word and is a:

Tenet[s] of African culture - the concept of a person who has a well-rounded character, who is well-mannered, courteous and disciplined, and realises...her full potential both as an individual and as a part of the community... Botho defines a process for earning respect by first giving it, and to gain empowerment by empowering others...and encourages social justice for all. Botho as a concept must stretch to its utmost limits the largeness of the spirit of all Batswana. It must permeate every aspect of our lives, like the air we breathe, so that no Motswana will rest easy knowing that another is in need. (Government of Botswana 1997a:5)

The Government of Botswana also adopted a rhetoric of self-reliance, as did many post-colonial governments, as a development strategy (Mokopakgosi 2008:294). Self-reliant development is driven and created by citizens who are not reliant on their government for support, but rather are self-reliant and unified as citizens. Projects of self-reliance are identified by the people and communities themselves.

The greatest symbol of self-reliance in Botswana is the University of Botswana. Batswana saw a need for the University, yet the government was unable to provide all the resources. Funds for the construction of the University were largely raised by citizens who donated cattle, thus making the University a project that is truly national (Mokopakgosi 2008:294). Botswana has been progressive in terms of the provision of social welfare and the national principles are highly valued by
citizens and government alike. The principles foreground peaceful and democratic systems of governance, alongside sustained development and equality.

A Setswana proverb, "Se ya re go tlogelwa, tsatsing se ikise moruting' [If you are in the sun, only you can bring yourself to the shade] is found on the Gantsi District Coat of Arms. Karim Myatt (2011:102) explains that this proverb was used by government officials when talking about the poverty of San and that it means:

That you should not be dependent on others to improve your current situation. The 'sun' represents poverty and danger since in the Tswana discourse it is often said that only those who are poor and powerless are out in the sun employed as herders. The 'sun' also represents a real physical danger in the summer season in the Kalahari Desert, while the shade represents safety from the harsh elements…it is the individual or community’s responsibility to leave the 'sun' and go to the 'shade.'...[the proverb] imply[ies] that the GOB [Government of Botswana] is not fully responsible for the San situation. They also implied that the San are responsible for their own current condition [of poverty].

Here we understand how self-reliance may lead to an individualisation of issues in which San could be blamed for their position.

President Lieutenant General Seretse Khama Ian Khama came into office for the BDP in 2008. His leadership blueprint was the five Ds: democracy, development, dignity, discipline and delivery. ‘Dignity’ is referenced in Charles Taylor’s (1992:27) work to highlight a modern, egalitarian and universalist notion that everyone is the same. For President Ian Khama’s office the inherent dignity of people and citizens must be upheld, ‘to work towards achieving the ideal of a dignified life for all Batswana through the delivery of sustainable economic development driven by the culture of democratic accountability’ (Motsamai 2013). The use of the term dignity can be traced back to the term honour– honour was about inequality, where some would be honoured and others would not. In this way the liberal notion of dignity is more universalist as it is rooted in the idea that all humans should be treated the same, with dignity.
San in Botswana

The people of Botswana are known as Batswana (pl.), or Motswana (sing.), and they are made up of various ethnic groups including the Kgotla, Kwenla, Lete, Ngwato, Rolong, Tawana, Tlokwa, Ngwaketse, Sarwa (San), Herero, Birwa, Kalanga, Kgalagadi, Subiya, Tswapong, Yeyi, Mbukushu, and Benderu (Republic of Botswana 2009:14). There are also a small number of people of Asian and European descent as well as people of ethnically mixed parentage. Since the Government of Botswana operates a non-ethnic policy, the census does not ask questions about tribal affiliation or language.

San are a ‘minority’ group and the estimated population of San in Botswana is 49,000 (estimated by WIMSA in Hitchcock et al. 2006:4; le Roux 1999, chapter 2, page 1, and chapter 2, page 7). In Botswana most San live in Gantsi District, followed by Central District and Ngamiland District. Many live on farms or at cattleposts (moraka) where they work as ‘herd boys’ for cattle-owning non-San. It is common for San who live in ethnically mixed settlements or villages to be dominated by and treated poorly by their non-San neighbours.

Often, but not always, San are distinguishable from other Batswana through their accent when they speak Setswana and/or English and sometimes also through their skin colouring. Bessie Head’s fictional novel, Maru (1969) sensitively depicts the social stigma and shame that being identified as Basarwa (San) carries in Botswana. It is common to hear stories of San individuals who, while in school, attempted to deny or mask their ethnic origins in a bid to rid themselves of the stigma carried within their ethnicity (see Motzafi-Haller 2002:159; Vierich and Hitchcock 1996).

Cattle are the foundation of the majority culture of Setswana speaking people. In Botswana, low social positioning comes from not being part of this majority and normative ways of speaking about wealth are described in relation to cattle. For instance, being ‘cattleless’ is to be perceived as having no wealth and therefore a low social positioning (le Roux 2002:32). Nevertheless, many San own and rear cattle, and
in 1998 in New Xade, a San resettlement area, there were two hundred and thirty cattle owned by fifty households (Hitchcock, Sapignoli, and Babchuk 2011:79). In D’Kar, a small village that is very close to the main road that connects the north and south of the country through Gantsi District, all my research participants owned cattle and the most successful development project run by the NGO was to secure communal grazing land from the government for households to keep and graze cattle. D’Kar residents have knowledge of how to look after and breed cattle as they have a long history of working on Gantsi farms (Guenther 1979:1986). There is a desire by San in D’Kar to participate in cattle rearing, and more generally San also want access to schools, medical care and water.

In villages where there are mixed ethnic groups, San are often treated badly by non-San, and so they tend to migrate to places where there is no one else to cause conflict (Motzafi-Haller 2002:158). This is a source of frustration for the government as it becomes difficult to provide services when populations keep moving from ‘orderly’ village centres. However, it is also a source of discontent for San who wish to live peacefully, without harassment and to be treated as equals by their neighbours. There has been a history of serfdom where San (and Kgalagadi) who were at the bottom of the social stratification were seen to be in a position of complete dependency and exploitation (Schapera 1930). ‘Serfs’ would often inherit the position of their parents (Motzafi-Haller 2002:159), and the relationships that the non-San majority have towards San in Botswana today maintains this inherited social hierarchy, which is a historical pattern of social exclusion. Indeed, when I moved to the village of D’Kar some San described themselves as ‘the useless people’, suggesting an internalisation of a low social position, where the ‘untruths planted within him by the oppressor’ are not eliminated from within (Fanon 2004:233), and become part of their own perceptions of themselves. For Fanon (2004:233), ‘[T]otal liberation involves

---

8 The top five population centres in Gantsi District are; Gantsi town 14,809; Charles Hill 3,591; Nojane 1,958; Tsootsha 1,848; and D’Kar 1,668. 10,044 people in Gantsi District were living outside of a village on farms (Republic of Botswana 2012).
every facet of the personality’ and so internalisations such as this are counterproductive to liberation struggles.

However, some San also advantageously used this label to gain support and help from sympathetic outsiders such as anthropologists (see Lee 2003 for strategic essentialism). Moreover, there was also an implicit level of expectation that outsiders would assist them. For the past forty years, development and advocacy agendas have frequently been led and supported by outside parties such as missionaries, anthropologists and NGOs. San have used this knowledge and labels of their destitution to garner support.

In international contexts San are recognised as ‘indigenous peoples’ and as such can appeal to indigenous rights as a key means to affect change. The rights discourse has been instrumental in bringing about changes for indigenous peoples worldwide, as the United Nations Indigenous Rights Declaration ‘acknowledged that a wide range of violations have occurred against indigenous peoples and it laid out the minimum standards for ensuring dignity, well-being, and physical and cultural survival’ (Hitchcock et al., 2011:63–64). In Botswana San are not considered as distinct from any other people in the country (Hitchcock et al., 2011:63). Botswana maintains that they do not want to differentiate ethnic groups as it would mean pursuing the kinds of oppressive policies that Apartheid South Africa followed (Olmstead 2004:836). Thus, San face the problem of how to persuade their government to hear and take seriously their plight in a context where the notion of indigenous rights has not been established. Instead of an explicit ‘indigenous’ discourse, we consider the San struggle within the context of the pervasive politics in Botswana which is structured through minority/majority ethnic groups (Solway 2002:714; Werbner 2002a:627).
San in a neoliberal nation

Like many other nations, Botswana uses a developmental and neoliberal rhetoric in the governance and planning for the country. Neoliberalism is not only an economic theory in which governments reduce their responsibility to provide public services and care for all citizens, but it is also a moral discourse in which citizens are repositioned vis-à-vis their governments (Pnina Werbner 2014:11). Under a neoliberal ideology citizens are seen as consumers and producers of goods and services.

Part of a moral discourse used in neoliberal states relates to the central place of productive work in the national polity, and education is needed in this model to produce citizens with the right skills (Pnina Werbner 2014:11). In Botswana academic achievement, employment and citizenship are tightly linked and, ‘education is unchallenged as both the remedy for the present and the recipe for the future’ (Meyer, Nagel, and Snyder 1993:455). Through education, citizens can become active members as they are ‘[i]nfused with national goals of self-sufficiency [/reliance], progress-development... and prosperity’ (Durham 2004:599), inherit the right to be upwardly mobile, and are empowered through government initiatives such as music and sports groups. Indeed, the development of Botswana is accented with terminologies that were once clearly associated with a development discourse, for instance ‘empowerment’, ‘self-sufficient’ and ‘capacity’. The wide and normative common use of these terminologies by governments and citizens means they have extended beyond the confines of development and into the vocabularies of everyday people.

Self-reliance is also part of being a moral citizen and employment is likely to offer financial stability, which increases the potential for that person to take on a social identity as an independent, self-reliant and responsible adult. For instance:

Becoming a woman is not only about childbearing, since teenage pregnancy is over shadowed by a girl’s obvious dependency within the household, her inability to manage her affairs, and her irresponsibility (of which the pregnancy was an example). (Durham 2004:594)
Here a woman is someone who can independently look after herself and any dependents she may have. Furthermore, evidence shows that this is also the case for young men (Motzafi-Haller 2002:53–54), suggesting that this is part of a normative and nation-wide process of personhood. Koreen Reece (2015) argues that ‘pregnancy and birth work first and foremost to convey a new dimension of personhood upon a woman’ although she also recognises that it is a woman’s ability to deal with ‘issues’ (dikgang), her natal family and her ‘ability to create and reconfigure kin’ (Reece 2015:174) that confer personhood too. For Reece, womanhood in Botswana is linked to the management and maintenance of intimate familial relationships that are inherently conflictual, yet continual.

A rhetoric of ‘building’ or self-making is also central in the formation of a positive social identity in Botswana. For instance, many aspire to build a brick home, rear large herds of cattle (wealth), and strive for a career, an education, as well as a family;

Through building, or self-making...people...develop moral, economic, political, social, or spiritual capital. It is the primary means through which the promise of liberal individualism (manifest in education, entrepreneurship, wage work) can be harnessed to the making of social selves. (Livingston 2005:15)

Being educated and employed are part of self-making which helps to create independent and self-reliant citizens who have positive social identities (Motzafi-Haller 2002:77). Employment can provide economic independence and stability which are valued attributes for adults (Livingston 2005:14). Many people migrate for work, and urban villages are a locus for those with money.

Many San are dependent on government welfare to provide food, clothing and support for their families and children who are in education. There is a general perception that San are not responsible and are sometimes labelled ‘childlike’, i.e. they are not responsible and self-reliant and thus have not achieved their adulthood. A San informant supported this by explaining that:
They [non-San students and staff at schools] go to the extent to insulting you and insulting your parents...you will be told “you people are useless, you see the government is feeding you, RADP (Remote Area Development Programme – a government programme) is feeding you blah blah blah”.

Khan’x’a (30, G/wi speaker), 2014

It is important for people to be seen as independently feeding themselves and their family, and to ‘manage their affairs’ responsibly. Relying upon government programmes for food, clothes and provisions brings with it a moral judgment from others. Those who are poor and/or living in poverty, or who are culturally or linguistically disadvantaged, may find it difficult to live up to these moral standards. Indeed, a rhetoric where poor people are blamed and condemned for their position is common in neoliberal states. Using self-reliance as a measure of ‘success’ and of personhood may be detrimental to those who are dependent on the welfare system for assistance.

There is a negative moral discourse about those who are unemployed and who ‘soak up’ resources through the welfare system. These people are seen as a drain on the national economy. The government’s strategic plan claims that, ‘[t]he education system will empower citizens to become the best producers of goods and services’ (Government of Botswana 1997a:7), as they will have the knowledge and skills to increase productivity and expand the economic landscape. Within this rhetoric, those who struggle in education and work are also likely to struggle to meet their responsibilities as citizens in a neoliberal state. Askew alerts us to the mutual engagement involved in order for nationalism to flourish, and thus at the same time this ‘sharedness...admits the possibility of dissension from those excluded from state activities’ (2002:12). The next section highlights some ways in which the San have been recipients of development.
Remote Area Development Programme (RADP) and NGO development

The 1974 Bushman Development Programme was renamed in 1975 as ‘the Basarwa Development Programme’ and later, in 1977, became the Remote Area Development Programme (RADP). It was initially formed to deal with the ‘difficult situation of the people who had been displaced by the development of freehold farms in Ghanzi’ (Saugestad 2001:113). RADP encompasses policy that targets poor people in ‘remote’ places. RADP settlements are identified as those which are more than fifteen kilometres from government services. Although not overtly racially or ethnically targeted, approximately seventy-five to eighty percent of all Remote Area Dwellers (RADs) are San (Hays 2002; Saugestad 2001:127; UNESCO and Leltoa 2005:1). RADP represents a particular way that the government categorises San – through a geographical, rather than an ethnic, linguistic or cultural lens. This follows policies in independence that have sought to downplay ethnic differences, and follow policies of liberal equality.

Nthomang (2004:120) writes that the RADP objective is to assist San ‘so that they can live a life comparable to that of other Batswana’, although this is attempted through settlement in Tswana-style settlements which brings its own set of issues. For instance, although RADP has increased the infrastructural development of settlements and villages in the form of access to water, education and healthcare as well as providing temporary employment, it has struggled to make actual improvements to the quality of life for San (Nthomang 2004:421). Recipients of RADP assistance have become dependent on this support which is locally known as ‘hand-outs’, in the form of food tokens that can be redeemed in local shops. Other assistance includes livestock such as goats or cattle, and school children are given food, clothing, toiletries, bedding and transportation to get to school and back (Ministry of Local Government 2011b). Hitchcock and Holm (1993:320) wrote that the top-down non-consultative and paternalistic approach of the government’s development
programmes disempowers San through their dependence on this support, at the very point where they are supposed to be empowered and encouraged.

Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) have also been involved in the development of San since the 1960s. In terms of education, the first school that San children attended was founded in 1967 in D’Kar, Gantsi District by the Reformed Church Mission of Aranos, Namibia. The Dutch Reformed Church in Africa built schools in Xanagas in 1970 and Kuke in 1977. In 1978, all three schools were taken over by the government. Other schools were started by anthropologists in Bere and Kacage, as well as in Qangwa, Kauri and Cgae Cgae in Okavango sub-district. In 1977, Botswana promulgated a new education policy (Republic of Botswana 1977) that encouraged education-for-all through the provision of free schooling (by abolishing school fees), a school feeding programme and the building of more schools in remote areas (as part of RADP). The RADP accelerated education for San and between 1990 and 1999 the number of San enrolled at schools doubled.

Now I will look at land and kinship as two key areas of literature on San that have been influential within on-going debates.

Figure 3

Enlarged map of Gantsi (Ghanzi) District showing D’Kar, Kuke, Bere and Xanagas.
Land and settlement

Much of the explicitly political research on San is centred on land, and this is for good reason as many San have been dispossessed of their ancestral lands (Hitchcock 2002, 2005; Kiema 2010; Malope and Batisani 2008; Robins 2000; Sapignoli and Hitchcock 2013; Taylor 2000). This has had a long-term impact on livelihood and subsistence practices. San have gained international recognition as indigenous peoples, and are said to have an intimate relationship with land, which is seen as fundamental to an indigenous identity. On a practical level, having land often means that one can cultivate crops or graze animals for domestic food production, or freely gather wild foods (hunting is illegal in Botswana).

Tribal Land Boards have the power to grant access to land. Although policy does not ‘officially’ favour persons of a particular tribal affiliation, San research participants explained that their applications to the Land Board are often pushed to the bottom of the pile. Only the eight major tribes have Land Boards under their name. The Government of Botswana is aware of the difficulties that San face in gaining adequate land (Suzman 2001:12), yet there are still consistent threats from the government to relocate people from villages that have many San living there (Hitchcock et al. 2011:79). In 2012 there was another attempt to relocate San from Ranyane, a settlement in Gantsi District. This was to create a ‘wildlife corridor’, although local rumours linked the relocations to mine prospecting. The government closed off the water supply to Ranyane and the Botswana Centre for Human Rights, Ditshwanelo, and British lawyer Gordon Bennet, Survival International (a UK indigenous rights NGO), and the San-led Botswana Khwedom Council have all been involved in negotiations and reporting on the situation (Ditshwanelo 2013; Lee 2013). Eventually the decision was overturned and the residents stayed, however this kind of experience helps to bolster mistrust and suspicion between San and the government.

Land remains a contentious issue for San and reveals the complexities that San face in being recognised. If San are recognised and granted land, other minority
groups will also make claims that the government would have to acknowledge. Therefore, San claims fundamentally undermine the status quo in Botswana, where the eight major tribes can, in practice though not in policy, access land more easily. Being excluded in practice from being allocated plots of land reveals the systemic prejudice and discrimination towards San in Botswana.

Research into settlement patterns has been used as a key indicator of social change, and research has shown seasonal changes in the settlement patterns of San as traditionally nomadic people (Barnard 1980a, 1986; Cashdan et al. 1983). Recent work shows that in New Xade, a resettlement village outside CKGR, G/wi and G//ana-speaking San still maintain their own manner of land and natural resource usage, despite thirty years of policies that have increased their sedenterisation (Maruyama 2003). In the Gantsi block area, Guenther (1986) described some of the key settlement patterns in relation to those living on farms, those living in the bush and those living in villages. In this area of the District, there has been less forced relocation from land, as with the case of the CKGR, though more and more land has gradually been dispossessed as it was distributed to non-San farmers. San in this area have been systematically excluded over a longer period of time, thus these San have lived in more sedentary circumstances for longer.

My work reflects issues that have largely been absent from previous research, which has been focused more on places where sedenterisation has been forced and more sudden (e.g. the CKGR). San in this region have been living sedentary lives, have been rearing cattle and goats, accessing government social services, growing small amounts of crops, at the same time as gathering wild foods from the bush for at least fifty years or more. This lifestyle potentially has more in common with other rural peoples in Botswana who also gather the wild food that is most popularly gathered by San in D’Kar, morama nuts. The biggest difference, however, was that San experience social and political discrimination that other Setswana speaking groups do not.
Kinship

Barnard (Barnard and Boden 2014a; Barnard 1976a, 1976b, 1978, 1980b) has written extensively on kinship and he notes that it is central to San sociality. He introduced the concept of ‘universal kinship categorisation’ which means that everyone in ‘society stands in a ‘kin’ (or affine) relationship to every other member of society’ (Barnard 1978:69). All those who come into contact with an individual have kin terms applied to them too. When I arrived in D’Kar, Benji (24, Naro speaker) told me ‘I suppose you have noticed that we are all related to each other’. Within a universal system of kinship the underlying structure distinguishes kin relationships as avoidance (g//ãi) or joking (lau) partners (Barnard 1992:267). Potentially all ‘joking partners’ can become lovers or marriage partners, although age is also a category to be aware of. For instance, you do not take a lover who is from another age category to yourself (Ono 2014:87). Kinship is still a pervasive structuring element within San sociality, even though the poly-ethnic and multi-linguistic make-up of the village was also apparent.

With the universal kinship structure in mind, I began to map the kin relations of my research participants, who were members of one of three largest families in D’Kar. However, I was surprised when two participants, Moses and Benji, were unable to fully explain their kinship relation to each other. Though they share the same surname and know that they are uncle and nephew, they are unsure of exactly how their birth parents are related. When I asked them further questions, I received no conclusive answers, which suggested that mapping relations was not a primary concern for them. Moses and Benji told me to speak to the elders in their family. I took their advice and asked three elderly members of their family. I mapped their family tree, though since both male and female members of the family have had children with multiple partners, the tree expanded uncontrollably, to the point where it was hard to follow.

The longer I stayed in D’Kar, the more I became aware that some young people engage in romantic relationships outside of the normative kinship structure.
For instance, in Chapter Four Grace (22, Naro speaker) refuses to marry her ‘joking partner’ and cross-parallel cousin, ‘Younger Jude’ (22, Naro speaker), as, she said, ‘he is like a brother to me…we grew up bathing together’. Other research participants also had children with non-San, suggesting a trend towards understanding kinship as part of a multiplicity of identity-making structures rather than as an elementary and fundamental organisational structure. I began understanding research participants’ kin in terms of their affective relationality and multiplicity, rather than through structural labelling.

Potentially troubling kinship relationships between those who have avoidance relationships, for instance that of brother and sister or parallel cousins emerged as well as resentments and feuds within the family network. These local public secrets, or ‘open secrets’ (Silberbauer 1981:156–157) were intimate and sometimes painful truths for those involved (Ono 2014:87). Some of my main research participants did not want me to ask questions about their own families, and some even went to the extent of distancing themselves from their given names at birth (for instance Murugan). Some told me about their family, but explicitly asked me not to write about their relationships in my work. Kinship, though potentially powerful and revealing, was not one of the main topics that my research participants wanted to discuss with me.

In my work kinship offers a window through which to demonstrate wider processes. For instance, greater and more diverse ethnic mixing in marriage is indicative of the ways in which San imagine their futures, which may be located outside of their village and ‘traditional’ kinship structure. Indeed, Takada (2015:110) understands that ‘family/kinship relations…provide[ed] a pathway across the boundary between ethnic groups…insofar that the ethical positioning of oneself and others is reconstructed’. In this way, interethnic marriages are part of how San imagine and enact their own identities in relation to others. Ethnically and linguistically mixed environments are reflected in the parental partnerships and romantic relationships that San research participants develop.
Conclusion

This chapter has contextualised San in Botswana within a political and economic history of Botswana, and has framed the structural disadvantages that San face. The policies after independence used principles rooted in neoliberal rhetoric. The RADP has been the main governmental programme that has tried to specifically engage San. The shift from taking about ‘Bushmen’ and ‘Basarwa’ to talking about ‘remote areas’ reveals a tension in the way the government wishes to handle ethnicity. Spatializing difference attempts to mask the ethnic divides and depoliticise ethnicity. Although land has been the focus of political ethnography, and kinship often roots cultural ethnographies in San, a government agenda has been to relocate San from ancestral lands to sedentary villages which are seen as spaces of order and development. A national rhetoric of self-reliance has upheld developmental efforts; however this might also be used as a way to blame those who are the recipients of governmental support. This chapter has revealed the dominant rhetoric and ideology in Botswana, and thus contextualised the way in which the government has led a top-down approach to nation-building and development. The concepts of ‘development’ and ‘civilisation’ used largely ignore San voice in favour of a dominant global discourse.

The next chapter further deepens our understanding of the political context of San in Botswana, and thus the contentiousness of using San voice. I focus on representation and research as a way of thinking about the political contentiousness, as when entering the field a researcher is faced with a number of difficulties which relate to the sensitive nature of talking about San in Botswana. Using a voice that does not follow the dominant ideology in Botswana is challenging. Moreover, San also make demands on researchers to offer ‘development’ to San communities. Some San argue that researchers have positioned themselves as the ‘voice of San’, but that it is impenetrable. However, some research participants’ convictions were to ‘speak for themselves’. In this way the next chapter shows how this thesis conducts an analysis based on an emic concept, ‘voice’, to add further understanding about the San struggle, and indeed other struggles that are centred on voice and recognition.
Chapter Three

The research process

In this chapter I describe the development of my research and I explore some of the key methodological and ethical issues around representation and voice that I encountered and how I sought to resolve them. In the first section of the chapter I describe the initial phase of investigation in which I travelled to Botswana and more specifically the Research Centre for San Studies where I was made aware of the political context and climate of research in this field of interest.

I then explore the second phase of fieldwork that I undertook in Gaborone city. At this stage I decided that a focus on university students on campus was not going to yield high quality data and that I needed to extend the research to include educated San with a level of education to ‘Form Five’, which is the equivalent of A-levels in the UK. I decided to follow the lives of ‘ordinary’ but formally educated San rather than just those in university contexts. This included church elders and community leaders and a number of young women and young men. I was learning Setswana but quickly became aware that literacy in English was a key marker of my research participants’ social position; indeed they were keen to conduct discussions and interviews in English. The early stage of fieldwork was difficult since I was unprepared for the pressure to produce and make development type projects that I was subjected to from participants and others who saw themselves as ‘advocates’ in their cause for recognition.

In the third and final phase of the research, I worked in D’Kar village where my direct engagement in everyday life allowed for a more holistic picture of ‘ordinary’ San life. One of the problems that I faced was of acceptance in the community. I undertook a mapping exercise of the village, which afforded me approval from some members of the church (see Figure 6).

This chapter reveals the ways in which San understand their position in relation to other members of society and to wider structures of power, such as
researchers/academia and the representations of San within these structures. Through a focus on the research process, it begins to unpack some of the ways in which these structures of power are negotiated by self-naming ‘advocates’. It alerts us to some of the main ‘issues’ that San face and contextualises the sensitivity of (non-dominant) San voices in research in history and legality. Lastly, it positions me, the researcher within gendered and age power relations while revealing how research is contentious for many San, and how this is negotiated through expectations and requirements of a contribution to the ‘development’ of San.

**Research participants and data recording**

One purpose of this research project is to be sensitive to the agency of San which includes the desire to be part of the research or not. This is in response to a long history of research with/on San, and also to the desires of San to be recognised and to be a self-defining group. Through their silence, made-up answers, or through their absence, San who were not interested in being part of the research made it clear. In this way the research group defined itself.

I was aware of twenty-five university educated San, and I met fifteen. This meant that they were either at university, had completed Bachelor’s (BA) or Master’s (MA) degrees, or had been at university but had not manage to complete their degree. I also met San who have completed formal education to Form Five (equivalent to A-levels in the UK). Four contacts who had completed Form Five, and who aspired to attend university had, during the period after the fieldwork in 2013, enrolled on university or college courses. The research is also informed by San who have limited or little experience of formal education, which means Form Five or less, or no formal education. I interviewed non-San including those who were working at NGOs or at the university, but also people I met during daily interactions while I lived in Gaborone where the population is predominantly a Setswana speaking, non-San majority.
I conducted many unrecorded informal interviews that were more like discussions and also some recorded interviews. During the informal interviews I took notes during or after the interviews. The way that I conducted the interviews was contextual to the person I was speaking to and for instance, in D’Kar village it was advantageous to refrain from using my notebook during the interviews. Without my notebook the conversation was more informal and I was received much more openly than with the notebook. In these cases I wrote extensive notes after the interview.

Adowa de Bruin (68, Afrikaans speaker), a white South African woman who has a long history of living and working in D’Kar as a missionary, and who initially set up development projects in D’Kar during the 1980s, agreed with and commended my approach, and explained that rigorous and rigid questioning is highly unsuccessful with San. However, university educated San and non-San, and those working at NGOs generally expected a formal interview structure and so in these cases a notebook and pen was more appropriate.

Other data were recorded as notes from participant observation, for instance from visiting homes and student accommodation, NGO workshops, sitting under trees in residential yards, taking shopping trips into town, meeting for a coffee or food, playing netball, or going to the local bar. Activities, for instance finding a house to live in were key ways through which I learnt about the relationships and structures at play. As the research unfolded and through the process of the research itself my research aims and questions emerged.

**Phase one: Pre-fieldwork trip April 2010**

**University educated San**

Coincidentally, during a two week pre-fieldwork trip to Botswana in April 2010, the Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS) at the University of Botswana (UB) was officially opened. RCSS offers academic, financial and emotional support and information for San to facilitate access to higher education, as well as promoting
‘research and teaching about the cultural, historical, economic and legal situation of San...[and] to encourage changes in the country’s...policies to become more accommodating to Indigenous and other marginalized minorities’ (Bolaane and Saugestad 2011:120). The opening ceremony was attended by anthropologists and academics, as well as San students and other interested people.

During the ceremony, a San man called Kuela gave a speech in English about the value of RCSS. He is an elder from Molapo which is in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR), and he was one of the first San to receive a BA from university. He read Sociology at the University of Namibia and graduated in 2006 (Bolaane and Saugestad 2011). His book, *Tears for my Land: A Social History of the Kua of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve*, Te’ammqoo (Kiema 2010), was available to buy at the opening ceremony. His book is about the struggles that he went through personally, but also as part of a group of people who were under pressure from the government to relocate from the CKGR in 1997 (Hitchcock 2001:63–65; Saugestad 2005:1).

Attending the launch of the RCSS and reading Kuela’s book informed my initial research intentions to work with higher educated San. A number of San were enrolled in higher education, which was a relatively new phenomenon, the RCSS was supporting them, and was officially endorsed by the government. Moreover, a body of research has focused on the high dropout rates of San school children and the high illiteracy level that proliferates throughout San communities (Hays and Siegrühn 2005:29–30; Hays 2000:28; le Roux 1999; Sekere 2011; Suzman 2001:17). What remains underexplored is San at the ‘top’ end of formal academic achievement; San who in spite of the gripping (and often crippling) challenges, have ‘made it’ and have completed degrees or are studying at a university, or college of further education.
Phase two: Living in Gaborone city

Tswanaification?

In April 2011 I moved to Gaborone and for nine months I lived within the home of a Tswana family in ‘Block 5’, an area of urban development in Gaborone (Figure 3). There was pressure from this family to be Motswana, to dress like a Motswana, to have a Setswana name and, importantly, to speak Setswana. Like other anthropologists, such as Janet Carsten (1997:6), at times I found living in this family home frustrating and alienating. My name, Jenny, was erased from use after the head of the household, Mma Lesedi (45, Setswana speaker) (literally mother Lesedi, or mother of Lesedi), quickly named me Amantle, a Tswana name meaning ‘beauty’ or ‘beautiful’.

In Gaborone I had lessons from a Setswana teacher, and I moved to a rural Setswana speaking village for two weeks of intensive language learning. Although the vast majority of social life in Botswana is conducted in Setswana, the majority of the residents of Gaborone are also fluent in English. In Gaborone, my research participants, like most Batswana, effortlessly and naturally switched into speaking English to me - there is a common assumption that white people will speak English. While I spoke Setswana, often responses were in English, yet I was still frequently reminded by my Setswana hosts to learn to speak Setswana fluently. I was being remade within a Tswanan image.

These frustrations helped me to understand in part what Werbner (2004) described as ‘Twanification’, a majoritarian project of: ‘cultural nationalism [that] left virtually no space in the public sphere for the country’s many non-Tswana cultures, unless recast in a Tswana image’ (Werbner 2004:38). When I retold my experience to San, they drew parallels with their own experiences often from school. For example, Tshidiso (26, G/wi speaker), a San student at the University of Botswana (UB), explained;
Within the school premises which includes within the hostels where students stay, students were only allowed to speak two languages: that is English and Setswana. They were forced to do that because the Setswana and English speaking students would report them and say they have insulted them when the San youth expressed themselves in their languages: minority languages. They were always punished for speaking their mother tongue.

Tshidiso, UB assignment, 2011

In later conversations in D’Kar, more San identified with the experience of living with this family, in that they too felt alienated and frustrated when they were given new Tswana names and told to speak Setswana. I realised that my time living with a Tswana family had given me a basis from which to understand, in part, what Tswanaification meant.

When I went to live in D’Kar village in January 2011, Moses, a San man, told me not to speak Setswana and having the experience from Gaborone, I quickly understood how language is part of how ethnic identities are negotiated in Botswana. Setswana carries the Tswana identity, an identity that many San have grown up next to and beneath. For some San, Setswana language is the carrier of colonisation and unequal power relationships between non-San Setswana speaking groups, and San. Purposefully not using Setswana in D’Kar distances San from Setswana speaking majoritarian ideas that are carried in the use of Setswana language.

Most San that I spoke to during this stage of my research were proficient in one or two Khoisan, or ‘San languages’, for instance Naro, G/wi, Khoe or G//ana, Nama as well as Setswana and sometimes Afrikaans too. English is a third (or fourth or fifth, etc.) language for many San, especially those in higher education who have learnt English as part of their formal education. Assignments at school and university are assessed in English and so consequently we already had a common language through which to communicate. Indeed, speaking English signifies educational level which is a respected position within Botswana. Proficiency in spoken and written English language sets some San apart from those who are not formally educated. Batibo (2005:19–20) writes that English language has been, ‘an effective tool for social distinction and the maintenance of power at the expense of the masses who, in most
Figure 4

Planning map of Gaborone, showing Block 5, where I lived with the Tswana speaking family, Botswana. Khedon Council Office and University of Botswana campus, scale 1:75000
cases, did not have the required proficiency or sophistication in its use’. Thus, San who can speak English, socially distinguish themselves from San and non-San who do not have these skills. For me, to speak in English also meant I had become part of a construction of social distinction, and throughout my fieldwork I spoke English to most San research participants. Many of my research participants enjoyed talking, in English, about ideas and concepts with me as a fellow academic.

The Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS) and the wider politics of the Research Permit

My first port of call in terms of making direct links with San for my research was the Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS) at the University of Botswana (UB). I was given clear advice by the RCSS to contact the Botswana Khwedom Council (henceforth, BKC), and to speak to the coordinator, Murugan. The RCSS expressed that BKC was concerned with political issues and that they verify research proposals, and grant access and permission for researchers to work with San. It sounded like a San-led organisation was taking charge of research access, and I was under the impression that this was part of the normal process for researchers and so I found this information inspiring. It suggested that San were in positions of power in relation to research and were making decisions about research while forming working relationships with researchers. Later I found out that this process was not as ‘normal’ as I had first thought. Here I reflect on why I was channelled to BKC rather than being absorbed into the mainstream RCSS and UB system.

I received my research permit before I arrived in Botswana in 2011, through direct communication with the Ministry of Sport, Youth and Culture. However, it was difficult for the RCSS to officially associate themselves with me after I arrived in Botswana as a new ethics review board for all researchers was introduced to UB sometime between me receiving the research permit, and my subsequent contact with the RSICC (about a four month window). Without the UB review board approval, the
RCSS might have undermined the new mandate of the review board if they associated with someone who had not gone through its process. In turn, this may put into question the validity of the RCSS as a politically neutral and sound centre of research, and thus potentially jeopardising the possibilities that the RCSS has for affecting research-based change in the future. Politically, the RCSS must make sure that there is never any need to question their validity as a centre of excellence, especially as issues concerning San in Botswana are already contentious or, as Bolaane and Saugestad (2011:123) wrote, they are ‘a very sensitive issue’.

Sensitivity around research, and especially research to do with San is high in Botswana. There is an *Anthropological Research Act* 1967 that is part of the Botswana Parliamentary Legislation, in which:

‘anthropological research’ means investigation or research of a physical anthropological, social anthropological, cultural anthropological, sociological, physiological, group psychological, linguistic, ethnological, ethnographical, or ethno-historical nature and includes research into the human geography and human ecology of any area. (Republic of Botswana 1967)

The Act goes on to state:

No person shall conduct anthropological research-

(a) by residing in, near, or among any community which is the subject of the research;

(b) by means of the questioning of informants;

(c) by means of the physical examination of individuals including the measurement of their physical traits; or

(d) by inducing persons to submit themselves to experiment,

unless with the prior permission of the Minister.

Moreover:

The Minister may refuse to grant permission under this section if he is of the opinion-

(a) that the person seeking to conduct research does not have the qualifications to enable him to do so adequately;

(b) that the person seeking to conduct research is for any other reason not a fit and proper person to conduct research;
that the nature of the research or the circumstances thereof are such as to make it probable that the life of any community or of any of the inhabitants thereof may be disrupted to an extent not justifiable in relation to the probable results of the research;

(d) that by reason of the moneys, equipment, or time at the disposal of the person conducting the research it is unlikely that the research will be conducted in an efficient or proper manner; or

(e) there is reason to fear for the safety of the person conducting research.

Finally, it states that:

The Minister may, by regulations, impose restrictions on the entry into or residence within defined areas of Botswana, of persons who are not citizens of Botswana to the extent that such restrictions are reasonably required for the better carrying into effect of the purposes of this Act. (Republic of Botswana 1967)

This Act is not a redundant piece of legislation and in 2005 Professor Kenneth Good, an academic at UB, was deported from the country under this Act. In his work, Good considered the government’s position in relation to San as well as writing about inequalities in Botswana (Good 1992, 1993, 1999a, 1999b). He was seen as a ‘threat to national security’ (Survival International Press Release 2005). Early anthropologists such as Isaac Schapera (1930) and George Silberbauer (1981) worked in Botswana. Silberbauer’s (1965) recommendations led to the formation of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR). Subsequently, the relocations of San (and Kgalagadi) from the CRGR have become a central political issue in Botswana and have become well known by the wider international public. A basic and commonly held interpretation of this in Botswana is that an anthropologist recommended action that was put into practice, i.e. setting up the CKGR, but later this was condemned on international forums and has caused ongoing damage to the national image. The work of researchers, and especially anthropologists, has the potential to be a political danger to the nation.
The CKGR became well-known, in part through international NGO involvement from Survival International, a UK-based NGO. Professor Kenneth Good was thought to be aligned with Survival International who are condemned in Botswana for lobbying for San rights in contentious ways. In 2013 there was another campaign by Survival International to boycott Botswana tourism (Survival International 2013), something that was reported in Botswana as a ‘cheap, calculated and malicious’ tactic (Survival International Press Release 2005). The boycott worked to foster a negative portrayal of Botswana, which was used to squeeze one of Botswana’s sources of GDP in an international arena. Suzman (2002:5–6) wrote:

Through using terms like “ethnic cleansing”… many [Batswana are led] to suspect that Survival [International] had a hidden agenda by means of which they intended to damage the reputation of one of Africa’s best governed states. … [the] Government [of Botswana’s] officials began to conflate the agenda of the Kalahari peoples [San] with what they considered to be Survival’s agitation. As a result, government invective concerning leaders of the Kalahari peoples [San]…became increasingly bitter.

Suzman argued that Survival International’s approach did more in the way of antagonising relationships between San and non-San in Botswana. Moreover, Survival International have been criticised for drawing on a largely racialised, primordial image of San that is difficult to distinguish from colonial stereotypes (Francis and Francis 2010:210; Suzman 2002:5–6; Sylvain 2005:354). The legacy of this approach has had knock-on effects for San, and for people conducting research in this area. Good’s experience is a case in example of the contentiousness of conducting research in Botswana with San and the interconnections with international NGOs and former anthropological researchers too.

Crucially then, the RCSS must adhere to new ethical rules and regulations as they are not separate from these wider politics either. Even though officially and legally I was permitted to be in the country, and had an approved research permit, formal association between myself and the RCSS was difficult. It was in this way that I was passed onto BKC, where I met Murugan.
Botswana Khwedom Council (BKC) was officially formed in 2008 to advocate and lobby the government for San rights so that the ‘voice of San people’ can be heard. Murugan was described by Tshidiso, a San university student who is also a ‘backbencher’ in BKC, as the ‘president’ of BKC. Khwedom is derived from Khwedam which means ‘Khoe language’ (literally Khoe tongue), and this, Murugan explained, connotes speaking. However, Murugan went on to say that since ‘khoe’ (person) is actually used in most Khoisan languages, it is being used to mean ‘San speak’, evoking San voice. Murugan described himself to me as a co-ordinator of BKC and on other online forums he wrote that he was the ‘executive director’ of BKC, and that his skills were in ‘advocacy’. The automatic signature at the bottom of his email read ‘San Rights Advocate’, though later this changed to read ‘San Rights Activist’. Working for BKC was to practise advocacy as an activist for San.

Murugan is from Mababe in Okavango district and he is G//anikhwe which means he speaks Khoe language, as well as Setswana and English. In 2011 and 2012 he was living with his San wife and children in Gaborone. During interviews and meetings, Murugan was sure to be deliberate and gaged in the information he disclosed. He often took short pauses while his brain palpably worked through what he should say (or not say). A reluctance to talk about himself in-depth created a distance between us that other participants did not foster in the same way.

Murugan and I always met in the BKC office, which was located in a new industrial development area of Gaborone (see Figure 3). There was a computer and a desk, tea and coffee making facilities, a telephone as well as Wi-Fi access in the office. I entered and sat down and took in my surroundings. As though it had once been on the desk and had accidently slipped onto the floor, I noticed a magazine by Murugan’s feet. The headline on the cover of the magazine read, ‘How to get rich quick’. I considered a previous conversation with a non-San Motswana man who had made a proposition that we set up an NGO together in order to ‘make money’. He explained that nowadays NGOs are the best way to get rich in Botswana. There are
few jobs or employment opportunities (Sechele 2011:36), and there are many people with entrepreneurial talent and thirst. In terms of a business idea, entrepreneurs can tap into the NGO market for donor money in order to make a living. This conversation resonated in my mind as I sat in Murugan’s office trying to ignore the cover of the magazine.

After talking for a while, Murugan commented that there were never photos taken of San in their offices or sat behind their desks. I agreed. I have not seen any photos of San like this, whereas there are many photos of San in the Kalahari bush or on community visits as NGO employees, or dressed in traditional leather clothes, dancing or making fires, although I had seen a few photos of San at UN and indigenous peoples’ forums. By pointing this out, Murugan draws us into an intersubjective dialogue about representation and voice. This discussion is an extension from Chapter Two where the naming of San has acted as an anchor for the complex and multiple ways that San have been represented in research and popular images. Most central to representation is that San have continually been represented by others, and have not represented themselves. San have been represented as bush-dwelling people who have an ancient link to our past as humans, and as such have been researched from the perspective of isolated, primordial primitives. They have also been represented as poor, weak, powerless people. However, Gordon (1992) and Suzman (1999) have led in inquiring how San themselves make their own histories and identities, which is something evident as Murugan was shaping his own image in front of me. Unfortunately, I did not have a camera with me to fulfil his wish.

In part, Murugan authenticated his position as leader of BKC and as an authority figure through his academic achievements. He is proud that he attended the University of Botswana (UB), where he read Sociology and Political Science. He admitted that this was not his number one choice and that he had wanted to study law. However, he conceded that there were problems with him being accepted onto that course and so he changed to Sociology. He also drew on a number of post-education accomplishments such as working for NGOs and for advocacy groups
including First Peoples of the Kalahari (FPK), a well-known local NGO lobbying for CKGR land rights.

Murugan explained that he supports and encourages San to participate in local institutions such as Parent-Teacher Associates (PTAs) and church groups so that a San voice is heard in all parts of social and political life. He spoke about the need for San to be, in his words, ‘personally empowered’ which he explained was needed first before San ‘group empowerment’. Markers of empowerment included to be educated, to stand and speak in local and national institutions, and to hold positions of employment in government and in managerial positions of NGOs. In general, being empowered was about realising the potential of an individual. Personal empowerment would lead to the empowerment of the group, as once individuals have a sense of who they are and what they are capable of, they not only act as role models for other San to follow, but they are also more likely to be in positions where they can make decisions and affect positive change for all San.

Murugan’s use of ‘personal empowerment’ may benefit from a brief link to theories of recognition. Being ‘personally empowered’ could be seen as a way of individualising recognition as being primarily concerned with self-actualisation, or the fulfilment of the self and for Axel Honneth (1995), recognition is about self-realisation of an individual. Indeed, this perspective is similar to Charles Taylor’s (1994), in that identity is individualised. Taylor (1994: 28) writes that ‘being true to myself and my own particular way of being’, or what he understands in an ideal of ‘authenticity’, is central to recognition. Similarly, Murugan speaks about realising the personal abilities and potentialities of the individual as a way to further the San struggle for recognition. For Murugan, when the individual has achieved, the group will too.

Murugan talked eloquently about different San individuals and organisations, demonstrating his overarching understanding of what was going on in Botswana. Over time though it became clear that the sphere of knowledge and influence that Murugan had was not necessarily as extensive as he expressed in these
initial meetings. Some San were in favour of BKC, yet there was also resistance as issues about how BKC operated were raised. Murugan was perceived as failing on his promises to consult San people after he was elected to a position of responsibility and given funding to undertake advocacy projects on behalf of San. In these instances I thought back to the magazine that I had seen the first time I went to his office, and wondered again about what this may have inadvertently revealed.

I sent Murugan my research proposal, and we arranged to meet. I thought this meeting would be an interrogation of my methods and ideas, and perspectives, after which the research would be verified (or not). However, Murugan only interrogated one aspect of the proposal, and that was about my contribution. He wanted to know what contribution I would be making, and what kinds of projects I was interested in contributing to. I explained that I was looking for something that already existed, and asked if he had any ideas. He had no firm suggestions about what kinds of projects could benefit from assistance.

There were no official forms to sign, or agreements to make in relation to information copyrights, research authorship, or official commitment to any particular cause or otherwise. I realised then that BKC did not have the structures in place to effectively deal with research or researchers. Murugan’s authority and power in negotiating and mediating research was sophistry. Being sent to his office was probably more to do with existing relationships between the RCSS and BKC rather than being about this research.

Challenging encounters

Often, though not always, my initial encounters with research participants began with critical assertions. For instance, Benji claimed, ‘I don’t like anthropologists’ and Moses said, ‘you will probably notice that most of us don’t like anthropologists’. When I asked further questions about why they hold these views, the main arguments were that, ‘all anthropologists take from us [and don’t give back]’, or ‘you
[researchers] write things down and just disappear without telling us what you wrote’, or, ‘people come and take our information and ideas and make lots of money from that’. As Clifford (1986) writes:

The ethnographer has shifted from a sympathetic, authoritative observer…to the unflattering figure…[of] the ambitious social scientist making off with tribal lore and giving nothing in return, imposing crude portraits on subtle peoples, or (most recently) serving as a dupe for sophisticated informants. (Clifford 1986:9)

The perspective amongst some San that researchers come, use ideas and then re-write them as their own, reflects Clifford’s observation here.

Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012:33, 164) writes that indigenous peoples feel that they are the most researched populations in the world, and that few indigenous people make distinctions between social researchers, journalists, travel writers and so on. Rather they distinguish between ‘friends’ and ‘non-friends’; who has something to offer and who does not (Smith 2012:164, 44). Murugan’s primary concern reflects this as does the suggestion from my research participants that researchers write things down and do not give back. There are expectations for researchers to give back to the community.

Part of my Ph.D. proposal was to engage in a project during fieldwork in order to show my commitment and support for San, but also so that I could take a role and position that is familiar to the wider community. However, I was aware of the troubling tendency for NGO workers and/or researchers who come in to create new projects, only to have them ‘fail’ when they leave. This was not my idea of a successful contribution. Rather my involvement must be within an ongoing project that already existed and therefore would continue to exist post-fieldwork. Through participation in an ongoing project I would understand the philosophical underpinnings of that political/advocacy/development project, which would root wider understanding of my research participants.
Although I went into the field with this intention, the reality of this task was challenging, and after nine months I had only contributed to short-term projects, such as providing transport for a visit to a community project meeting in a village, assisting NGO village visits, recording and transcribing local folktales/stories and writing reports on meetings, as well as buying and selling jewellery made by San women. Larger projects, such as building a San-owned and -run tourist lodge, were only in the discussion or planning stage, the kind of project that was too large to engage in during the eighteen months I would be there.

Although most San were aware of negotiating a reciprocal relationship with me, throughout my research the people who challenged me most directly about my contribution were those who considered themselves to be ‘advocates’ or ‘activists’. However, other San indirectly challenged me on this through the ways that they answered or approached me.

**Advocates and ‘San issues’**

Throughout my fieldwork different San research participants explained that they were San advocates. ‘Advocacy’ is a legal term that is used when the barrister pleads the cause of another in court. However, more broadly, advocacy means to actively and publicly support a cause. It is about backing, arguing for and supporting another through a process that enables people to express their views and concerns. ‘Advocate’ used as a noun means a person who upholds a cause or who intercedes on behalf of another. An advocate is a spokesperson, a campaigner, or promoter, an apostle or apologist. Using the word as a noun, as my research participants did to describe themselves, is to evoke the position of a spokesperson or campaigner. In this role, these San position themselves as the voice of the people and specifically, advocates in this context are San who are spokespeople for ‘San issues’.

‘San issues’ was a term used constantly by research participants and academics when describing the challenges and difficulties that San faced (Hitchcock
et al. 2006:11–12). ‘San issues’, or sometimes just ‘issues’, described challenges within a number of areas of social life such as education, health, sexual harassment, language, culture, discrimination, land and relocations, representation in public and state arenas, economic (poverty), dependency on the state, loss of culture, alcoholism, loss of livelihoods, prejudice and marginalisation. Although these issues involve all Batswana, frequently it was only San who raised them, and for whom these issues are perceived as being ‘for’. ‘San issues’ were largely discussed and dealt with by the least powerful members of society.

Tshidiso talked about ‘San issues’ in relation to dependency on government ‘hand-outs’ - a term that describes government provisions of maize meal, oil, bread, vegetables and other food items that were given to low income or ‘destitute’ people and ‘orphans’. He also raised concern about language in education, saying that ‘learning Setswana changed me’, and as a result, he explained, ‘I lost myself inside myself’. Murugan, the co-ordinator of BKC, shared a PowerPoint presentation with me about ‘issues’ facing ‘San education’. The main challenges to education that he raised were poverty, discrimination, ridicule from teachers, as well as language and low self-esteem.

Research participants were vocal about ‘San issues’ in different forums, including at NGO meetings, kgotla meetings, in everyday interactions as well as on Facebook. For instance, Moses posted a status update on Facebook that read: ‘Do we as San People have a say on Botswana Education policies?’, and then when appealing to his Facebook friends to comment on this, he posted: ‘How do we hold dialogue, lobby and influence education policy when we can’t even be understood?’ Moses attended meetings in national and regional forums, for instance he sat on an Open Society Initiative of Southern Africa (OSISA) round table event to speak about discrimination, language and other issues that face ‘minorities’ in Botswana. OSISA’s own website says that they are an institution that supports advocacy work that deepens democracy and protects human rights and good governance in ten southern African countries (OSISA 2014).
Advocates have a wide-reaching perspective on San issues, which links to the context and history of the region. For some advocates, like Robert (30, G//ana speaker), a university graduate, the politics of the current situation are not divorced from the wider politics in southern Africa:

The current situation [for San in Botswana] is similar to apartheid [racial segregation], where whites were making all the decisions and if you opposed you were seen as a problem, and now it is the same [for San in Botswana], you are seen as [a] problem, as trying to stop the development of government, [and] to bring instability.

Robert, 2011

This situates San advocacy issues in Botswana within a colonial discourse, or at least one rooted in racial or ethnic inequality.

Tshidiso referenced *If this is your land where are your stories? Reimagining Home and Sacred Space* by Edward Chamberlin (2003), explaining that he had enjoyed reading it. The book asks for a critical reimagining of how we engage in human lives through the stories they tell. If we listen to the stories that humans carry, and acknowledge each individual testimony we can move past the ‘us’, and ‘them’ concepts and reach ‘we’ and ‘ours’. Guenther (2006:254) highlights how storytelling is a creative medium of expression and a mechanism for personal agency, which suggests that recognising and listening to stories is to also recognise the agency and creativity of my San research participants. This book reference alerts us to part of what San advocates think about and what is important to them, to listen to their stories and to connect to our own stories through them.

Moses, a self-proclaimed San advocate, mentioned *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* by Linda Tuhiwai Smith (2012). This book asks questions about power and research ‘to disrupt relationships between researchers (mostly non-indigenous) and researched (indigenous)’ (Smith 2012:x). It is critical of Western perspectives and methods that objectify the ‘other’. For instance, Gordon (1992:217) suggests that research about San has come from a radical ‘othering’, that is rooted in a colonial and other historical context. Yet, at the same time Smith also affirms that research is important for indigenous communities, and she calls for the
renegotiation of the terms of research and encourages indigenous people to find their ‘academic voice and identity that sat well with strong indigenous identity…to develop ideas and research that would assist our development as peoples and communities’ (Smith 2012:xi). Research that is centred on the relationship between the researcher and the researched decolonises methodologies that otherwise objectify the researched. In this configuration, researchers intimately engage with and relate to indigenous knowledge and through scholarship write and produce with indigenous perspectives.

Smith (2012:10) writes that researchers must bring something that is of benefit for indigenous peoples, which is a prerequisite for indigenous research. However, what action looks like in practice is left open, as she recognises the diversity of experiences for indigenous peoples. Her book asks for a radical reimagining of perspectives towards research. It is significant that Moses directed attention towards this book as it revealed an awareness and engagement in these debates, and requires researchers to engage with them too. It brings into question a much wider and larger debate about power in the politics of research with San.

These concerns build upon an ethical dilemma that is premised on the basis of the relationship of power between the researcher and the researched as inherently hierarchical, with the power often resting with the researcher who has authority as the author. When thinking about the ‘generally awkward relationship between activist scholarship and “luxury” knowledge production’ (Hale 2008:16), the ‘research for whom?’ question is raised. This question raises awareness of the power dynamics between researchers and ‘the researched’. However, in the context of being an ‘activist’ anthropologist, what does activism mean? Charles Hale describes activist research as:

A method through which we affirm a political alignment with an organized group of people in struggle and allow dialogue with them to shape each phase of the process, from conception of the research topic to data collection to verification and dissemination of the results. (Hale 2006:97)
Hale’s definition is an all-encompassing vision of what is entailed in activist research. Moreover, he writes that ‘in some cases, it is understood that the marginalized [researched] group itself determines the direction of the activist project and… [w]hen such requirements are not met, the researcher may not be considered activist’ (Pierre 2008:117). What counts as being activist emerges in relation to and dialogue with the group who are the focus of the research.

**Opinions of researchers and methodological responses**

San advocates positioned themselves as mediators between San and researchers and their research, for instance with the case of Murugan and BKC. Here I discuss some of the common opinions that San vocalised about researchers. Some of my research participants were concerned that researchers ‘don’t recognise us in their work’. For instance two San men, Kuela and Dom’oro (34, Khwe speaker), explained how they felt robbed when their ideas and input were not recognised ‘properly’. In some cases, their names were not properly mentioned in the writing of books and work for which they feel they have been central in providing information: since they have not been recognised in this work, their knowledge and ideas have been stolen. I have addressed this throughout this thesis by citing specific person(s) when drawing from a conversation or interview, however there is potentially more to be done in order to ‘properly’ recognise research participants.

While still in the field, I asked research participants if they would prefer me to use their own name rather than a pseudonym in this research. While some agreed to the use of their real names, others did not. Many told me that as long as they were recognised somewhere in the thesis it would be satisfactory. Since there was a split decision amongst the research participants I have chosen to use pseudonyms for the majority of people within this thesis and so where I have cited the person, this is the person’s pseudonym. Some research participants are well-known public figures and when it was not possible to change their name due the circumstances in which they
were known, I have used their real name. The acknowledgements section at the beginning of the thesis thanks and briefly describes how each research participants participated and enhanced the experiences and understandings I gained during the fieldwork. It is also where I extend my gratitude to all those involved in this project, and where I recognise and acknowledge the relationships and conversations that have ultimately led to the formation of this thesis.

A further dimension within this ethnical conundrum was explained by Moses: when I am told something ‘bad’ about someone, I should never ask the name of that person. For instance, when relating stories of so-called ‘failure’, or of particular struggles of an individual, they were often told anonymously. This reminds us of Honneth’s (1995:163–164) assertion that the:

emergence of social movements hinges on the existence of shared semantics that enables personal experiences of disappointment to be interpreted as something affecting not just the individual…but also a circle of many other subjects.

So by making the story of the struggle anonymous, the otherwise fragmented experiences of personal difficulties can become the motives for a collective sense of a struggle for recognition. Like this, there are a number of stories that I have omitted from this thesis, as they do not adhere to this unwritten code. Moreover, the stories included here reflect the need to gather individual fragments of experience. In many ways this thesis can be used to understand the emergence of a San social movement, and the multiple stories, or voices that make up the collective experiences for San. Like this, pseudonyms are useful to anonymise, but having individual personalities is also part of the project of recognition.

Murugan explained that some non-San researchers have positioned themselves as the ‘voice of the San’ and that it is ‘difficult to penetrate academic work’. The idea of impenetrable academic work suggests that he sees himself in a position weaker than that of a researcher (i.e. in relation to my own position). Moreover, he saw academic work as excluding him. Indeed, accessible academic
writing is not only needed for indigenous peoples, but also to open out academic debates to many different audiences beyond, so that more people are included within the debates. Murugan’s comment reached beyond our relationship, towards a history of research, a history that, Smith (2012:89) reinforces, is imperative for researchers to address. Murugan wanted to work with new researchers who, he said, ‘know that San can do things’ themselves. Murugan asserted himself and his agenda; for research to be defined by and supported by San. Murugan’s opinion of researchers was fairly dismal. He suggested that they do not think that San can do things for themselves, that they are impenetrable and difficult. Yet when given space to collaboratively build a research programme with a researcher, he was less well-prepared, suggesting that he was not practiced at implementing changes to the system as it stands.

The opinions that Murugan had about researchers were dual-layered. First of all there is a level of mistrust. For instance, that researchers will take over, or speak for, or ‘steal ideas’. In a bid to gain control over the research process, this mistrust has developed into key sites through which research can be filtered. Yet on another level, an opinion that researchers were stronger and more powerful infiltrated this process. For instance, Murugan went on to say that researchers do what they like anyway, so at the same time as asserting himself as a person to be consulted, he also saw himself as being passive, or as being pacified within that process. Concerns about research ethics are not only concerns that the researcher considers, but are also central to experiences for the researched. Ultimately the position of the researcher was made ambiguous, as on the one hand there were voices asking for collaboration and on the other these voices were waiting to be led.

Another claim was that researchers write something ‘wrong’ and portray a wildly different reality to the reality that research participants lived and experienced. Throughout the fieldwork I reflected with the research participants about how to write and present the fieldwork. This was a way to understand how San themselves wished to be portrayed, and was part of understanding how San wish to represent themselves. For instance, I asked Kuela what he would think if I were to write about
San as ‘doing well’. He emphasised how difficult attempts to live well are, as daily struggles, and positions of material and social poverty are major disabling factors for San. He considered it a little further and said that there should be a balance, to show both poverty as well as the positive and encouraging steps that San are taking. This conversation and others like it have strengthened the approach I have taken in this work. It became more imperative that San in non-traditional roles were the focus for this work as San advocates expressed the need for diversity in ethnographic accounts. This came from a desire for representation to move beyond San as being depicted as ‘suffering’ or as living ‘traditional’ lifestyles. After all, Benji defiantly said, ‘there is nothing romantic about poverty’, a statement that critiqued perceptions of poverty and daily struggles as a ‘triumph’, while at the same time not undermining the difficulties of the situation that people actually live in.

**Being a woman in the field**

Being a young woman researcher opened many doors in the field. I was invited to attend female-only spaces, and the manner in which I have written this work reflects this access. As a result, I had a participatory experience of a female initiation, or diùì, which had previously been described from the perspective of a male observer, or by female researchers observing Ju/'hoan rituals more than fifty years ago in 1952 and 1961 (Marshall 1999:187), or from a re-enacted Naro ritual, rather than a spontaneous one (Marshall 1999:198). This ethnography makes a valuable contribution to the body of anthropological literature on San by providing details of an intimate female ritual as conducted in 2011 and 2012 in the midst of a series of questions San were asking themselves and others about their position as both ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’.

I was warned about the dangers of being a woman by San women, and I was also subjected to certain behaviours from men which the women around me were also vulnerable to. I was witness to a number of domestic violence situations against women, and also had to deal with harassment from men myself. What to some
researchers might constitute discussions of sexual abuse, to me was at times a potential threat to my own person, or to the San women around me. Being a younger woman shaped my interactions within the field and for instance in the opening vignette (Chapter One) it was hard for me to stand up to the older men who had joined the discussion about San and education, and although it was by no means abusive, it offers a small example of how being a woman changed the way in which I interacted in the field. However, this has not limited my research to women only, and many of my research participants were male. Gender is dialectic and is constructed referentially, i.e. in relation to each other. What affects men, affects women too and vice versa.

At times being a woman was not advantageous and I am aware that I was left out of male-dominated activities in the village. For instance, riding horses, herding cattle, branding cattle, milking cows, and learning about how to use the weapons that families owned. Likewise, even in the process of arranging and conducting interviews with San research participants, there were a number of gendered comments, the first being that I must be ‘the most powerful woman in Botswana’, another saying that he did not think I could have been the anthropologist that he was waiting for as I was so young, and finally I was stood up a number of times for interviews which my informant had suggested the times for. I wondered if I would have received the same kinds of comments and behaviours if I were older and/or if I were male. Like age, gender in Botswana is hierarchical and in general men are hierarchically superior to women and elders are superior to youth. While these experiences alerted me to the difficulties of conducting research, it also revealed broader more pervasive structures that shape social life in Botswana.

I was new to the field. The certainty and confidence expected of me by some San research participants, to assert my own perspective on San issues was challenging on a number of levels: being a young woman in front of older men, being new to the field and having no empirical grounding from which to make assertions, and being faced by someone like Murugan, who claimed that he was the spokesperson for San.
We faced a stalemate where I needed to collect data and gain experience in order to have an opinion, and he expected me to already have answers and suggestions for how to improve their situation. In many ways this thesis seeks to answer this expectation: it provides me with a perspective of the experiences and narrations of San self-representation in Botswana. This thesis can be understood as part of an ongoing academic discussion with my San research participants.

**Phase three: Moving to D’Kar**

While I had interviewed many San and had a sense of their concerns, I also felt I had little knowledge of where they came from and the kinds of lives their families led. I wanted to know how my research participants’ lives differ, if at all, from the lives of their siblings, cousins and parents who have had fewer years within the formal education system. More broadly I wanted to know where they came from. With the support of my Ph.D. supervisor, who came for a brief visit to the field in November 2011, I decided to move to a more localised village area.

Methodologically this presented a problem in terms of how to reconcile a new field site in relation to phases one and two. So far my research participants all had a university degree education in common. Moreover, many understood their own position as advocates for San issues. In phase three however I purposefully widened my participant base, yet what criteria would I use? Since university educated research participants were heterogeneous and had different mother tongues and were from different areas in Botswana, how should I choose where to move to? Six of my nine main San research participants, had links to D’Kar through either being from there or having spent time living and working there. D’Kar became an obvious choice.

Although D’Kar was a small village of only 1,668 residents it has had a wide draw for international visitors, ranging from social researchers, missionaries, NGO workers, international donors, biologists, ecologists and journalists. D’Kar has an
appeal to international visitors who come to look at or buy San art from the NGO art project, or to work at the numerous NGO headquarters that are located here, or come with an interest in San culture and history. There was a large San-focused NGO whose headquarters have been located in D’Kar since 1989. A hive of developmental activity in relation to San emanates from this village. Ex-NGO workers said things like, ‘oh aren’t these people so special’ and other statements which, to me, reified their identity as hunter-gatherers, healers or as resilient people living in impoverished situations.

I lived in D’Kar from mid-January 2012 until December 2012 (with a UK break from late-June until mid-September 2012). Naro is the lingua franca, and since Naro is in a different language family to Setswana, I began to learn Naro from scratch. However, D’Kar is also a multi-lingual environment and residents speak a mixture of Naro, Ju, Nama, Damara, G//ana, G/wi, Setswana, Afrikaans, Kgalagadi and/or Herero as well as English. After moving to D’Kar, a further difficulty of knowing which individuals to work with emerged. Since speaking English is a marker of being educated, which so far had defined my research group, I sought out those who spoke English. However, the NGO selected and employed San who were proficient in English, and a knock-on effect of having the NGO headquarters in D’Kar and international interest there was that residents have had more exposure to English speaking people than residents in other villages. Exposure to the English language has meant that some San who have not had a formal education have informally learnt English anyway.

English language proficiency is part of how some of my research participants articulated and negotiated their identity as distinct from San who did not have these language skills. When I said to Benji that he only liked to walk around the village with me in order to make himself look good, he laughed, and acknowledged this reality. Talking English while walking around the village made him stand out. Use of English in this research in part reflects the educational, employment and aspirational position...
of research participants. Using English is part of how San imagined themselves, and how they positioned themselves within the wider Botswana society.

**Zach: Interpreter in the village**

Since Naro is most widely spoken in D’Kar, I employed a local interpreter called Zach (42, speaks many languages), for the nine months that I was there. This meant that I could immediately communicate with a range of residents. This was useful because in the beginning residents would often shout over as we walked by their house, to ask who I was and what we were doing. Having someone who could explain this information was crucial for me to become known in the village. Having an interpreter meant that it was immediately possible to have conversations with residents, and thereby slowly build a level of trust and understanding. Other foreigners who were temporarily resident in the village during my fieldwork were less well-known by residents and this was due to their lack of visibility. Notably if they were not at work at the NGO, they would often stay in their houses, would be absent from the rest of the village and would not have the capacity to speak to people *ad hoc* in the same way as afforded when working with an interpreter.

Zach speaks Naro, English, Setswana, Nama, Ju, Afrikaans, Kgalagadi, Herero, G/ana and G/wi. He can read and write in Setswana and English and is able to write some Naro words too. When he was growing up he spoke Nama and Afrikaans, however now he explains he is better at expressing himself in Naro, as he has a better vocabulary. To non-San he is simply San; however Zach explained that amongst San in D’Kar he identifies himself as Nama, explaining that originally he came from Namibia. His father and uncles came to Gantsi District and worked on the farms and Zach grew up on these farms. Zach’s youth and way of life whilst growing up in Gantsi District was very similar to many Naro-speaking San in D’Kar. A slight variation however was that after passing Form Five at school, he was accepted into university, which is a prestigious and privileged position. Although he did his first
year, he did not complete it and instead returned to Gantsi District to work on the farms. His academic success assisted him in learning English, and Zach was proud to tell me that he has offered his services as a translator to many researchers.⁹

Nama are often seen by Naro speaking San as inferior to them. Remarks about Zach’s moral code of conduct were made by Naro residents in relation to him being Nama. One Naro speaking informant even told me that Nama are not considered San due to them being pastoralists, undercutting Zach’s belonging to D’Kar by suggesting that Zach was an outsider to Naro culture. In the distinction made by anthropologists between ‘Khoi’, who are pastoralists, and ‘San’, who were hunter-gatherers, Nama who are pastoralists from Namibia have been known as ‘Khoi’. Nama would have fallen back on hunting and gathering techniques at times when farming was not fruitful. Nevertheless, Zach’s children, wife and their shared wider kinship were Naro speakers and he was embedded within these Naro speaking networks.

Zach acted as more than just my interpreter, and during my time in D’Kar we became close as friends. Much of my time was spent with his extended kin, including his wife and his wife’s siblings, and their children and cousins. There were always many children in and around Zach’s yard, and this could include up to eleven or so children. In this household environment I asked about the meaning of everyday actions, which were being carried out in Naro. The adult population in his household were able to speak English as most of them have completed Form Five (UK equivalent of GCSEs) and have also worked in various capacities for the NGO in the village.

Using an interpreter brought certain limits to this research. Partly this was due to my position as a researcher as many San have simply had enough of being asked questions. For some San their confidence in a researcher came from his/her use of Naro language. In these cases making a meaningful connection was difficult with an interpreter as Naro language use was the ultimate marker of a researcher’s acceptance, integration and understanding of their culture and values.

---

⁹ Chris Low told me that he had worked with Zach too.
Naro is a complicated language and my level of Naro language was rudimentary. There are different pronouns depending on the gender of the speaker and the number and gender of the receiver(s). For instance, for me to say ‘let’s go’ to a woman is *sam qõò* and to a man is *kham qõò* and if I am speaking to two women it would be *se qõò* and two men it would be *tu qõò*. If I was male, this would be different again. There are four main ‘click’ sounds, including a dental, lateral, alveolar, palatal as well as a nasal and guttural sound. There are many different ways to construct sentences. Learning Naro in only nine months was a challenge. After six months I left the field for two months, which disrupted my language learning, and when I was there my frequent trips to the town with research participants and friends meant I was surrounded by other languages that were being spoken too.

The use of local words can add another layer of understanding to anthropological analysis, for instance, if there has been a shift in language use over time, or how research participants translate Naro into English themselves, or specific ways in which phenomena are described. My close research participants and friends did not insist on Naro language use, suggesting that for the research group, which was mostly San who had formal education, this was not as important as being able to communicate directly with the researcher through a common language, which in this context was English.

Using an interpreter was a formal way to communicate with research participants and this was useful when conducting interviews with elders who might not know English. However, everyday participation was less conducive to working with an interpreter as the environment was inherently more informal and relaxed. Formal engagement of an interpreter sometimes felt out of place. Moreover, Zach was less comfortable with interpreting in the moment of things happening informally, and often would not respond immediately if I asked what had just been said. He was more likely to tell me after the event had finished. In retrospect, he may have been shielding me from certain things, and in this way he acted as a gatekeeper to understanding.
At times the boundary between ‘research participant’, ‘friend’ and ‘interpreter’ became blurred. For instance, research participants who I also spent leisure time with became my friends over time. These are people who speak Naro, Setswana and also English (as well as other languages) and these people also became my interpreter and cultural translator at times. This blurring of boundaries is what I understand Smith (1999:15) writes about in that it is about the interpersonal relationships that ‘extend beyond a research relationship to one involving families, communities, organizations and networks’. Sugawara (2009:107) writes that any transactional encounter in a G/wi settlement was accompanied by an interactional effect, which further suggests the necessity for researchers to do the same. Each encounter with a person is an opportunity for interpersonal interaction and on each occasion it is necessary to engage in this way. My work with my closest research participants was often very relaxed and did not involve recording or note taking in the moment. Like this, the ambiguous boundaries within the (still ongoing) relationships I have with research participants mirror the kinds of research relationships that Smith (1999) commends.

Methods of research in the village

Before moving to D’kar I made sure that I had introduced myself to the ‘right’ people. I chose to work with one of the major families in the village, who have a relatively high social positioning. I introduced myself to key people in this family and asked permission to conduct research with them. I later found out that this family has some major ties to the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC) and D’Kar Reformed Church Council (DRCC). They agreed and I made a plan to move to the village properly in January 2012. In D’Kar, the DRC and the DRCC, as well as Kuru NGO and the Government of Botswana in the form of the primary school as well as the kgotla (chiefs’ meeting place) all emerged as institutional centres in the village. The DRC owns the land in D’Kar and the DRCC is the main body that makes decisions about that land. These bodies are important in terms of the administration and governance of D’Kar. This
was made clear to me from the start, as I was encouraged to present myself at Church, rather than at the government kgotla as was necessary in other villages where the land is owned and administered by the government. I made sure I introduced myself at Church on Sunday and after a few weeks I also visited the Kgosi (chief).

At first I joined one of the netball team training sessions each day and ‘hung out’ at the netball coaches’ home, however I also wanted to get to know the village. ‘Just’ walking around felt aimless and in some way inappropriate: it felt like an invasion of privacy. I was being watched by the residents and I wanted to carve out a role for myself. The NGO did not appeal as there was long-standing resentment towards the NGO within the village, which has been well documented by Bollig et al. (2000). By distancing myself from the NGO, I hoped residents would see me more as a neutral person and thus feel able to talk to me. In retrospect this was probably not possible given the long-standing association of white people working within the NGO.

Keen to get a sense of the different groups of people in the village, and to become familiar with some of the bigger and well-known characters, I enlisted the help of Zach, my translator, as we began to map the village. I never intended that this effort would become a whole mapping project. I initially used scraps of paper onto which I drew the outline of each plot while Zach described how the fences of each plot lined up with one another and, based on his local knowledge, who lived where. To the uninitiated, the village looks like unorganised homes in a bush, but after Zach explained how each plot relates to the next, I understood that there is, in some wards more than others, a methodical system used to demarcate plots of land to owners. In this way I learnt a local interpretation of the layout of the village.

After we spent a few days each week walking around the village, Moses and Jude (75, Naro speaking), key members of the D’Kar Reformed Church Council (DRCC) who were also employed by the ‘Custodian Unit’ of Kuru NGO, encouraged me to make a full map of the village. The DRCC was in charge of administering the drinking water and they explained that they needed a map to help plan the
installation of new water pipes in the village. A water pipe project was already underway after an American Peace Corps volunteer had sourced and secured the funds for the acquisition of new water pipes through an aid agency based in the US.

I thought it was odd that Jude and Moses were asking for details and physical information about their own village, where they had been living for decades, as I assumed they would know the area well. I found out that the only other maps available were a 2005 electricity line map (Appendix 1) and a 1995 Kuru planning map (Appendix 2). Both of these maps were inadequate for the purpose of building new water pipes as they lacked the right kind of detail, and moreover they were out of date. Moses and Jude’s strong positive encouragement towards making the map showed me that there was a demand and request for it. I agreed to the project, and this was to become my ‘contribution’ as it would help the community to build a new water system (see map, Figure 6).

Figure 5

Photograph showing a typical footpath that runs between residential yards in D’Kar, showing the kind of terrain that we mapped.
I accepted this project but this was not without concern. I was asked to produce a map that mirrored a colonial style of defining and organising space. Furthermore, I also wondered about its use after production. Depending on your perspective on the role and position of the DRCC, the map could be seen as problematic, or as a local asset.

Figure 6

The final product of the mapping project, ‘D’Kar Farm, Gantsi District’ 2012, map not to scale.

Maps

Maps can be understood as instruments of control and, Scott (1998:3) argues, when allied with state power, maps enable much of the reality depicted to be remade and controlled. Mapping has been a large part of projects for colonial and other kinds of administration, whose purpose is to rule over land and people who are relatively
unknown. In Gantsi District, the British Protectorate government mapped and remade the land into farms (see colonial map of farms in Figure 7). This eventually led to the systematic exclusion of San people as the land was divided into farms that have been largely owned by white farmers for intensive cattle rearing.

Russell and Russell (1979:80) wrote that there was a widespread adoption of local San place names for the early farm in Gantsi District, suggesting the recognition of San appropriation of the land. However, central administration ignored the presence of San, even when Afrikaner settlers pleaded for San to be given a place (Russell and Russell 1979:80). Scott (1998:32) argues that local forms of measurement and rule are of no use to central governance, who value universality and visibility in being able to successfully control through centralising and rationalising reforms. So,
San land-use and naming were never accounted for and were left out of the process of land allocation. Mapping was synonymous with the state, which focused on cultivation and production, and this was ultimately at the expense of San who did not become legal owners of the land.

Maps make distinctions between what is and is not useful data/information to include on the map. This distinction is made depending on the intended use of the map. For instance, the map of D’Kar (Figure 6) is intended for use by the DRCC in order to administer and build a new system of water pipes. It was useful to depict the distribution of residential plots of land and their relative location to one another. Maps are simplifications that make legible the illegible (Scott 1998:54) and as such a wealth of local knowledge is missed off this map, for instance whose field is whose, where electricity power lines run, who lives in what kind of structure, how many rooms each household has, the income source of the household, the location of footpaths, where the water taps are and which of those taps were working.

For Scott (1998:45), the purpose of a map is to demystify an area to outsiders: those without local knowledge. I was aware of the demystifying process of the map, but also how useless it would probably be to the average resident. To insiders, maps are redundant and unnecessary - local knowledge does not rely on a map to make sense (Scott 1998:45). Indeed, ‘what was simplifying to an official [i.e. an outsider] was mystifying to most cultivators [insiders]’ (Scott 1998:47). So through its abstraction and simplification, the map is often an unknown resource to local actors.

I turned to elders and a wider number of residents to find out what information should be included on the map. Rather than using directions, left and right and so on, way-finding in the village is based on people, so you might say that the place you want to go to is next to so-and-so’s house. The elders told me I could mark certain elders in the village whose plots of land could be marked on the map. In this way residents could also find their plots in relation to these people. However,
depending on who I spoke to, different sets of names were given. Moreover, did these people even want their names to be recorded on the map?

I had further discussions with residents, and it was revealed that it was best to ask each and every plot owner if they would like to have their name on the map. In this way, everyone in the village had the opportunity to be included, and the more people included on the map, the easier it would be for residents to actually use the map themselves, or at least find their own homes on the map. It became a way to include everyone in this project, albeit in a relatively small way, thereby helping to balance the power of the map.

In D’Kar, the ‘insider/outsider’ distinction that Scott (1998:54) makes in relation to power, is about being inside or outside of the D’Kar Reformed Church and/or the local governance structure of the DRCC. The DRCC acts in a state-like way, as the central governing structure in the village that supplied water to residents and also made decisions about the land, who lived there, and where they lived. The DRCC was outside the local knowledge of exactly who was living where in the village, which is why members asked me to draw the map. The map was commissioned by the DRCC so that the land could become knowable to them.

The potential of a map is to shift power and control away from the local actors to the state, or to the state-like church, as it now has a tool through which to know the local area. Some residents have settled on land and plots that have not been approved by the DRCC. Before the map was made, these residents were relatively illegible to the DRCC who was unaware of their exact location. As Scott (1998:54) argues, this relative illegibility can provide a vital margin of political safety from control—in this case from the DRCC. Through making the map, these people became visible and legible and could potentially be more easily controlled. The map demystifies the local area and in doing so potentially undermines the relative autonomy of those who built their home outside of the decision-making process of the DRCC. It became obvious that Dqaraga and Khootaase wards (see Figure 6) have been inhabited in a much more
ad hoc way, and without the consent of the DRCC. Would the map be used to exercise control over the villagers, and what kind of control would that be?

To take a different perspective, the residents and the DRC can be understood as the insiders in relation to the ultimate outsider, the government. From this viewpoint, the map was part of a wider process of autonomy and freedom of D’Kar from the centralised power relations of the government. As a researcher it was crucially important to work alongside the Church, as they were the authority in the village. The mapping project attested to my allegiance to the authority of the Church, which was an important part of being recognised as an ethical researcher by my main research participants. The map was my research contribution that Murugan and I had spoken about earlier in this chapter.

Validating research contribution

The way I provided for those around me during my fieldwork partly mirrored the local demands on someone who has an income. Behaving in this way was part of my own activism. The approach I took throughout my fieldwork was immersive and this was especially relevant within phase three of the fieldwork. I lived and behaved as a member of the community, albeit as a strange and foreign member who frequently got things wrong. I more or less ate the same food, drank tea with anyone who called by the house, gave away material objects, and wore clothes in the same style as the women in the village – i.e. colourful cloth bags tied over one shoulder and patchwork-style skirts. My daily activities included helping to buy materials to build a house for a family, providing groceries and food for a family, giving lifts to people who wanted to gather wild foods in the bush or attend the funeral of a relative in a different village, buying lunch, or shoes, football boots, baby clothes, hair relaxer, nappies, and other items that are of daily necessity or desirable for research.

---

10 Much to my dismay, part way through my fieldwork and while at an academic conference, an anthropologist who spotted me wearing the cloth bag laughed at me.
participants. I introduced the research participants to my Ph.D. supervisor, and even after my fieldwork I have continued to forward on opportunities for travel, participation in events, and funding places for education to my research participants and friends.

However, these small everyday acts were never overtly acknowledged by my research participants. Rather, they were taken for granted as part and parcel of living in the community and were not seen as being particularly ‘activist’. Smith writes that:

Most indigenous peoples and their communities do not differentiate scientific or ‘proper’ research from other forms of amateur collecting, journalistic approaches, film making or other ways of ‘taking’ indigenous knowledge that have occurred so casually over the centuries. (Smith 2012:2)

The specific methodology that I used, and the discipline that I am writing about, anthropology, and the ‘inquisitive’ rather than ‘acquisitive’ research I undertook (Smith 2012:3), was not necessarily noticeable and/or commendable by my research participants. Rather, there was the expectation and perception of researchers as (relatively) wealthy and powerful outsiders who are capable of offering something more than these taken-for-granted expectations that they have of anyone who works with them. Dominant assumptions surrounding activism are prompted here, ‘where participation in organized group politics serves as the only authenticating source of political commitment’ (Pierre 2008:131). Unless involved in something that resembled a ‘development project’, my activities were not perceived as ‘activist’ by my research participants. It was only when I took cues from the ‘organized marginalized local group’ (Pierre 2008:117), i.e. the D’Kar Reformed Church who asked me to make a map of the village, that I became validated in the eyes of my research participants.

Challenges made about my contribution were part of my research participants’ work as advocates. I was asked to fund a youth meeting for San in southern Africa. In this case I was approached by a San advocate in the following way, which I paraphrase:
How are you funded to do your research? You have been here for a long time now. You can now do something for us. You can fund a San youth meeting.

Even though the purpose of the meeting was unclear and the costs uncalculated, the assumption was that I owed San something and I was rich and so I should fund them. I was also asked to fund a child through private school, and to provide donor support for a village football team so that they could have a new kit. I found these situations difficult as my role was not as a donor, and I felt that all I was already contributing was not being recognised.

So although confrontational, these assertions reveal a certain strength as San challenge the researcher to participate in ways that are beneficial for them. However, activist academics such as Gordon (1997:203) and Pierre (2008:131) advocate that academic activism is much more than institutional alignment and acts such as participation in development projects or social and political movements. Importantly, activism is ideological as:

…there is a struggle for…self-identity from the local level straight up to the global level…[and so] the…academic activist’s task is to help forge an [this] identity…[t]hat facilitates all of the other levels of activism. (Gordon 1997:203)

Small acts, including providing employment and groceries, and in the way that I write this ethnography are in line with this idea as it helps people to form their own identity, and shows that San are representing themselves in this way. I acknowledged and absorbed the local ways of behaving and in doing so had my experiences shaped by local methods, ideas and practices. This is reflected in the underlying understandings within this research, so although subtle, they are crucial. My approach was commended by Shelly (24, Naro speaker), a woman who worked at the NGO, when, at an NGO workshop that I attended with her, Shelly used my participation in and understanding of the importance of gathering wild foods as a model for what non-San who work with San need to foster. Shelly explained that this kind of attitude is what government workers who are in contact with San need to
foster in order to understand them. Shelly said that this would foster trust and reciprocity, and ultimately good living and working relationships.

Conclusion

Through describing the research process as it unfolded, this chapter shows how the initial focus on university students widened to include San with different levels of education and experiences. Those in the research include church elders, community leaders, as well as young men and women who live in the city as well as in villages. Although university educated San were the starting point in this research, the scope broadened, especially in phase three, to include a cross section of experiences and lives of a heterogeneous group of San and experiences that have been explored through the English language. There is a multiplicity of San voices. However, since Murugan spoke of a singular ‘San voice’, we are also alerted to issues of representation.

The research was either conducted in English or with a translator. Although this made interactions with some San in the village more difficult, overall the use of the English language reflected the initial interest of the research from phase one, namely to work with university educated San, and that a symbol of being educated was the use of this language. This was part of how my research participants distinguished themselves from other San. English is also part of a repertoire of languages that are used in Botswana and so it was the language that we already had in common.

Research with San in Botswana is set within a broader political context of contestation about anthropological research and international political advocacy. This can make research and researchers seem politically threatening, and this was most evident in the way my research permit was awarded and then interpreted by the Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS).
Methodologically I became absorbed with daily life in the village. It was important for me to show loyalty to relationships and honour them through monetary payments and, sometimes, material gifts. I participated in ways that echoed local expectations, for instance giving lifts, drinking tea, sharing sugar when neighbours asked, employing residents, as well as participating in other small everyday actions. San advocates expected me, as a researcher, to contribute to the San struggle in a particular way. The map of D’Kar became my verified and accepted contribution as it aligned with the institutional and ideological frameworks of the village where the DRCC, and the DRC, were the main political and governing body.

Some of the broader challenges that San faced as advocates have emerged. For instance, given what seemed like a perfunctory role of the BKC, will future collaboration with researchers be mediated through NGOs such as BKC or through government bodies, such as the University of Botswana? Moreover, how will the new ethics review board at UB influence this process and are San voices heard within these processes? As more San are educated and become academics, how will they, as ‘insider’ researchers mediate these ethical issues?

Given the structural disadvantages of being San in Botswana, (Chapter Two) the next chapter frames the individual and personal challenges that San face in daily encounters and interpersonal interactions. These challenges contextualise the desires expressed by many San to use their voice. In the following chapter I focus on one San woman’s struggle to act in the world as she moves between living within the village of D’Kar where she was born and the nearby town of Gantsi. The chapter roots the thesis in discrimination, which is central in San experiences in Botswana. I use voice as a lens to view discrimination in public San where voice is ignored or laughed at. The chapter also begins to tease out gender as an additional factor in the way that misrecognition occurs in public.
Chapter Four

With Grace: Ethnic discrimination

In the previous chapter it emerged that being an advocate for ‘San issues’ was important for some San research participants. San women, like many indigenous women all over the world, ‘face multiple forms of discrimination based on their gender, ethnicity and class’ (Dieckmann 2014:561). In this chapter we follow the life of a San woman, Grace, a twenty-two year old Naro speaker from D’Kar, who balanced life in the village with life in the nearest town, Gantsi. Grace did not identify as an advocate, however it is important to hear her story as her struggles are indicative of the wider social context that advocates seek to address as the social context is marked by discrimination against San.

We begin in the village where Grace’s family were at the centre of her experience, and where ideal marriage partners and naming practices signified the process of reproducing kin and community. Her family were central in the formation and functioning of the dominant political structure of the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC). Her family were also economically advantaged in comparison to other residents and they were actively involved in producing their ‘culture’ through kin practices, naming as well as singing, dancing and making jewellery. Grace dropped out of school after she became pregnant at sixteen years old by her non-San boyfriend who lived in Gantsi.

Markers of San ethnicity are visible through ‘culture’, for instance, in making kin. This was demonstrated in the village where traditional San naming and marriage practices are encouraged. In Gantsi the cultural norms of the village are not recognised. We follow Grace into the town, a place for frivolities that she enjoyed. She formed friendships and romantic relationships with non-San there. At the same time, she encountered negative comments and sometimes physical violence. In Gantsi, Grace was not recognised in the same way as she was in the village. San voice in Gantsi was silenced through various mechanisms that sought to maintain and
reiterate difference that was noted through the body. Grace’s accent when speaking English, her beautiful skin tone and figure was, for her, the key ways in which she was understood by non-San in Gantsi, and which were also part of how she made herself known to people from outside her village where her Naro San culture was not known or understood in the same ways.

In Gantsi, an ethnically mixed environment, San are positioned at the bottom of the social hierarchy. Here ethnicity was the main factor through which Grace’s position was evaluated and discrimination brought daily reminders of her low ethnic position. As Takada (2015:5) reminds us, ethnic boundaries between San and non-San have been maintained throughout history, yet the specific ways in which these boundaries continue to be established and how they have been transformed have changed over time. Grace’s story highlights the problems that San still face and I have rooted this in rich ethnography. This chapter maps Grace as she balanced her aspirations and disappointments as she migrated between two locations. Through relationships in Gantsi and by remaking ideal notions of kin, can San transcend their ethnically-circumscribed social position which silences San voice in public?

D’Kar and the dance troupe

Like many young San before her, Grace dropped out of school before she was able to complete her BGCE exams (equivalent of GCSEs). She was living in D’Kar and had one older sister and one younger sister, as well as two younger brothers (see Figure 8). Her younger sister was a dancer in a troupe of young girls and boys from the village. Their household was financially stable in relation to other households in D’Kar as her mother worked for the NGO in a ‘salaried’ position. Being ‘salaried’ meant that the family was part of a small minority of the total population of D’Kar (total 1,688 people) who directly benefited from being given a salary from their employment at the NGO. Having a salary meant they were less dependent on the often inadequate money provided by the government through the ‘destitute’ or
‘orphan’ programme, or even through an old age pension that many households in D’Kar received in order to buy food.

Grace explained that her sister’s dance troupe was invited to perform at the Gantsi bus rank the coming Saturday as part of a government-funded event, ‘World Day of Remembering for Road Accident Victims’. Government-funded events were quite common across the nation, and local dance groups were frequently invited to perform so that the resident population would be encouraged to attend. Dance was a popular art form all over Botswana and ‘culture’ was celebrated through dance festivals, where traditional dance groups from different ethnic groups came together. Grace’s paternal great-uncle Jude (75, Naro speaker) was a community leader and although I did not have the full details about how the dance troupe was invited to perform, the invitation came via Jude.

Grace’s father Bright (45, Naro speaker) was also a leading figure in the community and most of Bright and Grace’s close kin were active members of the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC). They sang in the church choir and spoke fondly of the former pastor, Cornelius de Bruin, who passed away in 2010. The land at D’Kar was owned by the DRC and Bright was one of the ‘founding fathers’ of Kuru NGO, having been on the D’Kar Reformed Church Council (DRCC), the main decision-making body in the village. Bright, Grace and Jude and their close kin were involved in the church, as well as traditional healing practices, and they adhered to some traditional rules. For instance, Bright had a stroke in 2011 and his close kin arranged a healing dance that was held at his residential home. Although an interest in both the Church and in traditional healing may appear contradictory to some Christians, this is a common occurrence in anthropological literature (see Bowie 2009:22) and indeed this mixing of practices may be what has given rise to the popularity of churches across the globe (West and Luedke 2006:14). Bright’s household was by no means unique within D’Kar as most people in D’Kar practised some form of traditional healing and/or use traditional medicines, and many believed in ancestor spirits at the same time as identifying as Christians.
Grace’s family rooted their sense of belonging in the dominant rhetoric of the Church. They explained that since the land had been given to them via the Church, the land was theirs. Interestingly, not all residents shared this view, thus this household and their kin had oriented themselves within the land and the structures of power in a positive way. They had a voice and a presence within the Church. They felt ownership and belonging within the land through participation and acceptance by the Church, as well as through cultural practices and beliefs. The strength of their voice drew from both, the structures of power that historically came from outside the village (the Church and the NGO) and the cultural practices and language from Naro cultural history. Positioning themselves physically, socially and ideologically within the Church meant that their position was strengthened through this alliance and access to resources made available through these institutions. Yet at the same time they value the maintenance of Naro language and cultural practices which strengthens their position within the village as their speech and bodily actions (voice) continue to be central in the production of cultural activities, such as Naro kinship (and in Chapter Six they are involved in the creation of a female initiation ceremony).

Grace’s sister practiced all week with her dance troupe. Grace went to assist her paternal great-uncle, Jude, in coaching and encouraging the group (for kinship relations see Figure 8). One of the singers in the troupe was Jude’s daughter, Qane (13, Naro speaker), and most of the troupe were related as cousins. I went along to the practice in a dusty space at the back of Jude’s house. They practiced traditional songs in which the young girls stood in a circle and sang and clapped whilst dancers moved shyly in the middle, stamping their feet in the distinctive traditional way, and occasionally partnering with a few of the boy dancers too. Grace and Jude coached the group together, giving confidence to the young people who would soon perform in a public sphere in Gantsi.

I was struck by how Grace held a captive and respectful audience as she taught the group of young performers with her great-uncle Jude. She nurtured the dancers, who included her sister and cousins in Naro, the dominant language of the
village. This positive experience demonstrated how easily and comfortably Grace was accepted within certain roles in the village. She was confident and knowledgeable about how to manage and encourage the dance troupe. Although Grace herself did not dance, she took the role of a mentor and in this role she practiced her ‘culture’. She was recognised and respected as a person of value in this role as she was encouraged to use her voice to collaborate like this in the village.

Namesakes and Marriage

Grace had a close relationship with her great-uncle Jude. Jude helped Grace with issues that she came to him with, for instance, advice or financial support. According to traditional kinship structures they are g/ññi, ‘joking partners’, a jovial, informal affectionate relationship between grandparents and grandchildren as well as same-sex siblings and cross-cousins. Conversely !au, ‘avoidance partners’, are less affectionate and more respectful, and encompass relationships between parents and children, opposite-sex siblings and parallel-cousins (Barnard 2007:130). Remember from Chapter Two that universal kinship categorisation means that everyone is related to one another through kinship terms, and this is supported and made through a system of namesakes and through an avoidance and joking relation distinction which distinguishes marriage partners.

Jude’s wife was also called Grace (we will call her ‘Older Grace’ [40, Naro speaker]), making Grace and Older Grace namesakes. Please note that for simplicity I have used the research participants’ English names to demonstrate the namesakes, although in reality both the Naro and English names were given to a namesake (Sylvain 2003:116). Older Grace was generally called by her Naro name, Ntcisa, and Grace was called by her English name. Namesakes have a close relationship and any of your namesake’s relatives are taken as your own (Barnard 1978:74). Namesakes also have a joking relationship. Joking relations, except for a grandparent/child, make ideal marriage partners (Barnard 1978:75–76).
Grace’s paternal aunt had a son called Jude (I call him ‘Younger Jude’ in this thesis, [22, Naro speaker]) which means that Jude and Younger Jude are also namesakes (see Figure 8). Traditionally, Grace and Younger Jude could marry one another; as cross-cousins they have a joking relationship, g//ài (Barnard 1978:76). Younger Jude’s mother explained that in an attempt to encourage them to marry one another, Grace and Younger Jude were named after their great-uncle and aunt who were already married. However, Grace explained that she did not want to marry Younger Jude, as they had grown up closely, as brother and sister, and a romantic union felt wrong to her as they were too close. Younger Jude was more open to the idea that they should marry. He was her friend, her family and, according to tradition, her husband too.
Naming children

Grace was tall, light skinned and always had a new hairstyle. She was often told that she was beautiful by San and non-San in Gantsi. Many women were envious of her good looks. A few months after my fieldwork, Grace won a beauty contest in Gantsi. I wondered what winning this competition meant to her. She liked make-up and clothes and enjoyed going into Gantsi to socialise and for leisure activities. I was told by a San man from D’Kar that Grace had a reputation for spending too much time in Gantsi. Grace became pregnant by her Gantsi-based non-San Kgalagadi (ethnic group and language) boyfriend at the age of 16, and she dropped out of school. Her parents helped, supported and cared for her child in their home in D’Kar.

According to traditional Naro culture a child is named after any of the child’s grandparents, great-aunts or great-uncles, from either the maternal or paternal side (Barnard 1992:151) - in the case of Grace’s son, only the maternal line applies in terms of Naro culture as the paternal line is Kgalagadi. This follows Takada’s (2015:95) observation that children born from San women and non-San men often return to and raise their children within San conventions. There were approximately sixty-two Naro names (Barnard 1978:75) and they each skip a generation. This pattern was evidenced in how Grace and Younger Jude were named (see Figure 8). At times when the kinship link between two people is unknown the system of namesakes orients the relationship. For example, two women whose mothers shared the same name related to each other as sisters (Sylvain 2002:1079). In this way everyone can be related to in terms of kin. Naming children after grandparents strengthens and maintains the structure of the universal system of kinship (Barnard 1978:75).

Yet Grace used an English name that was outside of the naming system for her son. She explained that she had always thought of using ‘Richard’ as a name for her child as she thought it was a beautiful name. The phenomenon of naming children ‘new’ names was common. For instance, three young parents named their children outside of the traditional system and chose names that they found elsewhere, including for instance, the names of footballers or other friends. Naming in this way
reveals that parents’ ideal kinship was changing, as choice and personal preference for names was becoming more common. Choosing a name that was not within the kinship structure suggested that Grace was orienting herself and her son in more complex ways beyond the ‘universal system of kin categorization’ (Barnard 1978), which, as described above, worked through a system of namesakes and categorising kin as either avoidance or joking relatives. Having a unique English name was more desirable. This raises questions about the recognition of San names in the wider public. Often San have their Naro names changed in school by Setswana speaking teachers who can insist on giving them a Tswana name as Naro names are thought to be too ‘difficult’ to pronounce. If San already have their own ‘knowable’ names this forced renaming is less likely to occur as the child will keep using their English given-name in school.

Most people in Botswana had at least two names, often one in English. For instance, one Naro and one English name, or sometimes one Naro and one Tswana name, or even one Tswana and one English name (which is common amongst non-San). However, common everyday use of the English name was a common practice amongst members of the village who, like Grace came from more prominent families, and who often (but not always) had a better economic situation than others in the village. It was also significant that Grace used an English name. Using an English name was an aspirant choice to make, as English is a language associated with education and privilege. By choosing an English rather than a Tswana name, Grace also shows distance from Tswana domination.

However, Grace’s parents also named Richard using a Naro name, Tcoma. Tcoma was the name revealed to Bright by his ancestors during a dream, and it was the name of one of Bright’s own grandfathers (or male kin from the 1st generation, whose name should, according to tradition, also occur within the 3rd generation, and then again in the 5th generation, see Figure 8 for generations). Grace did not stop her parents from naming her son, nor did she try to stop them from using Tcoma rather than Richard, although she herself only used ‘Richard’. Nevertheless, by Bright
naming his grandson as was instructed by the spirit of his ancestor, the child’s kinship bond with the Naro side of his family was strengthened. By using Tcoma, Grace’s parents encouraged the use of a Naro naming system, which suggested that they preferred and still valued the traditional kinship system. A sense of belonging to an enduring system of kinship was clearly of importance to them as they sought to strengthen and maintain the Naro kinship system.

**What does the town offer?**

Every week, and especially at weekends there was a mass exodus as residents of D’Kar travelled the forty kilometres south west to Gantsi town. This distance was relatively easy to traverse as D’Kar was located on the main and only tarmacked road that ran through that part of the region. Hitch-hiking normally took some time but was mostly successful, and there were many people travelling to Gantsi from D’Kar who might have space to take passengers in their vehicle. The cost to get into town was either free or was the equivalent cost of a bus journey for the same distance (7 Pula which is approximately 55 pence).

Grace was often part of the weekly mass movement as excitement built up in the village all week before each Friday night. In Gantsi there were many cars, shops and businesses, and the general pace of life was faster. The population was 10,044 people, approximately ten times the population size of D’Kar (Republic of Botswana 2012). More people had paid employment and Gantsi represented more opportunities to find work and increased the potential for diverse relationships beyond the village. On average every two months, famous singing and dancing groups toured the country and performed in Gantsi. Touring groups did not perform in small villages or settlements and so Gantsi town was the place to see and enjoy these activities. In Gantsi there were opportunities to hear current music and to be part of wider social networks and popular movements within the country. Fast food such as fried chicken or ice cream was also available in Gantsi, and this was a treat for many.
Those who lived in settlements and villages throughout the District visited Gantsi to complete administrative tasks such as collecting pensions, paying road tax, attending hospital appointments, etc. Within the town there were three banks and six ATMs as well as a post office. There were three large supermarkets including Choppies, Spar and Super Save. In general, most shopping in Botswana was done at supermarkets rather than at smaller local markets or shops. Choppies was a South African-owned chain that was introduced to me as ‘the peasants’ shop’ by an American expatriate in Gaborone, as it was the cheapest supermarket that was marketed towards the poorest end of the market. Grace and her family, like many others in D’Kar, shopped at Choppies. Across the country, shopping at larger supermarkets was cheaper than buying from the smaller shops found in villages, where prices were greatly increased. Most people preferred this more economical method of shopping.

In Gantsi there was also a large wholesale warehouse, as well as a number of small street stalls run from the side of the road and many small tuck shops (small shops selling basic goods such as sweets, cigarettes, sugar, glass beads, etc.) that were run from inside residential yards. There were a few clothes shops as well as some ‘Chinese shops’ that sold many different household items. From frequenting ‘Chinese shops’, it was clear that what San were saying was evident - local San or ‘black’ employees were not allowed access to the till. Rather the owners, who were of Chinese descent, took this role for themselves. For a short time Grace had a job at one of the ‘Chinese shops’ although she quit. She explained that the owners had not treated her very well. Moreover, they had expected her to work long hours although she wanted part-time work.

A white Afrikaans speaking family in Gantsi owned a plethora of businesses including a petrol station, a butchers and a shop. There were also a number of mechanic workshops, two tyre replacement garages, a handful of spare parts shops (mainly run by people of Indian origin), two car washes, two other hardware shops, a furniture shop, a stationary shop, and a couple of restaurants. Further, there were a
couple of internet cafes, an (under stocked) library, a junior and senior secondary school, a primary school, a number of nurseries, a hospital, and some football pitches.\textsuperscript{11}

Apart from the practical and economic uses of the town, a trip to Gantsi was frequently for leisure activities. This consisted of socialising with friends but also partaking in general frivolities that a trip to town can bring, such as flirting with the opposite sex, drinking alcohol, driving around in cars, perusing consumer goods, watching popular local football matches and mixing with people outside of the village.\textsuperscript{12} Grace particularly enjoyed meeting her Gantsi-based boyfriend, socialising at informal bars, seeking out new hair fashions and meeting the people she knew in a more energetic environment than D’Kar provided. ‘I wish to move from the only place I have ever known [D’Kar]’ was Grace’s response when I asked if she would prefer a job in her village or elsewhere, showing that she had aspirations to experience that which was beyond the place she was brought up in.

The buzz of Gantsi at weekends was palpable. Like other residents of D’Kar I went to Gantsi at least once or maybe twice a week and originally this was a way to break the monotony of village life. For a while I was not aware that my trips to Gantsi were going to be so ethnographically rich, however over time my weekday tasks of making a map and interviewing people became balanced with the participant observations of the weekend in the town. In D’Kar, residents were sometimes a little wary of me, yet in the town, and especially as I had a car, participant observation was made easy. It was expected that like other young people my age (although older residents also went there to socialise), I would enjoy being in town and so it was relatively normal to go there. My car gave me easy access to town as well a reason for going – in order to drive friends.

\textsuperscript{11} Itekeng senior secondary school has been written about by Kiema (2010).

\textsuperscript{12} There is also a small gay scene in Gantsi town, and so there is also flirtation between people of the same-sex.
A town divided: ethnic mixing and alcoholism

Gantsi was a more ethnically diverse town than towns in other regions. Throughout Botswana there is often ethnic mixing between members of the eight majority groups (represented in the House of Chiefs), and maybe one or two minority groups (those not represented in the House of Chiefs). However, in Gantsi there were a number of minority groups, as well as some majority groups who live side by side. So while in the more general context of the nation, ethnicity issues often took the form of majority and minority group affiliation, due to the vast diversity in Gantsi, particular ethnic group affiliations were sometimes more pertinent. I make a general delineation between San and non-San, though some more specific inter-group relationships are also described.

In Gantsi a divide based on ethnic groupings was often articulated in terms of differences, and these became economic observations and remarks about the public recognition and respect too. For instance, a 30 year old Setswana speaking non-San NGO worker who lived in D’Kar told me, in a tone that was supposed to appeal to my (unfounded) sense of superiority, that a particular bar in Gantsi was for ‘farm workers’ and thus we should leave for the other bar. ‘Farm workers’ used in this context was a derogatory euphemism for San that drew on the image of a cow-less, wealth-less, nothing-ness of a worker in comparison to a cow-owning wealthy farmer. Apart from revealing something of this man’s character, it also opened up a dialogue between ethnicity and economic position. Here the low economic position of farm workers was linked to their ethnicity as ‘lowly’ San. Also, remember that the commonly used Tswana word for San, Basarwa, connotes a cattle-less, and thus wealth-less person (see Chapter Two) and thus suggests that this description was also part of a broader labelling and stereotyping process.

At ‘Choppies Mall’ there was often a hive of activity as people gathered to shop and meet friends. The ‘mall’ was a small shabby-looking brick built structure in a horse-shoe shape with chipped white painted walls and a shaded walkway around the outside of the car park that sat in the middle. The walkway offered space for hot
and tired shoppers to rest and it was a socialising and meeting space. Choppies Mall often felt like the central space in town.

Herero women wore their traditional long, full-bodied Victorian dresses and ‘cow horns’ wrapped in cloth adorned on their heads. They often rested together, sitting on the ground or stood to chat. San men and women with shopping bags and long skirts, or old tatty trousers, greeted each other, eating chips or sweet ice cream they had purchased from Choppies. There was a plethora of Kgalagadi men selling knock-off ‘Chinese’ CDs and DVDs of the old and newest favourites. A man with a TV and loudspeakers was often set up at the weekend, playing the latest music DVD on a television screen, drumming up interest from the bystanders who watched and laughed at the funny dances that the entertainers had perfected. At least four or five different languages were heard as people chatted, and these languages included Naro, G/wi, G//ana and Ju, Herero, Kgalagadi and Setswana, as well as Afrikaans, English and Nama. The noise and bustle of the place was greatest on Fridays and Saturdays and reached its peak at ‘month end’ when pay cheques came in and there was money to spend.

Next to the lines of supermarket trolleys there was often a group of San street children. They begged for food and money from shoppers. A sign (written in English) outside another supermarket around the corner from the mall told us not to give these children money as they would use it to buy glue. Indeed, I observed these street children sniffing glue from clear plastic sandwich bags. The children waited and begged from people who looked nice (or wealthy) or those who they remembered always gave them something. One day my Naro speaking San friends shocked me after one female friend physically attacked one of the children, and, when I asked why she had done that, she replied that these kids always try to steal from people. She dared me to watch them, convinced that my compassion for the children, and condemnation of her aggression towards them, were misplaced.

Contrastingly, Benji (24, Naro speaking), a San man with a diploma level education had a different opinion about these street kids. He conducted some
interviews with these children when he was employed to carry out research for a local NGO. He explained that they had alcoholic parents who neglected them. He went on to say that many local people chastised them because they think they should go home to their parents. Benji explained that many people thought these children were naughty - they did not realise that ‘home’ did not exist. Their parents’ love and care had been taken away by their dependence on alcohol.

Benji’s understanding about these children’s lives was based on insights gained from a research job in which he interviewed the children. His education helped him to gain employment and through this job he learnt about the children’s lives. So where other San relied on a perception that primarily came from their own experiences in the village and their trips to Gantsi in order to interpret the children’s behaviour, Benji fell back onto research-based knowledge. Research was familiar to Benji, and not just from the perspective of being the ‘researched’ which many San are familiar with. Rather, Benji had been a researcher himself, which provided him with a different vantage point through which to assess the predicament of these street children. His education was higher than many other San, like my friend who had been aggressive towards the children. Benji had identified my friend as holding different interpretations of these street kids’ behaviour, to his own. He recognised these street children as being let down by wider social processes, whereas less educated San thought of them as naughty and undisciplined children.

Farm workers live on farms. They were mainly San and were often reliant upon the farmer for lifts into town but also for money to bury their dead, for visits to the hospital and for access to other government services. White (Afrikaans speaking and English speaking) farmers owned the vast majority of the farm land in the District. Whilst in Gantsi town on a typical day like many others, I observed a lorry being driven by a white farmer and in the open trailer at the back sat and stood twenty or so San women, men and children – farm workers. They looked like a chain gang as small children peered over the sides of the vehicle, holding onto the metal sides for support, and their clothes looked old, tatty and worn. Only a few people from the
trailer got down to buy something from the shops and I wondered if they were allowed off the lorry or not. Farmers brought their workers to town on the back of these lorries and then returned with them to the farm. News reports have questioned child slavery on farms in Gantsi District (Kraai 2013) and staff at Kuru told stories about workers not being paid adequately, correctly, or on time, in what seems to be situations best described as indentured labour. The contours of the economic situation map onto ethnicity, and Gantsi town was a confluence of both ethnic mixing and economic activities.

We continue to follow Grace in the town through social events and leisure activities where ethnic and economic relations continue to be significant and where there is more at stake in terms of voice and recognition as discrimination largely defines what is possible.

The dangers of town

I had known Grace’s family for a long time and I became frustrated at always being left in the village with her older family members, especially as I knew she was in Gantsi enjoying herself. After a few months, I asked Grace directly, ‘How come you’ve never asked me to come out [in Gantsi] with you?’ She looked down towards the floor and her aunts who overheard the conversation scolded her in Naro, and explained to me in English that they had been encouraging her (without my knowledge) to be my friend and to spend time with me. They felt I was a ‘good’ person who would look out for her wellbeing. Younger Jude normally accompanied Grace into town, not directly to chaperone her, although he always acted as a pair of soft and protective eyes. Her family were constantly worried about Grace as she spent many days at a time away from home without being in contact with anyone. I was perceived as being another ‘good’ person who would also look out for her wellbeing.

At first I could not understand why her family were being strict with her about going to Gantsi. It was confusing that there were negative connotations attached to
her going to town when most people in the village seemed to go there so frequently. However, one day Grace’s mother, Sandy (42, Naro speaking), told me a story of how her own sister had been just like Grace. She had gone into town a lot and thought she was friends with non-San people there. Sandy’s sister was raped and a short while after this she killed herself. This was the greatest fear that Sandy, Bright and their family held for Grace: a fear that was already too close to their hearts. Sandy told me she could see the same thing happening to Grace and asked me to speak to her to encourage her to stay at home in D’Kar.

Sandy and Bright could see that their daughter was seeking something else outside of D’Kar, and they frequently encouraged Grace to visit Sandy’s relatives who live in the village of East Hanahai (see on map, Figure 2). They recognised a desire in their daughter to leave the monotony of D’Kar life and visiting relatives was one way to break this up. However, the relative safety of the hospitality of kin in East Hanahai, rather than non-kin and non-San in Gantsi, only kept Grace from returning to town for short periods of time. Visits to family in East Hanahai, another village, was not a replacement for, but was additional to, spending time in Gantsi.

Like other young people in D’Kar, Grace frequently went to town with friends and cousins from D’Kar. However, unlike others who returned home after their night out, Grace often stayed away from D’Kar for nights on end. She frequently avoided contacting her parents or aunts during this time which meant they worried about her wellbeing. Her family suspected that Grace spent her time with her Kgalagadi boyfriend who they did not approve of. Grace told her family that she stayed with friends.

Sandy explained that the non-San people who Grace called her friends, actually did not treat her well. This was most recently evidenced by a fight that Grace was involved in. Grace had come back from Gantsi with deep cuts in her skin after being attacked by a non-San girl, who was supposed to be her friend. Grace showed me her scars. Sandy explained that non-San treat Grace ‘like a dog’, a euphemism that connoted a low status: in fact, the lowest status. Dogs are animals that represent a
threat to food resources since they scavenge and can potentially steal from humans. Thus, in Botswana dogs are often treated as pests (especially in villages) and are frequently kicked out of the way. Sandy feared that by socialising with non-San, Grace would be ‘killed’. Based on the story of her sister, Sandy feared that Grace would kill herself if she was treated in this way for much longer.

A few months later I was stood with Grace outside a bar in Gantsi. Grace said she hoped that when I returned to Botswana she would still be alive. I half laughed, a little stunned by her remark, and said of course she would be alive when I returned. She turned back to me with tears welling up in her eyes, and quietly revealed that she sometimes thought about ending her life. Tears rolled down her face as I gravely comforted her. Younger Jude was with us too and the juxtaposition between the love and care in his eyes and the desperation expressed by Grace in this moment was stark.

This bleak realisation about what was at risk in Gantsi for San permeated subsequent trips to, and stories about, Gantsi. The story told by Sandy and the fears that Grace’s aunts had for her, as well as the revealing conversation with Grace, emphasised the core issue of discrimination and what is at stake: literally life and death.

**Escape from Grace’s boyfriend**

After going to Gantsi most weekends for a few months I realised that a popular place to socialise was in and around two residential yards that were owned by Kgalagadi families in one of the poorer wards of the town. The household of one yard illegally sold cold bottled beer after-hours and the other sold daga (marijuana). These yards were next to each other on a residential street, and were busiest after the bars and clubs closed. Both the houses were medium-sized and were made of brick. There were often people nearby, buying bottles of beer or daga, drinking, smoking, chatting and listening to music. Although the atmosphere in the yards could sometimes feel unsafe, one of my ‘coloured’ girl-friends was romantically involved with the
Kgalagadi son of one of these families. Due to this connection we felt protected as he was the law and authority in that space and he held control over what happened there.

That night I met Grace’s boyfriend, who was also the father of her child (and subsequent child too, see Figure 8 showing Grace’s children). Although I had a generally poor impression of him from little bits of information pieced together from Grace’s aunts and mother, I reserved judgement. Many people were gathered and everyone seemed to be intoxicated. The cars that brought everyone from the nightclub lined the verge of the road - my car was included in the line. It was hard to tell exactly who was there, as people were scattered around the yards and street. People were ducking behind cars to urinate and were chatting or dancing with friends, partners and potential partners to the beat of popular ‘house’ dance music being played from the cars.

Grace’s boyfriend called her over and they were chatting together. Even though Grace was a particularly tall woman at approximately six feet, her boyfriend was even taller than her. I realised that he kept pulling Grace by the arm and she shook herself free, over and over. Grace’s face had turned into a fearful, painful expression. Her head dropped to the floor and her big round eyes peered up at him. Then he grabbed her firmly and dragged her to a dark corner away from all the people we were with. As if hearing Sandy’s story, I feared that he would beat her up or rape her. I moved so I could see the whites of Grace’s eyes from the darkness. What did he need to say to her in the darkness away from the light, away from her friends and from the party?

Eventually she came back and I asked if she was okay. She replied that she was fine, but soon she leaned into me and said ‘Jenny, can we please get in your car and go’. I feared that her boyfriend would stop her from leaving, so we jumped into the car and in haste to make a clean getaway the car screeched to a start as we pulled away. I kept checking the mirror to make sure that he had not followed us in another car. When we were safely on the way back to D’Kar, I asked Grace why she liked her
boyfriend and she told me that he had a beautiful face. I told her that I thought his ugly heart made him very unattractive and she said, ‘Yes his heart is not good but his face and body make beautiful babies’. The following night Grace went back to Gantsi.

Public shaming at a party

We now shift to a private gathering of women in a residential home. The purpose of the gathering was to celebrate the marriage of a wealthy non-San Kgalagadi woman, Lebo, to her fiancé. Lebo’s mother owned a restaurant and was known as a business woman in town. Although I never met him, her father was involved in politics. Grace did not normally socialise with Lebo but through her friendship with me and Lisa, my Dutch NGO worker friend, we all ended up at Lebo’s ‘bachelorette’ party.

The invitation to this ‘bachelorette’ party was shocking as it stated that the dress code was ‘underwear only’. I asked different Batswana if this was usual but no one I asked had heard of this kind of party before. Lebo wanted to be notorious for being forward-thinking, and an underwear party was likely to be an edgy and gossip-worthy event. It was a daunting prospect to attend a party without the normal protection offered by clothing. We were entering a revealing and potentially vulnerable position. We arrived at Lebo’s house and Grace, Lisa and I were ushered into a bedroom where we could change (which really just meant undress). Grace was reluctant to undress, feeling that it was a bad idea to bare so much flesh. I gave her my pink dressing gown and she wrapped herself in it.

We entered the living room where twelve other women stood or sat around a red three piece suite and soft armchairs. My body prickled under the scrutiny of so many strangers’ eyes. Lisa and I were given ‘bunny ears’ as a welcome present though this gesture was not extended to Grace. Lebo’s house had all the trappings of modern aspirations. A wide-screen television sat in the centre of the room playing popular music videos and, even though night had already set in, the cool ceramic floor tiles were a welcome relief from the heat of outdoors. In relation to the dusty cow-dung
homes and intense heat conducted by corrugated iron roofs in the village, this felt like luxury. Indeed, in relation to other more modest homes in Gantsi, this was a big and luxurious residence. The rest of the house expanded through an open door as it branched into a spacious hallway from which the kitchen, bedrooms and bathrooms could all be accessed.

All other women were Kgalagadi or part of other non-San, Setswana speaking groups. Only Grace, who was San, and Lisa and I, who were white Europeans, diversified the ethnic mix. Grace sat next to me on the pouffe and while my legs and body were given space by the other women so that I could face into the room, Grace sat with her legs turned to the outside of the semi-circle with her body twisted around so she could see into the middle. Our backs were gently touching as the party proceeded. Just then one of the women turned her head over her left shoulder and she looked at Grace and said, in English, ‘Are you…? You look like a…’, but never finished her sentence. The heaviness of this accusation, of being a worthless, unwanted Basarwa, was unavoidable as momentary silence filled the room.

Lebo’s sister moved the conversation on, continuing in English. We all had to answer a question about Lebo but first we could drink a ‘vodka jelly’ shot. No shot was offered to Grace directly but when the tray came back around she raised herself a little from the pouffe and reached over to claim hers. We each had to read aloud from a small piece of paper which had a question written in English on it. When I read mine, my voice sounded very alien: a cut English accent. It came to Grace, and her accent when speaking English was also audibly different to everyone else’s in the room. It made her stand out as being San. Everyone started laughing and sniggering while she read.

After a few more shots and party games, the heat of public shaming seemed to die back a little as other more interesting things to laugh at occurred. I turned to Grace and said, ‘Let’s just go, these people are disrespectful.’ Her response was, ‘but this is fun’, she was enjoying herself and we should stay. A little later Lisa suggested that we stay only until the food was served - in Botswana it is socially acceptable to
receive food, eat and then leave a party or gathering. So as food was served, we stuffed our bags and mouths as much as possible, giggling at how fun it was to do so. We changed back into our normal clothes and as we exited the house through the living room, a few of the women were back on the sofa, eating from plates on their laps. One woman called Grace over, which made her grin as she happily obliged. They chatted in Setswana, laughing together. I realised that not all the women in the room wanted to shame Grace but equally no one stood up in the heat of the moment.

In the car I turned to Grace, feeling guilty for taking her along to the party and ashamed that I had made such an ethnographic blunder – how could I not have seen that this situation would be so challenging? Had Grace felt pressurised to come when she had not wanted to? Grace explained that she did not want to disappoint me by declining to come to the party as I had obviously wanted her to join us. In retrospect it seemed that although Grace had knowledge about the difficulties that the situation would bring for her, she was swayed by her loyalty towards me, her friend.

I explained that I was sorry as these women had treated her badly and yet I had not known what to do or say in response. Grace smiled with tenderness as she turned and looked at me. She said that she was not angry towards me but rather she was grateful. This took me aback and I asked her why she was grateful. She explained that she was grateful because I treat her like a human. I continued and asked why she wanted to stay longer at the party and she replied that she always tries to let God show her what is good about people and ignores the bad things that they do. The strength of Grace’s character shone through in this moment. She was willing and able to see the goodness inside the people who had shamed her and, knowing that I had made a mistake in attending the party, she forgave me too. To be treated as a human was the measure that she used, which only attested further to her mother’s explanation that non-San treat her ‘like a dog’, which was far from being human.

Later in the week, I sent an SMS to Lebo to say thank you for the party. She responded to say that ‘obviously’ I had enjoyed it, as I had been the ‘most naked’. Considering everyone in the room was wearing the same thing, I was shocked by this
Furthermore, Lebo wrote that she thought all the people in the UK would enjoy the format of an underwear party. I realised at this point how similar yet diametrically opposite Grace and I experienced subversive discriminatory practices based on our ethnicities. Whereas Grace had borne the brunt through public ridicule and shaming, discrimination towards a white woman was under the whispers of rumour and suspicion of being sexually ‘loose’. I had been imagined as an immoral, overly-sexualised figure and Grace as a stupid, unworthy ‘animal’.

Recognition

In town Grace was valued for her beauty, and she was subject to actual, as well as the threat of, physical abuse by non-San in Gantsi town. She was hit by a woman and sexually harassed by men, the kinds of negative experiences that are noted as being part of an indigenous woman’s experience globally (Dieckmann et al. 2014:516). She was mocked and excluded from partaking in certain aspects of the bachelorette party, such as being given a seat and a welcome present. However, in the different environment of D’Kar she was respected and looked up to as a mentor by her sister and her dance troupe. I look now towards Alex Honneth’s (1995) phases of recognition in which self-realisation of one’s desires, characteristics and abilities is centrally essential for recognition. He writes about three phases of the struggle for recognition which are love, rights and solidarity:

(i) the demand for love, confirming the reliability of one’s basic senses and needs and creating the basis for self-confidence, (ii) the demand for rights, through which one learns to recognise others as independent human beings with rights like oneself, creating the basis for self-respect, and (iii) the demand for recognition as a unique person, the basis for self-esteem and a complex and tolerant social life. (Blunden 2003:1)

All three dimensions of recognition are needed for self-realisation:

For it is only due to the cumulative acquisition of basic self-confidence, of self-respect, and of self-esteem... that a person can come to see himself or herself,
unconditionally, as both an autonomous and an individuated being and to identify with his or her goals and desires. (Honneth 1995: 169)

In some literature about San there are references to the lack of, or the need to build ‘self-esteem’ (Braam le Roux 1998:1; Hays and Siegrühn 2005:32; le Roux 2002:74; Suzman 2001:2). Grace could be seen as having both her self-esteem and self-respect undermined in Gantsi. She was not recognised for the spectrum of qualities that make up her complex identity, which undermined her self-esteem, while also being physically abused which undermines self-respect. It could be interpreted that Grace was struggling to be fully recognised as the basic dimensions of recognition were not all being met.

**Racial delineation?**

From the moment we walked into the party Grace was differentiated from the other guests. This suggested that Grace’s racial features were part of what distinguished her from non-San, as on-sight she was treated as different. However, Gantsi is a small place and although they were not necessarily friends with Grace, these women all know of each other, and thus had established prior knowledge about which ethnic group everyone belonged to.

Moreover, ethnic mixing was a norm here and using racial features to make judgements about ethnicity may be ambiguous. Some people who did not typically ‘look San’ were known and distinguished as San in the town. While darker skin tone might suggest non-San group membership, a person who has grown up with a Naro speaking San mother though had a Kgalagadi speaking non-San father, would be known as San. In D’Kar this racial ambiguity was made obvious in the nickname given to a San man, ‘Blackie’. Blackie, I was told, might look ‘black’, the label that San research participants generally use to describe non-San who spoke Setswana or Kgalagadi, but he was not. He was a Naro speaking San man from D’Kar. Moreover, Abraham (from Chapter One), a San informant from Gantsi, who was ethnically mixed with a Naro mother and Kgalagadi father, considered himself to be San. His
accent when speaking Setswana was distinct from non-San people which meant that he was ‘obviously’ distinguishable as San when he spoke. Speech was a potential opening of weakness through which public shaming and ridicule could emerge. The stakes were high if, and when, San opened their mouths. So although it was possible to distinguish Grace’s ethnicity from her physical features from the very beginning of the party, the context was such that the women knew each other and so her ethnicity as San was also already known. Racial features were sometimes used as criteria for ethnic group membership, but there were other attributes that had salience in understanding the ‘correct’ social hierarchy in this ethnically mixed environment.

Having a lighter skin tone was a sign of beauty. Grace’s boyfriend had a lighter skin tone than other Kgalagadi men, which was part of how she viewed him as ‘beautiful’. Grace would also tell me that her skin colour was desirable, which was later reinforced by her winning a beauty pageant. Linked to this is the term ‘Ncoakhoe’, a Naro word used for ‘San’ that literally means ‘red person/people’. Drawing on what sounds like a racial category seemed almost counter-intuitive since San were often labelled and categorised by non-San based on pejorative racial features, for instance, ‘peppercorn hair’, ‘Chinese eyes’, ‘large buttocks’ and so on (Motzafi-Haller 2002:181). However, skin tone was a complex issue, as like in many countries which have a brown- and black-skinned majority, having a lighter skin tone was a sign of beauty. Being ‘red’ rather than ‘black’ was to have a lighter and therefore more beautiful skin tone. Yet at the same time as being San, being ‘red’ is to be viewed as the lowliest of ethnic groups.

Grace was well-known for being beautiful. Male San research participants would frequently tell me that non-San men want to ‘take’ their women (i.e. have sexual relationships with them) because they think they are beautiful, although they will never marry them. This complaint mirrored accounts from other ethnographies in Botswana, in which San women mother children from non-San men who do not claim these children as their own, suggesting that San women are ‘used’ for their
beauty, and for sex, but are not deemed ‘worthy’ of marriage, a respected social institution (Becker 2003:17; Motzafi-Haller 2002:182; Russell and Russell 1979:90).

Despite this, my present ethnography revealed that some San women were choosing to build relationships with non-San men, although not necessarily marrying them.¹³ Grace dismissed the observation that her Kgalagadi boyfriend did not have a good heart, for the observation that he was beautiful and could produce beautiful children. It was notable that her boyfriend had relatively light skin, yet Naro-San often had lighter skin than his. This suggests that both his ethnicity as non-San - a social and ethnic status that is hierarchically ‘above’ San - along with his relatively light skin tone made him an attractive partner. Grace was aware that her parents’ worries were probably true, in that she was not treated well by her boyfriend, but this was superseded by the production of her children.

Grace’s desire to have beautiful children was part of her own identity formation. Grace was, as I mentioned earlier, often spoken about by San and non-San as being beautiful, a compliment that she enjoyed accepting. This kind of compliment seems complex however, when in context, her comments about wanting to end her life are incongruous with this positive image of being beautiful. Does beauty mask the underlying issues that were commonly espoused by other San, that San women are only ‘taken’ for sexual relationships, but their beauty does not translate into being marriageable, i.e. recognised as human beyond their beauty? Gendered discrimination about beauty appears as San men are not as desirable due to their ‘beauty’. However, there was also an issue of being respected as a human who is worthy of marriage. A San friend of mine who had a non-San girlfriend was discriminated against by her family, who said that he was no good for her based on his ethnicity. This was a painful realisation for him, yet he remained with his girlfriend and they began their own family. So while there was always a level of discrimination, San women were perceived as being ‘only’ beautiful and not

¹³ Conversely, for an example of intermarriage between San and non-San, see Takada 2015:88-95.
marriageable, whereas San men were potentially marriageable, though still undesirable.

**Children**

Grace sought relationships in Gantsi which involved interactions with non-San and she invested in romantic relationships there. She wanted to be part of, and influential within, the wider social landscape of Botswana. Grace, like many San, entered this social landscape through, for instance, the production of hair styles, popular consumption patterns, beauty contests, and making ‘beautiful’ babies with non-San men.

In Botswana, women tended to have children at a young age and it was common to find that from the age of sixteen to eighteen women were pregnant and having children. Most of my research participants, both male and female, who were in their early to mid-twenties already had children. Children are greatly desired (Durham 2004:594), as parenting a child is part of signifying a transition into womanhood and manhood. A post on Facebook from a male San informant read, ‘My mother still loves me like a small child, she always gets me sweets whenever she goes to the shop...I guess until I get her a grandchild, I will always be her baby boy!’ Although not something undertaken instrumentally, children nevertheless were an undeniable marker in the change in one’s social position. Grace’s position as a woman was increased through her children.

It was notable that Grace chose to have children with a non-San man. By doing this, she was asserting her own ideals about a suitable partner and at the same time she rejected the man who her own kin encouraged her to marry (Younger Jude). Though the ethnicity of Grace’s children was socially recognised as San, and they had Naro language as their mother tongue, how does this ethnic mix of parents change the way that her children are viewed? By choosing a non-San man to have a child
with, does Grace try to transcend the ethnic group hierarchy and yet maintain ‘beauty’ by choosing someone ‘good looking’?

Her position as a woman was not only marked by having a child but was also wrapped up in the woman being independent in terms of managing her own affairs, including her financial affairs (Durham 2004:594). The following section thinks about the way that education, language and wealth are positioned within the social/ethnic hierarchy in Gantsi.

**Education, language and ethnicity**

If it was not already clear that Grace was not welcomed to the ‘bachelorette’ party in the same way as the other guests, the accusation that she was different, and moreover that she was not as ‘worthy’ as other guests, was vocalised. Notably, the woman who made this accusation never actually completed her sentence. The absence of description mirrored an idea that Grace was unworthy of even being named, and that San or Basarwa were so unworthy that they were not even worth mentioning. In the car Grace recognised that these women sought to delegitimise her fundamental position as a human. Like this Grace was not drawn into relations of ‘mutual recognition’ (Honneth 1995:160) that have been central to anti-colonist manifestos (for instance, Fanon 1967).

Although Grace’s ethnic group membership was used against her at the bachelorette party to publicly shame her, her position in relation to education and material wealth also played a part in the way social hierarchies were maintained. Lebo, the ‘bachelorette’ was a non-San, Kgalagadi woman who, I was told, ‘thinks that she is better’ and more sophisticated than everyone else because she went to Gaborone for school. Lebo’s education in Gaborone was a prestigious marker of her wealth.

English language skills attest to a good education. It would not be surprising if Lebo had attended a private school in Gaborone. Private schools were known to
provide a ‘better’ education to students and often this was noted by the high level of
English language spoken by students and teachers. Although English language was
generally known and understood widely by Batswana, many spoke it mixed in with
Setswana. In the home, or even at a party, using only the English language was not
common, yet the invitations to the party were written in English and the entire formal
section of the party was conducted in English. Lebo distinguished herself through her
use of English language at the party.

It was well-known that the cost of living in Gaborone was much higher than
in other towns (you had to be wealthy in order to afford such an experience). Moreover, most people in Botswana struggled to save enough money to have even a
modest wedding ceremony. Since Lebo and her fiancé had the finances to get married,
the wedding itself was symbolic of their wealth, as was her schooling in Gaborone.
Additionally, in a town, cattle (the traditional way to measure wealth in Botswana)
were less visible than material goods or objects. Their large house, television, sofas
and 4x4 cars in their yard all attested to the value of material objects in showing their
‘success’ and wealth. The bunny ears given to us on entry to the party, the ‘vodka
jelly’ shot and the dress code, all suggest an idealisation of a popular ‘modern’
lifestyle where wearing revealing clothing and enjoying consumer goods were valued
(Durham 2004:591). Material objects symbolised wealth in this setting. But more than
this, they also represent a particular lifestyle that appealed to the rich and famous, a
lifestyle that is aspirant of aesthetics beyond Gantsi and indeed beyond Botswana too.

San were not generally associated with any of these symbols and the
assumption was that San were low status and always will be. History suggests that
San occupy the lowest position in society, as serfs, or as low skilled, low paid, low
status farm workers. Even though Grace displayed proficiency in speaking and
reading English, a marker of distinction, she was still shamed for just ‘being’ San and
participating in the party activities. This suggests that San will struggle to be accepted
as equals as their ethnic position is tied into the broader class system (Povinelli 2002)
in such a way that markers that are otherwise used to distinguish class, have little
effect on their public image and reception from others. Through her ‘indigenous’ body which was visible from the way in which she used her mouth to speak (her accent), as well as through her skin colour, Grace’s position as from a lowly part of society will not shift. Part of being distinguished from the others at the party was to be treated as different and as less valuable. Markers of Grace’s difference were imbued within her accent and in the prior knowledge that she was Basarwa (derogatory Setswana word used to describe San). If Grace had not been accompanied by me, would she have been allowed to stay at the party? Yet if she did not speak English, would she have been told to leave?

Voice and participation

Participation marked Grace out for ridicule. For instance, she became a target for ridicule when she read aloud the question in English for all the party guests to hear. Although she can read English, something that some residents of D’Kar may not be proficient in, her actual voice was a further marker of her difference as her accent when speaking English was different. As a Naro speaker she pronounced words in a particular way, making it obvious that her mother tongue was not Setswana.

This differentiation made me think about some of the challenges that San experienced in school where situations like this might be more frequent. For instance, one of the main concerns raised by a number of San research participants was the use of Setswana language in schools (see Chapter Three for Tshidiso’s comments on learning someone else’s language). San students were told off harshly if they spoke their own language, and so they ‘just listened’ in school for a long time before they actually participated. The fear of saying something wrong in class was exacerbated by ethnic hierarchies that placed San at the lowest position. Being vocal exposed difference, and being San was a difference that was not tolerated. In Chapter Three Murugan explained that his projects of advocacy were driven by the desire to encourage San to speak in public spaces, such as at Parent-Teacher Association
meetings or church groups. Through Grace’s story we hear what was at stake for San in making themselves heard in public: taking a role as a spokesperson, or even just a speaking role, was to become vulnerable to public ridicule or shaming. Clearly the experiences noted from San in school are mirrored in life outside of school too.

Previous confrontations between Grace and non-San in public places in Gantsi now made more sense. I had wondered what had stopped Grace from being vocal when, for instance, men grabbed her in intimate places or pushed or kicked her. In relation to non-San women in Gantsi who also dealt with unwanted harassment from men, Grace was quiet, meek and, although she did not concede, she was more likely to act coy or laugh to get rid of the attention. Non-San women were frequently more vocal about rejecting unwanted advances and they appeared to be confident that this action would result in the desired outcome. San were not sure if their voices would add further venom to the confrontation, rather than reduce it. Grace’s position within public places was such that she was quiet in order to avoid any further shaming. Gendered discrimination mapped onto ethnicity, which suggested there was a glass ceiling in terms of the respect and recognition she was given as a human while in public, and that being both a woman and San contributed to this, as her body revealed both sources of ‘weakness’ or vulnerability that could be used against her.

After returning to D’Kar from Gantsi, I explained to Grace’s aunts that when a Setswana speaking woman had verbally abused Grace in Setswana as being a ‘nothing’ Basarwa, I had retorted in English saying that she should be ashamed of herself for having such a bad attitude towards a fellow human. I told them as I felt I had extended my loyalty towards Grace, however her aunts, Nco’xae, Kgaba’xae and Qoba scolded me, saying ‘this is not what we do’, and said, ‘don’t do this again’. Confrontation was deemed inappropriate and it was not part of their own coping mechanisms. We are reminded here about egalitarian conflict resolution in which mechanisms to deal with conflict would involve moving away from the antagonistic parties (Morris 2014:124). Grace chose to remain in close contact with these antagonistic people and yet Grace’s aunts reminded us that moving away from and
avoiding these kinds of conflict situations is what they expect. My argumentative approach to this antagonistic situation was reprimanded. By staying out of confrontational exchanges they distanced themselves from such interactions. After this I never actively retaliated vocally in public and I only privately expressed myself to San friends about difficult situations. The way Grace and her aunts dealt with public confrontation was to use a silent, bodily aspect of their voice – to move away. Like this they ignored this abuse, and continued with their activities.

In being non-vocal but also not moving away from antagonistic situations, Grace’s story strengthens the need for what some San, such as Murugan, argue for: a San voice to be heard. Yet given the solid advice from Grace’s aunts, being outspoken and vocal uses of voice, rather than action was also the opposite to their own conceptions of how to deal with these kinds of situations. Participation in social and political spheres frequently involved the use of speech and speech carried difference, through accent. When San participate or become central within certain social settings, they could be pejoratively marked out through markers of their ethnicity, noted through language and specifically through accent, when speaking both English and Setswana. Being vocal was a vulnerable position. In other words the dominant project for Murugan, for speaking out, did not necessarily map easily onto the lived experiences of San who had different levels of education, gender and social positioning. So for Murugan, an articulate, educated and entrepreneurial man, speaking out was imperative for voice, whereas for Grace and her aunts there was a need to remain safe and protected which was not guaranteed through being vocal and here it was about moving away from a conflict situation that was preferred. Being vocal disrupted the status quo where San were to be seen but not heard, and who were barely acknowledged as human.
Complexities of ethnicity

Grace was well-known and respected in D’Kar as her kin were relatively wealthy and had good relationships with the Church, the central political structure. Grace was knowledgeable about her culture and was an appropriate mentor for her younger cousins and her sister who were part of a traditional dance troupe. More widely, her kin valued ‘culture’, and taught and encouraged their children ‘traditional’ skills, such as dance or jewellery-making and singing traditional songs. They encouraged the continuation of the traditional naming patterns for children and supported the selection of marriage partners based on joking relationships and namesakes. Grace’s parents and aunts had a sense of belonging to D’Kar and to their ethnic and cultural group through these practices.

However, for Grace, like other San from D’Kar, there were benefits of and aspirations to spend time in Gantsi which often their parents and grandparents did not understand in the same way. Grace’s parents’ sense of belonging to D’Kar came from their participation in building its conceptual and physical foundations. Grace was part of a second generation of people in D’Kar for whom this was not part of their experience. Her sense of rootedness was found in a migratory relationship between the village and the nearby town where she sought something beyond what she perceived as the confines of the village and the cultural life offered there. The village was monotonous and boring, and the town was exciting and adventurous. Grace negotiated her position as a woman through interactions and relationships in town. For instance, to have children was a marker of womanhood and to have a beautiful child was a further boost to this status. Giving her child an English name was symbolic of her choices outside of her ‘tradition’, yet since her parents also named him within the universal kinship structure, this acted as a counter balance.

There was a different set of criteria for group membership in Gantsi where it was ethnically diverse. Here there was a hierarchy that was ethnically delineated and signified, though not determined by, racial features. Language, and specifically the accent that San used when speaking English or Setswana, was a distinct marker of
difference, and this use of body affects and shapes voice. Yet, recognition is based on the ability for these differences to be accepted by the dominant group. However, carried within a San accent was the perception of a person of low status, a farm worker, and someone who was not a whole human being.

This reminds us of a model of stratification used by Davis and Gardner in 1941 in the USA, in which ‘whites’, ‘coloureds’ and ‘blacks’ were part of a hierarchical structure (cited in West 1971:1). This structure was also divided into ‘classes’, as well as ethnic groups. Within this configuration, ethnic groups were more or less bound by their group status in relation to the other ethnic groups. However, individuals were able to climb social class depending on their local position vis-a-vis politics, education and religion/church in the community or local area. Nevertheless, there was a ‘glass ceiling’ effect, where for instance, if a ‘coloured’ and a ‘white’ person held the same position in the community, by virtue of ethnic group hierarchy the ‘coloured’ person would always occupy a lower social position than the ‘white’ person. While there was a degree of flexibility for individuals to hold a high social position which may exceed the low position of individuals who occupy the ethnic group ‘above’, there was also a sense that ultimately ethnicity remained a marker within the social hierarchy.

In this chapter, although Grace had a level of education, she was marked out by the non-San women at the party as being different due to her ethnicity. This was noted through her contested participation at the party. Although Grace sought romantic relationships with non-San, and had children which was a widely accepted way to become a woman, Grace met her ‘glass ceiling’ at this party where she was not accepted. Russell and Russell’s (1979:67) ethnography of Gantsi District highlights ethnic distinctions between groups and maps how ambiguities in this hierarchy, through marriage and children, were negotiated within Afrikaner and coloured identities. In this chapter I have shown the ways in which San identities were shaped and negotiated around ethnicity.
After my fieldwork, Grace enrolled on a course at an academic institute in Maun. She studied to become a Health Education Assistant and in October 2014 she was working on a placement at the D’Kar clinic, which meant learning while working on the job. She also had another son from her Kgalagadi boyfriend and she was able to finish her studies while pregnant. Her second son whom she named Princeton (another name outside of the traditional structure), was being looked after at home by her parents. Grace continued to live in D’Kar but was looking for a permanent job. She was still balancing life between her education, children, boyfriend, family, the village and the town.

Although at times San were subject to ridicule and public shaming, individual agency in relation to marriage partners and naming children revealed the complexities in navigating ethnic group stratification. Social positioning through language, children, gender, naming and education, revealed a complex construction that mapped onto ethnicity in a particular way. The next chapter picks up the thread of language, and maps the changing hierarchies of language use for Naro speaking San in D’Kar and how language can be used for and within political and cultural projects of ‘advocacy’. 
Chapter Five

Language in everyday life

My aim in this chapter is to explore the impact and effects of language on recognition and voice for San. Linguists and linguistic anthropologists have carried out detailed work on how San borrow terminologies between languages (Barnard and Boden 2014b; Güldemann 2014; Vossen 2013). While this is important, linguistic analysis, including analysis of particular words and their etymological trajectory, is beyond the scope of this thesis. I adopt the perspective of language having wider and broader symbolic value where it has been used in claims for, and recognition of, minority and indigenous culture and identity. I explore some of the complexity of the linguistic landscape of Gantsi District and show how language is used in a contemporary context - a lens through which to understand political and economic processes.

Language is one of the first things that springs to mind when we talk about ‘voice’. Language carries cultural meanings and ‘expresses cultural reality’ (Kramsh 1998:3). Yet it is not only about expressing experience, but also about creating experience through language (Kramsh 1998:3). Language is also a set of signs that is seen to have cultural value, and speakers identify themselves and others through their use of language where language is a symbol of social identity (Kramsh 1998:3).

Yet, linguistic anthropology has often focused on technical linguistic forms and microanalysis of language and thought (Kroskrity 2000:1). In comparison, ‘thoughts about language’ by the speakers have been neglected (Kroskrity 2004:498). At the same time, language has been intimately connected with group-making and nation-building. Shared language has long been the key to naturalising the boundaries between social groups (Kroskrity 2000:23). Scholarship on nationalism and ethnicity often includes language as a criterial attribute and at the same time indigenous and minority groups across the world struggle to maintain their mother tongue languages.
Language is complicated and cannot be separated from power structures (Chebanne 2002:50; Hays 2002:77). Language, politics and identity are intertwined through what are called ‘ideologies’ that are ‘suffused with the political and moral issues pervading the particular sociolinguistic field and are subject to the interests of their bearers’ social position’ (Irvine and Gal 2000:35). Power, politics and social hierarchies are invoked in ideologies, and for Michael Silverstein (1879:193), linguistic ideologies refer to ‘sets of beliefs about language articulated by users as rationalization or justification of perceived language structure and use’. For Judith Irvine (1989:255), language ideology is ‘the cultural system of ideas about social and linguistic relationships, together with their loading of moral and political interests’. The focus is on the way in which the language is thought of by the speakers which directly links to political-economic macro processes (Kroskrity 2000:2) that speakers may perceive, narrate and engage in. This chapter uses language ideology to think about the socio-political landscape in Botswana.

Botswana is multilingual (Batibo 2005: 1), and a total of twenty-eight languages are spoken. The government’s dual language policy of recognising Setswana as the national language and English as the official language means that eighty-two percent of the total number of languages are identified as ‘minority languages’ (Batibo 2005:52). Although there are always exceptions, in D’Kar and Gantsi District more broadly, Naro is predominantly spoken by Naro people (San), Kgalagadi is predominantly spoken by Kgalagadi people, Afrikaans is predominantly spoken by Afrikaners (although Afrikaans is also spoken by ‘Coloureds’ too), Setswana is predominantly spoken by Tswana people, including the eight major tribes, and English is spoken predominantly by British, and other Europeans. English is also taught in schools. English language is prestigious as it is associated with modernity, technological advancement and internationality (Batibo 2005:20). English is the language of business and of ‘development’, both in terms of being a symbol of being developed, as well as being within developmental NGO contexts. People in Gantsi District generally know more than three languages and so can mix languages easily.
In terms of the ‘San issues’ that we learnt about in Chapter Three, language was constantly raised as a point of contention by San, especially in the context of school, but also more broadly – the use of minority languages was not permitted at school or in any official contexts. San children were, as Tshidiso put it, forced to ‘forget themselves’, as schools and teachers insist on the use of Setswana. Moreover, learning in school involved ‘cultural representations in curriculum materials that represented the perspective of the dominant group, and teaching styles are derived from the dominant culture’ (Hays 2011:130). There was little or no space for minority culture, or language in school, and this was often expressed as being painful, alienating and abusive (Hays 2011:130; le Roux 1999). This continued in broader social life, where the use of non-Setswana languages was socially chided.

Language ideologies cut across and through this chapter, and indeed through parts of this thesis in a number of ways which link to indigeneity, identity, minority language, and voice. In relation to identity, Elinor Ochs (1992) notes that linguistic structures, the way that language is used and its features, may index the meaning of social categories. Indexicality involves the creation of semiotic links between linguistic forms and social meanings and this relies heavily on ideological structures that associate particular sorts of speakers as producing particular sorts of language. This can be done directly through labelling (see Bucholtz and Hall 2005:594), but also indirectly ‘through a chain of semiotic associations’ (Irvine and Gal 2000:378; Ochs 1992). Interactional stances, such as uncertainty or forcefulness, may come to be associated with particular social categories such as gender or ethnicity.

Indigeneity is constructed around ideas of cultural difference. Indigenous identity has become synonymous with linguistic ‘otherness’, where having a distinct language is central to establishing and authenticating an indigenous identity. This idea runs deeper still, as in anthropological and popular notions of culture, language is also a key marker for cultural identity and this has been described as iconization, a process in which ‘the ideological representation of a given linguistic feature or variety is formally congruent with the group with which it is associated’ (Buchhotz and Hall
Iconization is an essentialising process as it creates a naturalised link between the linguistic and the social and in turn essentialism is part of the web of ideas that indigeneity is intricately woven together with (Weaver 2000:221).

The way that voice is heard and/or received feeds directly into language ideology. For instance, San use a minority (indigenous) language in Botswana where Setswana and English have been given positive positions and status, and minority languages have not. Like this speaking a non-dominant language already feeds into the broader nationalist discourse in which Setswana, as the national language, is an index for national identity and belonging, and non-dominant languages are peripheral to this. Voice in non-dominant languages is automatically less powerful as it is symbolic within the grander narrative or ideology in which language acts as a key signifier of status. Indigenous voices have historically been outside of the dominant structure, and indigenous languages in form and content, are constant markers of this difference.

Through language, San are recognised as being different on two levels. Firstly, the Khoisan languages that are spoken by San sound audibly different to Setswana. This was most distinguishable through the ‘clicks’ that inflect Khoisan languages, and which are absent in Setswana and other Bantu languages spoken in the country. Secondly, even when San speak one of the officially recognised languages, i.e. Setswana or English, they do so using a different accent, as their mother tongue is different (for instance, when at the party Grace read aloud in English, Chapter Four). Thus, even when speaking Setswana or English, language still distinguished San from non-San. Attitudes towards language and the hierarchy that language took is indicative, and indeed was mapped onto, political and economic processes around minority and majority groups in Botswana.

In the first part of the chapter I will describe the linguistic landscape of Botswana and the hierarchical way in which the official languages of English and Setswana are mapped onto that. The key point of this argument is that the language policy of the government has helped to create a set of problems of its own making. In
part two of the chapter, I contextualise this discussion with some description of the Gantsi region. I then draw upon ethnography with Jude and his son Moses who lived within D’Kar. In this section I explore some of the underlying issues and tensions of their position that incorporates a discussion of land, missionaries and the Church, which have continued to have a pervasive influence in the region. Part three maintains a focus on the Church, and using oral and other historical accounts, I contextualise the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC) and reveal the use of language within the DRC.

In the final part of the chapter I extend the ethnographic base of understanding through three portraits of Naro language use. Nco’xae, Smallie, Benji and Moses are San who are part of the same family living in D’Kar, yet they all had slightly different ideas about the use of language. My aim here is to bring together residents’ different perspectives of language and its everyday use, to reveal the multiple complexities of language use. Ultimately these perspectives complicate ‘voice’ as the multiple and sometimes contradictory evaluation of language use reveals that language is seen as a tool for communication, as a carrier of culture and also as a weapon of resistance.

**Part One: The linguistic landscape of Botswana**

Independence in 1966 meant that there was a shift as the British handed governance back to Botswana. The language policy used since independence has recognised English and Setswana. This dual language policy was introduced under the first President Seretse Khama (President of Botswana from 1966 to 1980). In contrast to the Apartheid system of separation and inequality in South Africa, his aim was to create a peaceful ‘One-Nation’. Under this arrangement, Setswana became the national African language. Setswana comes from the Bantu language family and is spoken,
albeit in different dialects, by the eight major tribal groupings comprising approximately seventy-eight percent of the population (Chebanne 2008:95).14

In contrast to Bantu languages which are a family, Khoisan languages are a Spachbund (‘language area’) which means they are a group of unrelated languages that share a geographical area and therefore share some common vocabulary (Barnard, per. comm.). So whereas languages that are part of a language family are closely related and share common words, and grammar and/or sentence structure, the languages within a Spachbund are more diverse. Naro and Ju, two Khoisan languages, have no similarity in grammar although they do share some vocabulary through the borrowing of words. Naro speakers have always been multilingual, and indeed Naro speakers used to speak a language related to Ju, and over time this gave rise to the Naro language that we find now (Barnard 2014:210).

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Language users</th>
<th>Percent of 1,601,885</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setswana</td>
<td>1,253,080</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>National status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikalanga</td>
<td>126,952</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>No status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shekgalagari</td>
<td>44,706</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shiyei</td>
<td>4,801</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herero</td>
<td>10,998</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setswapong</td>
<td>5,382</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebirwa</td>
<td>11,633</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbukushu</td>
<td>27,653</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subiya</td>
<td>6,477</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sekgothu</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sesarwa (Khoisan)</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,037</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.9</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indigenous</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>No status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ndebele</td>
<td>8,174</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shona</td>
<td>11,308</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>34,433</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others foreign</td>
<td>18,811</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,601,885</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14 A ‘language family’ is a set of languages that have diverged from a common source.
English was given official language status and it was seen as a neutral language that was not associated with any ethnicity and which favoured no ethnic group over another (Batibo 2005:20). This ex-colonial language also became useful to the ruling elite who were able to use English as a ‘tool for social distinction and the maintenance of power’, as the majority of the population could not use it in a sophisticated way (Batibo 2005:20). It was the language associated with modernisation and progress, and, according to Chebanne (2008:95), it is spoken by just over two percent of the population in the home (Table 3). However, many more speak it as a second or third, or even fourth language which is not visible through these statistics. There is also significant borrowing of English words and, for instance, in more urban areas Setswana sentences might include four or five English words. Note that although Table 3 lists ‘Sesarwa’ there is actually no language called this and so its inclusion in this table highlights the problems of recording language in Botswana. Sesarwa is a Tswana word, meaning ‘the language of’ Basarwa and its use alerts us to the issue of the homogenisation of San ethnic and linguistic groups.

Education is free for ten years (ages 6-15) and this includes seven years in primary school (Standards 1-4 in lower primary and Standards 5-7 in upper primary), and three years in junior secondary school (Form 1-3). Finally, two further years in senior secondary school are optional (Forms 4-5) (Buchmann and Hannum 2001; Davies 2007; Hays 2011; Nyati-Ramahobo 2004). Following the Revised National Policy on Education (1994) Setswana has been used to teach in Standard (primary) 1, and from Standard 2 onwards tuition changes to English. However, depending on school-to-school practices, English might be introduced at any time between Standard 2 and Standard 4 (Adeyemi and Kalane 2011:122). There is often significant code-switching between Setswana and English in classrooms, so in practice children are taught in both languages (Arthur 2001; Nyati-Ramahobo 2004).

Sought-after private schools in Gaborone (like the one that Lebo in Chapter Four attended), teach in English throughout all years. Many parents who send their children to private schools believe that their children will automatically learn how to
speak Setswana as it was both the language that they used and the lingua franca of the nation. Setswana was most commonly used in shops, clinics, on the radio and Botswana Television (BTV). Children who have been to private schools often have a higher level of English language proficiency than those who attend government schools. Paradoxically, the language policy makes it more difficult for children who go to government schools (rather than private schools) who use a minority language as their mother tongue. At government schools students must first learn Setswana before they can learn concepts and ideas. By the time the students have begun to grasp Setswana, the language shifts to English, meaning they often learn English through Setswana. This only serves to reinforce the status of majority over minority languages. Whereas in private schools English is the language of instruction from Standard 1 and thus children only have to learn one new language, which makes the process much easier for minority language speakers.

### Naro: A regionally important language

It is estimated that there are about 49,000 San in Botswana, and depending on the source used, they speak between thirty-five (Batibo 2005:9), twenty-three (Güldemann 2014:7), or twenty-two (Barnard and Boden 2014a:6) languages. These speakers make up just over two percent of the population in Botswana (Chebanne 2008:95). These languages used to be described as Khoisan languages, but are now described by linguists as being from three language families; Khoe-Kwadi, Kx’a and Tuu (Barnard and Boden 2014a:6). Naro comes from the Khoe-Kwadi family which is made up of Khoe (a few tens or hundreds of thousands of speakers) and Kwadi (virtually extinct). Khoe-Kwadi used to be known as the Central Khoisan language family (see Figure 9).

Between the numerous mother tongue languages spoken by San, Naro has the most number of speakers at approximately 9,000-10,000 people, which makes it the tenth most spoken language in Botswana (Batibo 2009:198). Hessel Visser, a Dutch
linguist and resident of D’Kar, explained that there are three main dialects of Naro: Naro (main/central dialect), Ts’aokhoe and New Xanagas (dialect of Naro spoken around New Xanagas). However, Ts’aokhoe is not being maintained as children are speaking the main Naro dialect instead (Visser 2000:2). In D’Kar, the majority of people speak the main Naro dialect, and Naro is transmitted as a first language or mother tongue (Sommer and Widlok 2013:479).

Figure 9

The Khoisan languages, taken from Chebanne (2008: 95) and highlighted to show Naro which is part of the Khoe-Kwadi language family.

**Note that =Hua is now N!aqriaxe, and is almost extinct.

Due to the small number of speakers and their marginalisation and subjugation by dominant Bantu language speakers, Ju, Shua, Tshwa, G/wi, G//ana and other languages are classified as ‘highly endangered…extinct or nearly extinct
languages’ (Batibo 2005:145, 2007:196; Sommer and Widlok 2013:480; Visser 2000). However, Naro is perceived as a relatively thriving and regionally important language (Batibo 2005:52). Benji (24, Naro speaker) explained in his own way that, ‘Naro’s are lazy’ to speak other Khoisan languages. He noted that Naro becomes the language of preference when San from different language groups speak to one another. Although Naro might be termed as marginal as it is a minority language, which is generally spoken by people who occupy a low ethnic status, Naro is one of Gantsi District’s regionally dominant languages and is used for intergroup communication (Sommer and Widlok 2013:479).

Part Two: D’Kar and Gantsi District – history and language

Naro speaking San have resided in Gantsi District for up to 22,000 years. In the past 170 years, a number of different language and ethnic groups, including both white and black groups, have settled in Gantsi District. It has been suggested that because San in Gantsi district, and Naro speaking San in particular, no longer lived in the bush they were ‘farm’ rather than ‘wild bushmen’ [sic.] (Guenther 1979:2) and have been ‘acculturated’. Acculturation suggests that the culture of one group engulfs the other. The implications of such categorisation in terms of recognition and claims to an identity as former hunter-gatherers or as indigenous peoples might be to undermine these claims as somehow ‘inauthentic’.

Prior to the 1850s, San were the only inhabitants of Gantsi District, and there were at least seven language groups; Naro, G/wi, G//ana, Ju, Ts’ao, and !xo (Guenther 1979:45–46), and Nama too. In the latter stages of the 18th century Herero, Kgalagadi and white Afrikaans speaking South African settlers came to the area (Childers 1976:10; Guenther 1979:54, 1986:36). Setswana speaking Barolong, from the south, arrived around 1895, and Herero arrived after the war in Namibia around 1907, and

---

15 Ju is known locally as Sekaukau.
by 1906 Kgalagadi were already settled in Kalkfontain (see map, Figure 2). Meanwhile, Setswana speaking Tawana from Ngamiland were engaging in hunting exchanges with Naro speaking San, and took some San as their slaves (Guenther 1986:37). Afrikaners settled in the district from 1874 onwards, following Henrick van Zyl, the first white settler to the area (Gillett 1970:54). So in addition to the seven languages spoken by San, there were also two dialects of Setswana spoken by Barolong and Tawana, as well as two other Bantu languages, Kgalagadi and Herero and finally there was also Afrikaans: a total of eleven languages spoken in this area. This suggests that Gantsi District has always been multilingual, with Khoisan languages which have been a Spachbund for approximately 2,000 years, and with non-Khoisan languages too from 1895 onwards.

Since the 1890s much of the most fertile land was divided and given to white Afrikaans speaking farmers. This area is called the Gantsi Farming Block. Even with the division of the land, San moved between farms relatively freely. Many of the white farmers knew how to speak Naro and other Khoisan languages. The relationships between farmers and San generally matched this linguistic phenomenon as they worked and lived cooperatively. Farmers needed the labour and the knowledge of survival in the bush provided by San in finding water, hunting as well as gathering wild foods, especially in times of drought when farming was not productive (Childers 1976:9; Russell and Russell 1979:54, 68).

From the 1930s onwards English speaking farmers settled in the area, adding to the linguistic mix, and dividing the white farming population. Many new English speaking farmers had more progressive and commercially minded ideas about farming (Childers 1976:13). Infrastructure was improved in the region which meant the cattle trade between Gantsi and other Districts was more favourable: cattle rearing became more lucrative. At this time white famers seemed to have fairly powerful relationships with people in government and could influence decisions.

In the 1950s, the government allocated a further one hundred and thirty new farms, and in 1959 introduced a law which required freehold farmers to fence their
land. Most of the land that Naro speaking San used was now part of the Gantsi Farming Block, and was divided into these fenced-off farms. The free movement of San over this land was curtailed, as residing on farms was only lawful if they were employed by the farmer. Gathering wild food became more difficult for San, as they were unable to easily reach the areas that were most plentiful in each season. Access to land was being shaped by decisions in central government. However, to a certain degree being allowed to stay on the farms and being given jobs was also locally negotiated. The Afrikaans speaking farmers that San already knew were more likely to grant employment and settlement on their land. These farmers had been on the land longer than the newer English speaking farmers. It was advantageous and also more likely that San spoke Afrikaans with those farmers with whom they had long-standing relationships.

The history of the region in relation to language is the groundwork to understand the context of language use in the region today. Gantsi is still a multilingual District, and it follows that those who were residing in D’Kar were surrounded by different languages. In the next section of the chapter I switch the focus to Jude and Moses who were leaders in the San village. Living in hostels was often mentioned by San as being one of the most difficult and challenging aspects of school. Moses was fortunate because rather than living away from home, he was able to complete his early primary education at D’Kar Primary School (1993–1999). Moses moved away from home between 1999 and 2002 to attend junior secondary school in Charles Hill, and then between 2002 and 2004 for senior secondary at Gantsi (see map, Figure 10). For three years, between 2004 and 2007, he volunteered for Kumku and D’Kar Trust (which are both part of Kuru NGO). During this time he explained that he conducted research into Naro traditional healing and he wanted to find out ‘how they [the healers] heal’, if young people were learning how to heal, and whether healing practices would continue in the future. He was concerned with cultural conservation and maintenance, which was also matched by the NGO’s foundational purposes.
Working as a volunteer for these three years, Moses gained experience in how NGOs work. Volunteering was possible as he had financial support and emotional encouragement from his family, which not all San have as they would often need to financially contribute towards their family’s food and subsistence. Pursuing cultural and political endeavours through investigations into the cultural and social changes of healing dances was also encouraged by missionaries who worked in the village. These missionaries were interested in promoting self-esteem, and positive cultural values and so encouraged and developed projects around and for the production of cultural practices. Between 2007 and 2009, Moses went to tertiary college in Gaborone and completed a two year Human Resources Diploma. Between 2009 and 2011, he again worked for D’Kar Trust as a business development officer and between 2011 and 2013 he worked as a secretary for the Custodian Unit, an advocacy arm of Kuru.
His work trajectory in D’Kar was concentrated on cultural conservation and research, as well as preserving and promoting cultural values, and engaging in cultural history.

**Moses: A crash landing in language politics**

When I arrived in D’Kar it was refreshing to hear Naro being spoken at a public celebration/party being held in the central area of the village where the church building (see Figure 11), pre-school as well as numerous log cabin buildings that housed Kuru NGO offices were located. It was refreshing as I had come from Gaborone where I mainly heard Setswana or English being spoken. Moreover, it was heartening to know that Naro was spoken in public, as in Gaborone, some university educated San explained how their languages were not supported or recognised in Botswana, and that it was hard for them to speak their languages in public. The impression that the buildings, and the open use of Naro language gave, was that D’Kar was ‘somewhere’, as opposed to being a remote ‘nowhere’ that San villages in Botswana were often depicted as through governmental use of ‘Remote Area’ terminology (Saugestad 2001:169).

I had telephoned ahead to Kuru, and a Naro speaking San woman, who had been waiting for my arrival, warmly greeted me in English. I entered the Bokomoso Trust’s office, the education ‘arm’ of Kuru NGO, and greeted Deborah, the Zambian finance officer, in Setswana. She laughed playfully, and reciprocated by greeting me in Setswana, although I could tell that she spoke with a poor accent. She quickly switched to English, and explained the cost of the hostel where I was booked to stay. Later I found out that nearly all the employees in Kuru, except for some drivers and cleaners, can speak English. In fact like many jobs in Botswana, literacy in English was a prerequisite for getting a job here.
Facing the hostel building was the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC), a large Dutch style structure with a sloping triangle roof made of red corrugated iron sheets (Figure 11). Two large 4x4 vehicles were parked in the arena, and by the look of the deep loose sand these were essential pieces of equipment. Moses (25, Naro speaker) walked past me, near to the Church building. He was living in D’Kar and identified himself as a Naro speaking San. Moses’ life trajectory and working opportunities have largely been shaped by the availability of employment in D’Kar, his home village. His education and level of English language have helped his employability. He is also the son of Jude, an elder and community leader.

Moses walked towards me with an out-stretched arm ready to shake my hand. He was tall and thin, and he smiled at me whilst peering over the top of his small
rectangular glasses, engaging me with direct eye contact. I could not tell how old he was. There were conflicting clues - his confidence and manner spoke of a man much older than his face suggested. I began to introduce myself in the Setswana language I had learnt in Gaborone. He cut me off to inform me this was ‘not the best way to get around in this place’. Naro was the language spoken in D’Kar, and he reassured me that he would prefer it if we spoke together in English. It was easy to communicate with Moses in English as he was fluent, and although my Setswana was improving, I was still missing important parts of conversations. I felt a slight panic that all the language learning I had already done was in one fell swoop taken away! However, Moses was confident to request that we use his preferred language of communication and was quick to dismiss Setswana. This suggested a strong move against Setswana language and Tswana culture.

This was a crash landing in language politics, and indeed the wider politics of identity and belonging for San. Moses’ disapproval of Setswana, and positive affirmation of Naro language and in the context of this research, approval of the English language, spoke more broadly as a rejection of Tswana domination and towards his position as an educated political advocate. As discussed in Chapter Four, San were often discriminated against by Setswana speaking people through challenges, for instance when the women at the party laughed at Grace as she read aloud. Setswana has largely been the language through which derogatory relationships and ways of relating to San have developed in Botswana. When Moses distanced himself from Setswana language, it suggested that he was emancipated from these derogatory Tswana ‘rules’.

Over time I heard rumours that in D’Kar, Moses was known by other Naro speaking San as a ‘white man’. This was in part due to his ancestry as his grandfather from his father’s side was an Afrikaans speaking white man of Scottish descent, and his grandmother was a Naro woman. Moses’ mother was Ju’hoan. Parental mixing in D’Kar was relatively common although, historically speaking, ethnically mixed parentage, especially between an Afrikaner and a Naro person, was not often socially
accepted by the white population (Russell and Russell 1979). However, since other San in D’Kar who have ethnically mixed descent are not all called ‘white men’, the ethnicity of Moses’ ancestors seemed to be less important than his behaviour in determining his nickname and it revealed how people in D’Kar understood identity, and that language was used as a marker. Of particular note was how he used the English language, as well as how he took a position of relative authority: he was a self-titled ‘advocate’ for San, in D’Kar, in the nation, and further afield too. In May 2011, Moses read a statement at the 11th Session of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues in New York (see Sapignoli 2012 for more on San in international indigenous rights forums). Moses’ use of English supports an image of him being ‘white’, which the ancestry from his father’s side also suggested.

Language was an important aspect of Moses’ identity as a Naro speaking San person. In comparison to his own position, he spoke aboutǂKhomani San in South Africa as he had recently come back from a workshop in the Western Cape that was attended byǂKhomani people.ǂKhomani are San ‘others’ in relation to Moses who is Naro and in part this is significant in the way that Moses relates to and positions himself in relation to them.

In 1999ǂKhomani people were legally given 38,000 hectares of land by the South African Government (Chennels 2002; Robins 2001). Yet Moses dismissively describedǂKhomani people as ‘Just a bunch of coloured people who have lost land and they came together’, suggesting he did not strongly believe in their claim for land, or in their authenticity as San who could then make claims as indigenous people. His concerns about being coloured did not come from racially (physically) orientated markers, rather he drew on language:

‘Their [ǂKhomani] children [same generation as Job with parents aged 55 years or older] don’t speak [N/u, the Khoisan language of that region]. They just speak Afrikaans’.

Moses, 2011
Did Moses ascribe to the rhetoric that compels a conclusion that ‡Khomani have lost their culture or have been “‘deculturated’ and so no longer possess a culture that could count as “indigenous’’ (Sylvain 2002:1076)? Or is there more going on as he seeks to define himself in a process of othering in which creating distinctions between the closest ‘others’, ‡Khomani, is a powerful way of creating identity. As we know, identity formation is about sameness and difference. Yet the paradox of identity is that rather than having a more strong sense of sameness, it is often those who are the most same who have the most complex ways of differentiating themselves from each other (Bucholtz and Kira Hall 2004:370).

I asked Moses if he had questioned the ‡Khomani people as to why they describe themselves as coloured, but he said that he had not. Rather his interaction with them had ‘made me question myself’. This admission lay in the room as we both contemplated the significance of this refection. Indeed, Moses has a ‘coloured’ father, Jude, who grew up with a Naro speaking mother and a white Afrikaans speaking father. However, Job’s mother and father both identify as being Naro. This mixed lineage is a potential point of weakness in his claims for indigenous rights internationally, and his claims to belonging locally (Hitchcock 2002:799). Moreover, his local perception of being a white man may also jeopardise his authenticity as a Naro San. His concern for using Naro – or rather his concern that ‡Khomani did not use their own language - was a particular point of contention that he raised.

I pushed this idea of what markers are used for ethnic distinction further. I asked Moses what he thought about the use of blood tests in Canada (and Australia) that determine if a person is classified as an indigenous First Nations, Canadian. Below is a quote from Moses in response to this question.

‘I mean you don’t have to be an indigenous person because of how much indigenous blood you have in you. It’s just a matter of how, how you grew up and where you, where you have grown up. I mean if, if I grew up elsewhere as a San person as a Naro person, let’s say in Gaborone, and I never knew the language, I grew up as a Tswana person. I become a Tswana. My customs, what I do is just all Tswana. So I accept myself as Tswana. But if I say, if I realise, no, I’m not really Tswana, I’m Naro. I must try to get back to where I
am from. I mean if you really, maybe there is too much white in you but you really want to associate yourself with being Indian, what you going to do?’

Moses, 2011

Here language and customs were important for Job. They were markers of identity, but more than that language and customs - the practicing of ethnicity - outweigh an indigenous blood argument prevalent in Canada and Australia. Indigenous identity is articulated as a practice and set of behaviours and language is used as a central marker and descriptor for ethnic distinction. However, that language is not removed from tradition and customs suggests how Moses articulates ideas about language within a dominant rhetoric which indicates that culture and language are mutually intelligible, and carry one another. Within this idea, the loss of language runs alongside the loss of culture.

There is also a tension running here between how you are socialised and your bloodline. In case there is a crossover between these dominant ways of orientating identity, an issue is raised about the potentially challenging implications for claims as an indigenous person. Children from ethnically mixed parents, or those who live and/or work outside their mother tongue language speaking area are more vulnerable to these issues as their positionality is often socially understood as ‘neither one or the other’.

Jude: Afrikaans and Naro

As a boy, Jude, a 75 year old Naro speaking San man, explained that he worked alongside his father, Sammy (deceased), and brothers (Figure 10) on farms in Gantsi District, erecting fences and digging boreholes for farmers. Jude never attended formal school. He explained that his white Afrikaans speaking father of Scottish descent spoke Afrikaans (as opposed to English) and his mother was a Naro speaking San woman and his parents spoke Naro to each other. Jude grew up predominantly speaking Naro. They were able to forge good working relationships with local
Afrikaner farmers and thus they probably had a relatively steady income. Jude lived the life of a relatively affluent man under the protection of his father (for a similar story in Namibia of the son of a !Xun [San] woman and wealthy Ovambo [non-San] man, see Takada 2015:94).

Jude can speak Naro, but also G/wi, Afrikaans and Setswana fluently. He was not fluent in English although he was able to make basic practical arrangements in English. For instance, in September 2011, I approached Jude to ask about renting a property in D’Kar. We had a conversation in English without an interpreter, about a number of issues to do with the property. I was sometimes unsure about how much English he did or did not understand.

\[\text{Figure 12: Illustration showing Jude (red) and his siblings. His father, Sammy (purple), had children with seven Naro speaking women.}\]

\[\text{Figure 13: Illustration showing Jude’s (red) children with six different women. Moses (green) is Jude’s last-born son.}\]
Post-independence in Gantsi district

Following independence, some white farmers decided to leave their land as they were fearful of the new African-ruled government, while others stayed to protest against African-governed services. In Gantsi District, Guenther (1986:48) wrote that there was an ideological polarisation between “African” liberalism and “European” supremacy. Presumably this polarisation was due to the shifting political and economic power from Afrikaner settlers to a Tswana governance in independence.

Decisions about tax, payments, export, residence permits, land allocation, citizenship, as well as innocence and guilt were made by Setswana speaking people from the east of the country who now dominated the upper echelons of civil service, replacing the British (Russell and Russell 1979:124). For instance, it was reported that Afrikaans speaking people felt the shift away from the ‘…old days’ when it was possible to ‘…slap them [San] around. These days they are more difficult to keep under control’ (Childers 1976:23). Farmers could now be brought to court and tried for causing bodily harm as a court conviction in 1973 against a farmer who used an electric cattle prod on a San worker exemplified (Childers 1976:23). Furthermore, another Gantsi Afrikaner was prosecuted under the racial insult legislation in 1973 after he allegedly called an employee a ‘kaffir’, a derogatory word used for someone with brown or black skin tone (Russell and Russell 1979:133).

Nevertheless, at the time of writing, in 2015, Christian De Graaf, a man of Afrikaner descent, was the Minister of Agriculture for Botswana. He was first elected to parliament in 2004. His farm was located in the Gantsi Farming Block, and it boasts ‘Tautana Lodge’, a luxury hotel for tourists. The Minister of Agriculture is a highly prestigious and high pressure government position. Nearly all Batswana are involved in the cattle trade that is orchestrated through the government-run Botswana Meat Commission (BMC): cattle are the national enterprise. De Graaf is the head of the Ministry that directly deals with the BMC, and so the decisions that he makes affect nearly everyone in the country: from farmers who own only one or two heads of cattle, to those with large commercial farms. Since De Graaf was in Parliament, this
suggested that although the Afrikaans language and ethnic group are a minority, Afrikaners still have a significant voice within the political structure.

There was a certain level of pride from residents in Gantsi District that De Graaf was from their District. Many San thought that he must have the interests of the District at heart, and San in D’Kar often spoke fondly of De Graaf because, they said, he spoke Naro, a sign of his allegiance to the District. However, national newspapers often depicted De Graaf as being underhand and cast aspersions about his conduct being corrupt (Dithapelo 2013). In Gantsi District, Afrikaners were more likely to be understood and respected, but in the wider Botswana society Afrikaners were less influential and less accepted. The particular trajectory of their settlement in Gantsi District probably supported this as they held the majority of the fertile land and have been able to affect policy change in the region. In most other parts of Botswana Afrikaners have settled less prominently.

The status of ‘whiteness’ was ambiguous in Botswana. On occasion whiteness signified immorality, sexual promiscuity and a perception that whites think they are culturally superior, while at the same time ‘white’ Western culture, such as English language, education and music was often revered. In D’Kar San differentiated Afrikaans speaking white farmers who they liked and were more likely to know, from the less well-liked English speaking white farmers. In the rest of Botswana English speaking whites seemed to be more favoured over the Afrikaans speakers. San made further distinctions between Europeans and Americans, although crucially some research participants discerned those with a ‘good heart’ and those with a ‘bad heart’. Like this, individuals would be known locally for their character. I will now go on to look at the way D’Kar village has been formed in and around these wider politics.

Part Three: D’Kar land, missionaries and the Church

In 1963, a few years before Botswana’s independence in 1966, a farmer who was said to have been of Namibian origin, named Thys Talijaard, entrusted D’Kar farm land
to the Aranos Reformed Church, Namibia on behalf of San. A Christian mission was set up in 1964 on this farm land. Between 1968 and 1970 a school and a hostel, that housed San school children from other settlements, was set up by the mission. At around a similar time the Dutch Reformed Church in Africa also built a school at Xanagas, and in 1977 they also built one in Kuke. However, by 1978 the D’Kar mission could no longer financially sustain their school, clinic and hostel. The missionary had to give the land and responsibilities for providing salaries, food and equipment to the government. The other missionary schools at Xanagas and Kuke were also taken over by the Government. The pastor at that time, Gert Dirking (deceased), acted as the negotiator for the D’Kar land transfer, and now the government has land inside the village for the kgotla, clinic and primary school (see map of D’Kar, Figure 5).

Figure 14

A photocopy of the title land deed for D’Kar, stamped by the Deeds Registry, Botswana, on 22nd February 1989.
Even though there had been mission-run schools, very few San attended school before 1977. At this time the Bushman Development Programme was renamed the ‘Basarwa Development Programme’ in 1975 and became the Remote Area Development Programme (RADP) in 1977. Alongside the new education policy that encouraged education-for-all through the provision of free schooling (Republic of Botswana 1977), the RADP accelerated school enrolments in the early 1980s as they provided school uniforms and a school ‘feeding programme’. Between 1990 and 1999 the number of San enrolled at schools doubled.

The Church at D’Kar was also given the status as an independent arm of the Reformed Church and it became ‘D’Kar Reformed Church’. The D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC) was the first piece of land to be officially owned by a collective of San (Adowa de Bruin, 2013, pers. comm.) and at the time of writing it still held legal rights over the land (Figure 14). In 1983 the first economic and social projects were set up by the new missionaries, Cornelius (deceased) and Adowa de Bruin (68, Afrikaans speaker). The NGOs in the village are the legacy of these efforts.

What follows in the next section is an account from Gums (over 70, Naro speaker) about how D’Kar land was given to San. He was the recipient of this land, as well as a recipient of employment opportunities and developments from NGO projects and he spoke to me through an interpreter. Later I spoke to Adowa de Bruin, the former missionary, about her experiences in D’Kar and later she wrote to me at length in 2013 via email.

**Gums’ history of D’Kar**

Thys Talijaard, a farmer, was a good God-fearing man, although he liked to swear! He wanted to move away so he arranged to swap his farm, Dtcoca/dxo, with another farm in Namibia. Dtcoca/dxo is the name that San use for D’Kar: it is the original name. Thys had been living and farming on Dtcoca/dxo for a long time (also see Russell and Russell 1979:15), and he realised that if he moved, then San would soon
be without any land since, as Gums said, ‘the Bushmen were helpless to keep the land for themselves’. Thys feared that San would not be able to defend the land from Setswana speaking people who were moving onto the surrounding farm land.

In the Botswana National Archives an account from a Ghanzi Farmers’ Association corroborates this fear, and for instance, Thomas Hardbattle, a farmer who advocated for San, wrote to the District Commissioner in 1951 after fearing that San would be left landless:

Bushmen are entitled to a place in the sun like any other inhabitant of the territory…people are likely to forget that they were the original inhabitants of the Ghanzi District. (Botswana National Archives 1951)

Two years later, in January 1953, Hardbattle suggested that 22,000 morgen of land (approximately 18,900 hectares) was set aside for Naro speaking San (Botswana National Archives 1953a).16 Again the next month, Hardbattle pushed that each San ‘clan’ should be provided with a ‘sanctuary’ with a separate water hole:

Where each clan could come to and from as he pleased and to view as his haven or home area. No attempt would be made to compel Bushmen to live there and nowhere else, or prevent them from working on farms or elsewhere if they so wish. (Botswana National Archives 1953b)

Clearly efforts were made by farmers to ensure that San were not forgotten by the government. So although the relationship was paternalistic, there was a sense that farmers and San were generally fighting the same battle that was directed against Batswana, Kgalagadi and Herero.

Gums explained that he had come with his father to live on Dteogaadxoo farm. Gums’ father was friends with Komtsa Komtsa’s father, and Komtsa Komtsa’s father had worked for Thys for many years. Thys had specifically brought Komtsa’s family

16 Morgen is a unit of measurement used in Germany and the Netherlands and although the measurement varied, in South Africa the conversion rate was 1 morgen = 0.856532 hectares (Law Society of South Africa n.d.).
with him from Kuke where he had been farming before he moved. Thys wanted to leave *Dteogadxoo* land to Komtsa Komtsa’s family and to his other San workers, rather than to the encroaching Setswana speaking tribes.

Along with Thys, Komtsa Komtsa and Gums as well as other San, attended the Church in Aranos, Namibia where, as Gums explained, there were ‘many white people who were all friendly’. Gums was given food and, he proudly explained that this was where he first slept in a bed. In Aranos the land was accepted by the Church on behalf of San. Komtsa Komtsa was the representative who accepted this offer and who shook hands with the people involved.17 The people at the Church told Gums and the other San that this was their land now.

**Adowa’s account: Kuru and the Naro Language Project**

In her youth, Adowa lived in D’Kar when her father, Gert Dirking had been the missionary there. In 1982 Adowa came back to live and work in D’Kar with her husband Cornelius de Bruin:

> My husband accepted a calling by the Church council in 1982 and brought me and my 2 kids here much against my will. I adapted though, and got involved in people's lives and therefore still consider this place as my home village. We lived there (in 5 different homes) for 17 years, until 1998.

Adowa de Bruin, 2013

Cornelius and Adowa de Bruin arrived when the school and clinic were already being run by the government. They quickly reacted to the state of poverty in the village and set up the first Kuru projects in 1983 which included a sewing group, a vegetable garden, leather workshop and tannery. From 1984 to 1986, an education arm of Kuru, called Bokomoso Trust, established a preschool programme. Water, fencing and other

17 Komtsa Komtsa was a well-known and remembered person in D’Kar although he passed away some time before my arrival.
services for D’Kar were funded through a different arm of the NGO, called D’Kar
Trust.

The D’Kar Reformed Church has its own Council, the D’Kar Reformed
Church Council (DRCC). According to the current pastor, van Burren, there were
eight elders and five deacons, and he explained that ‘a deacon is responsible for the
physical needs of the congregation’, whereas the elders were ‘responsible for the
spiritual needs of the congregation’. This was based on a structure that has been
replicated in all Reformed Churches. The DRCC members, i.e. the deacons and the
elders, were supposed to rotate and change over time; however some of the same
council members had been on the DRCC for many years. In the beginning, the Church
and the NGO affairs were all dealt with and managed by the DRCC. The DRCC
members made decisions about development projects, as well as the spiritual needs
of the village residents.

In 1986, the Kuru Development Trust (now called Kuru Family of
Organisations (KFO), though still referred to as Kuru) was formed so that it would
run separately from the governance of the DRCC. In 1989, the same year that the land
title deed was fully processed (Figure 14), Kuru was officially registered as a
development NGO. The first Kuru governance board was formed in 1990, signifying
structural efforts towards a separation between the Church and NGO. In 1991, the
Kuru Art Project, as well as a San political advocacy group called First Peoples of the
Kalahari (FPK), were founded. A Dutch couple, Hessel and Coby Visser who worked
for the Christian Reformed Church, also came to D’Kar Reformed Church in 1991 to
work on translating the Bible into Naro. They were still living in the village in 2011
and 2012.

While there were some attempts, for instance by Barnard (1985), to write Naro
language, before Hessel and Coby Visser began the translation project, Naro was
largely an oral language. Barnard used the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA)
system that was based on Latin to write Naro, as there was no specific Naro
orthography at that time. The Naro Language Project (NLP) however, engaged in
academic recording and development of Naro language and developed a new Naro orthography and lexicon. A Naro dictionary with over 2,000 entries was published in 2001 (Visser 2001), a monthly Naro newsletter was published, and stories and language learning materials were produced (see Chebanne 2010b for the role of dictionaries in codifying language). The Naro New Testament was published in 2012.

Although the language project was motivated by translating the Bible, the wider value of creating a written language was also undeniable. The project ran Naro literacy (reading and writing) classes that were available to all Naro speakers. While Hessel and Coby Visser were unsure about the exact numbers of Naro speakers who were literate in Naro, they commented that they were often pleasantly surprised as people would spontaneously read a passage (of the Bible) out loud in Naro, or would confidently explain how a Naro word was spelt. Batibo (2007:199, 2009:5–6) writes that Naro speakers have been empowered by the promotion, documentation and use of their own language.

Having a written language means that if and when government policy around minority languages changes, Naro language will be more easily accepted and channelled into schools and into wider public use as there are already resources available. Moreover, in Botswana, Naro is the third language to have its own Bible (Kajevu 2012). The Bible was translated into Setswana by Robert Moffatt in 1957, and the Kalanga Bible was published in 2009. Seeing as Naro is the only other language to have a Bible, it endows it with a certain prestige and dominance over other languages that do not have this, as Christian morals are valued in the wider Botswana society.

**Afrikaans in Sunday Church service**

During my fieldwork, DRC services in D’Kar were held every Sunday. They were normally led by the Afrikaner pastor, Marius van Buren (40) who speaks Afrikaans, or sometimes a Tawana pastor who conducted his services in Setswana. In both cases
one of the Church elders, sometimes Jude, stood up at the front of the Church next to the pastor and translated the service, either from Afrikaans or Setswana, into Naro. The congregation was mostly Naro speaking San. Sometimes the two Dutch linguists and maybe an Afrikaans speaking NGO employee, and the Setswana speaking Kgosi (chief) would also attend.

The use of Afrikaans and Setswana in the Church surprised me, as both the Afrikaner and Tawana pastors spoke and understood Naro. When I asked members of the congregation why the pastors did not address the congregation in Naro, San responses were that the pastors speak in the languages they can best communicate in. In the wider context of D’Kar this was normal practice, and many residents listened to whichever language was being spoken, and then would respond in their own preferred language.

Each week the service was translated into Naro, and sometimes it was Jude who took the role as translator. He was able to do this because he had a good understanding and knowledge of Afrikaans and Naro languages. Moses would not be able to take his place easily as he cannot understand Afrikaans. In the context of the DRC, knowing the Afrikaans language was advantageous and in some respects was rewarded as not only could you directly understand the pastor, but you may also become a translator who stands up in Church and has the crucial job of speaking to, and translating the words of the pastor to the rest of the congregation: a critical role in terms of the work of the church.

It seemed odd that the pastors did not support the use of Naro in the DRC, especially since the NLP has spent the last twenty years researching and writing this language, specifically for the Bible to be translated. I asked the Naro language team about this and they explained that in Chobokwane, another San settlement in Gantsi District, there was a San pastor who spoke Naro to the congregation. Their hope was that a similar thing would happen in D’Kar. Meanwhile, I spoke to the Afrikaans speaking pastor at D’Kar, Van Buren, who explained that he was invited to come to the village by DRCC members, and he seemed stable and settled in his role there.
Although the Naro Language Project has been built upon missionary foundations, there were underlying tensions between the DRC and the NLP that suggested there were competing ideas and positions within and about the Church, which were revealed through the language used in the Church service.

**English at the Naro New Testament Bible Dedication Day**

The Naro New Testament Bible Dedication Day was the unveiling of the printed and completed version of the Naro New Testament. It took place on the 10th November 2012 and was hosted in D’Kar. It was the culmination of twenty years of hard work by Hessel and Coby Visser and their team of four San translators, not to mention the broader network of San who spent many hours being involved in the initial development of the language. Residents who were most closely affiliated with the DRC, through their own participation in the choir, or in attending services, pulled together to create the event.

Firewood was collected, the diesel water pump was fuelled, large tents were erected, food was prepared and cooked, donations for repairs to the existing Church building were made, women set up stalls to sell snacks and drinks, chairs were set out in the tents and a PA system was installed. The choir had been practicing hard during the preceding weeks, a group of traditional dancers had a role to play in the ceremony, t-shirts and programmes had been printed, and arrangements about the ceremony were finalised. Naro speaking San from Chobokwane and East Hanahai were driven to the village. The Naro New Testament books were delivered, guests were invited, friends were accommodated and people came to the event wearing their best clothes.
The Netherlands combined Churches supported and financed the Bible translation project, and so many of the guests at the dedication day were Dutch speaking people from this network. The whole ceremony was conducted in a mix of Naro, English and Setswana, which reflected the diverse mix of guests at the ceremony. Most of the speeches were given in English and sometimes in Setswana, and then translated into Naro by either Moses or another multi-lingual Naro speaking San man. Some of the missionaries, who have worked in Gantsi District for a long time, gave thanks, prayers and sections of their speeches in Naro. In these cases no one translated into English or Setswana.

Jonnie Swartz the Minister for Infrastructure Science and Technology, who had been the Member of Parliament for Gantsi and later Gantsi North since 1987 (however in 2014 the Umbrella for Democratic Change (UDC) candidate, Noah Salakae, won this seat), opened the speeches using Setswana. Other honoured guests also spoke, the majority of whom were European missionaries and members of Church groups who either worked in sub-Saharan Africa or who were from the

Figure 15

The D’Kar Reformed Church choir performing inside the tent erected for the Bible Dedication Day, 2012
Netherlands. They spoke in English and all commended the considerable efforts of Hessel and Coby Visser but more than that, thanked God and sent Him praise. They also encouraged Naro speaking people to take the opportunity to use the Bible, to read it and to know God this way.

Once again, Moses and Jude held central roles and Jude was scheduled to make a speech and this matched his participation in the DRC and in the village. However, Moses gave this speech instead of his father. Moses began in Naro language although he quickly switched to speak in English. The English part began by giving his apologies for his father Jude, who, he said, was too ill to make the speech himself. He used English for the rest of the speech and he gave heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the NLP, as well as thanks to God.

It was notable that at an event celebrating Naro language, Moses chose to use English. I would have expected him to speak in Naro in order to symbolically cement the use and dominance of Naro language. When I asked Moses about his use of English, he simply explained that he would not give a speech in which he translated for himself. I later reflected that if his father had been well, he would have given the speech in Naro. In the future when Moses will inevitably take over more roles from his father, what will happen to the use of Naro more broadly?

Jude was described by other residents of D’Kar as a ‘community leader’. He was one of three employees of the Kuru ‘Custodian Unit’ (including his son, Moses) and was a D’Kar Reformed Church Elder in the D’Kar Reformed Church Council. Jude attended Kuru NGO meetings which were normally held in English. At these occasions he asked for a translation from English into Naro and frequently his son Moses was the translator. Some non-San Kuru staff members thought that Jude just claimed that he was not proficient in the English language, and that he actually understood it. These employees were annoyed as they thought that to insist on a translation into Naro was a way of being ‘difficult’. This was a different view to what was held in the NLP, and to previous pastors who encouraged and supported the use of Naro, and of translation into Naro in these contexts.
Jude was present and conspicuous at formal occasions in the village, for instance he was a speaker at the Naro San Values (2012) book launch, where he gave a speech in Naro that was translated into English by his son Moses. It was common to find both Jude and his son at the podium together. That Jude stepped down at the Naro New Testament Bible Dedication event, in effect, felt like a symbolic handing over of responsibility from father to son. Jude was involved in the Naro translation project from the beginning, having been instrumental in assisting the Vissers early on. Now that the New Testament was completed, was it time for someone else to take over the role and positions of leadership? What will happen to the use of Naro language in Kuru if Jude is not there to ask for translation?
Moses’ use of English was not the only surprising use of language at this event. The choirs, who are often cited by San as being the highlight of, and sometimes the only reason for, attending Church, sung the majority of their songs in either English or Setswana. The songs that are sung in Naro are translations from Setswana songs, rather than being ‘original’ Naro songs. Since no hymns or songs have been developed in Naro language independently, it suggests a level of acceptance of other languages within the Church.

Moreover, it also suggests passivity on the part of San in their development as Christians. Although detailed ethnography of San religious belief is beyond the scope of this thesis, San research participants occasionally made comments about the level of belief in the Church religion held by residents. A Naro speaking San man, James (26) told me that his grandmother was a ‘Sunday believer’, i.e. she went to Church on Sunday, but the rest of the week she did not pay attention to the Bible or Christian beliefs. He explained that this was common amongst residents. For James, who self-identified as ‘the first atheist in his family’, D’Kar residents were ‘pretending’ to be Christians, implying that residents were not ‘real’ believers and were engaging in the Church in minimal ways in order to look like Christians (Dahl 2009:26 also comments on a similar phenomenon in the broader context of Botswana).

James’ perspective seemed to mirror a particular perspective about what Christianity was: an all-encompassing moral and theological shift. James did not explore the possibility of holding both Christian beliefs and ancestor beliefs simultaneously and without conflict. Rather, he was disparaging of those who ‘pretended’. ‘Pretending’ was a trait that Benji, another Naro speaking San man, told me that ‘D’Karians’ (people of D’Kar) were good at. For James, being part of the Church at the same time as observing rituals that linked to beliefs in ancestors was irreconcilable. ‘Pretending’ to be Christians, was a critical local discourse that can help to contextualise the observation that hymns were only translated from Setswana, rather than being developed in Naro, as residents were not fully ‘committed’ to the Christian faith. They were happy to accept translations of songs, rather than creating
their own. This suggests a level of passivity around Church-based belief, though nevertheless it reveals that the Church is part of a discourse in the village as well as in the broader Botswana society.

What follows below are three perspectives from residents in D’Kar who had different ideas and practices around language. All four people, Nco’xae, Jude, Smallie and Benji were kin.

Part Four: Three portraits of language use in D’Kar

Naro not Setswana

I sat with Naro speaking Nco’xae (42, Naro speaker) in her residential yard, under the tree. Jude is Nco’xae’s uncle. Within her household, members of Nco’xae’s family spoke Naro to each other and used few Setswana words. Most of their everyday social life revolved around the four yards of Nco’xae’s brother, two sisters and niece. Atypically for D’Kar, most members of these yards could speak in English well and had at one time or another been employed by Kuru. Only Nco’xae’s mother and her eldest sister did not speak much English, although both worked for Kuru, and could understand a little.

Kaoga (6, Naro speaker) played by the gate of the yard. Nco’xae stopped threading the ostrich eggshell fragments onto the strong rope - she was preparing them in this way before she shaped and smoothed them into perfect circular beads. Later these beads would be designed and crafted into necklaces, bracelets or anklets that were marketed as ‘Bushman crafts’ and sold for cash directly to tourists in D’Kar or to the local craft dealer in Gantsi town (Hitchcock n.d.; Ikeya 1996). She turned to me and pointed over to Kaoga, her youngest child. She asked if I had heard what he was saying, as he had used the Setswana word for ‘gate’ while he played his favourite game of make-believe cars. This game involved imagining any props into the shape of a car (koni sa [Naro]). Nco’xae explained that she does not want to hear her children
using Setswana and said in relation to Kaoga’s use of Setswana, ‘we don’t want this’. However, no matter how her son was taught in their home, every day he went to the pre-school where they speak Setswana. He bought these words back home and mixed them into his everyday speech. As Kaoga grows he will move into primary and secondary school where he will learn more and more Setswana.

While Nco’xae wanted all of her sons and daughters to have a good education she also valued her own language and wants to continue speaking Naro. When I asked if she believed in the school at D’Kar, she replied that she would prefer the school to teach in Naro first, and then to move onto teaching in English. Like this, the children would be given the best of both worlds. It was her belief that her children would automatically learn Setswana from everyday interactions. This justification echoed those of parents whose children attend private schools in Gaborone, in that learning Setswana was something that comes from just being in, and living in Botswana.

This tension summed up how culturally and linguistically conscious San residents of D’Kar understood the impact that the current education system had on the use of Naro language. Although formal education enabled children in terms of learning concepts, ideas and taught them how to read and write, it also reduced the prevalence and use of Naro in everyday conversations. Children were taught to use Setswana instead of their own language, Naro. Learning English was not seen in such a problematic light, and indeed parents wanted their children to be taught in Naro and English. English was seen as an important language to learn in order to find employment opportunities. Parents like Nco’xae were asking for mother tongue education, something that has been identified as one of the biggest educational barriers for indigenous communities (Hays 2011:132).
Smallie is Jude’s elder brother (Figure 12). Smallie’s Omang (national identity card) read that he was born in 1937, making him seventy-seven years old, although he does not trust this date as it was just assigned to him by the issuing office. I asked what language he felt most comfortable speaking and expressing himself in, to which he replied, was Naro. He also spoke G/wi, Afrikaans and Setswana. He explained that he never learnt English. Out of his ten siblings, only one of them, the youngest, went to school. Like his brother Jude, Smallie spent his childhood moving around the Gantsi farms with their father working jobs, such as erecting fences and digging bore holes.

Code-mixing between Setswana and Naro was commonplace in Smallie’s home and yard. \(^{18}\) Code-mixing here is where some words are provided using Setswana, but within a grammatically Naro-formed sentence (Batibo 2005:29). Smallie, as well as his grandchildren and children, mixed Naro and Setswana in this way. Indeed, mixing between Setswana and Naro was commonplace in D’Kar.

I asked Smallie what he thought about his grandchildren using a mix of Naro and Setswana. He told me, ‘what can I do?’ And explained that he also mixed languages as, ‘this is the only language in front of us’. He explained simply that code-mixing was the norm. When I explained that other people in the village were upset when they heard their children speaking Setswana, he laughed and asked ‘will they [the parents] stop them [their children]?’ His laughter signified that he did not think this was a process that could be prevented, by parents, or anyone else. There was no accompanying feeling of regret or sadness around this inevitability.

\[^{18}\text{I do not have a written record of code-mixing as Smallie’s grandchildren, who were often in the yard when I visited, were against him speaking to me. My interpreter, Zach, told me that they think he should not speak to me (or other researchers) as it is an unequal relationship in which I take information and give nothing in return. Writing notes about the general happenings in this yard was impossible, and unwanted in the sceptical eyes of his grandchildren.}\]
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Smallie laughed again, ‘the government says to use English. Why? Do they want their [the government’s] children [i.e. citizens] to be Englishmen?’ He said this in jest as a way to undermine the privilege that the use of English language holds in Botswana. English language comes from overseas, a place far removed from this local context and that had little value to Smallie. While the government values English, making it the language of official matters, in everyday life outside of higher governmental processes, English has limited value in communication between friends and neighbours, ‘English…is seen as a remote elitist language which has little place in village life.’ (Batibo 2009:3). This was signified in Smallie’s laugher that there were no Englishmen here and so why was there a need to use and learn this language. Also crucial to this understanding was that many young San who completed school and who have learnt English, often still remained in the village unable to find employment. There was a seventeen percent rate of unemployment and university graduates still struggle to find employment. Smallie’s criticism of the English language also resonated with this broader issue which was not only faced by San, but also all young people in Botswana.

Rather than following the dominant government rhetoric of English as the official language, Smallie laughs at English as a foreign language. He was more comfortable code-mixing between Naro, his first language, and Setswana, the national language and lingua franca. Smallie’s response towards language was more practical than that of Nco’xae who felt sad about the use of Setswana by her children. Smallie made his decisions based on what is useful for now and not on a projected desire to maintain his language or culture in the future.

**Naro in a Setswana speaking social surrounding**

Benji and Moses are best friends, and Moses is Benji’s uncle. Using one of their laptops, they often enjoyed watching action films together and they liked talking about their problems ranging from women, to political action and advocacy, to other
‘San issues’ and the problems of living in a small place. Their relationship was competitive, and they disagreed about who had a better relationship with their respective girlfriend, or who was more educated. Benji can communicate in Naro, Setswana, Kgalagadi and English. He can ‘hear’ (understand but not speak) Afrikaans, Herero and Ju but if spoken to in these languages he would respond using Naro.

Benji gleefully told me that the most fun and exciting thing that he and Moses did together, was to go to Gaborone and speak Naro in public to each other. Benji explained that it is fun because people who overhear them do not know what to do, and wonder what they are saying. In general Setswana speaking Batswana react negatively when anything about Basarwa (the Setswana word used for San) was spoken about. Often I witnessed physical reactions, for instance, eyes would roll, or audible sighs and other signs of impatience were made alongside general feelings that they were having their time wasted. At other times stereotypical comments about Basarwa being ‘animals’, or wearing leather loin clothes, or being ‘stupid’ and uneducated were added to the conversation. Many Batswana were genuinely shocked when I explained that I was working with San university graduates. I can only imagine the reaction when Benji and Moses talked loudly in Naro, for instance in a combi (mini-bus taxi), laughing as they normally did together.

Understandably, Benji and Moses delighted in speaking Naro together in Gaborone and their combined confidence probably provoked reactions from the people around them. Moses and Benji asserted their linguistic and ethnic identities through openly and unashamedly using their own language with one another in public. Use of Naro was taboo: it had been drummed out of public use from school age onwards. Even if Benji and Moses had to face everyday challenges as they came from a marginalised ethnic, linguistic and cultural group, using Naro in this way carved out their position as confident Naro speakers. After all ‘I am a real Bushman’ and ‘I am Naro’, and ‘I will never be Motswana [connotation towards a Setswana
By being in the city Benji and Moses were breaking the stereotype that ‘Basarwa’ were only found in the bush. Being in the city was a universal sign of wealth in Botswana as moving to the city involved a more expensive lifestyle than the village required. They were asserting their relative position in Botswana, in terms of achievements and successes, as well as representing their ethnic group (nationally known as Basarwa) outside of their stereotype as bush people from the ‘deepest of the deep’, a Tswana phrase that connoted someone who was from deep inside the Kalahari bush, physically, but also mentally and culturally.

Moses and Benji were proud to speak their own language, showing that they felt no shame about who they were and where they came from. They were together, friends and kin, being themselves and not apologising for it. Sometimes Benji visited other towns without Moses. He sometimes found that people were rude or disrespectful towards him and in those cases he might end up in a physical fight with them. Being together with Moses in Gaborone was a safer and more robust unit. Together they could back one another up at times when it seemed inevitable that people would try to put them down for being San.

Will this sense of pride and confidence in Naro language and cultural identity that is lived by Benji and Moses continue? Is this the future for Naro language? Or as Smallie suggests, is there an inevitable and undeniable shift towards using Setswana, the language that Nco’xae is fighting against?

**Conclusion**

Kroskrity (2000:8-23) identified that ‘language ideologies represent the perception of language and discourse that is constructed in the interest of a specific social or cultural group’. This is the idea that what is seen by members of the group as morally good or aesthetically pleasing underlies the way in which language is used. For
instance, to be San is to talk about mother tongue language as being intimately tied to San identity. This was expressed by Moses who stated how language is tied to his understanding of himself and his identity as indigenous San.

This chapter has revealed tensions in the way that language is used. There was a multiplicity of voices about what different Naro speaking and non-Naro speaking people thought in relation to language. Kroskrity (2000:8; 2004:501) writes that seemingly homogenous cultural groups actually consist of contestable and partial cultural conceptions. The language used within a group might ‘represent the construction of particular elites who obtain the required complicity of other social groups and classes’ (Kroskrity 2000: 8; 2004: 501). For instance, Moses, who I spoke to initially in Setswana, told me that this was not the best way to get around in the village. Yet later in the chapter it is clear that this one particular view of language was not necessarily shared by all the residents. Smallie, for instance, preferred to use a mix of Naro and Setswana languages. Residents talked about Naro language use in different ways, revealing that there is no single way that language is conceived in this context, and that the ‘elite’ San (like Moses) that I had been working with represent one voice and perception amongst many.

There is a specific linguistic history in Gantsi District which reveals that Naro has been maintained as a regionally dominant language. While Afrikaans has also had some real importance in Gantsi District, for young San, knowledge of this language is dwindling as employment opportunities for those with education are largely in Setswana and English speaking contexts. Political and economic factors suggest the dominance of other ethnic and linguistic groups: however Naro still remains important in the region, and is often the interethnic language of communication. Indeed, G/wi, G//ana speaking San know and learn Naro. Regionally the use of this language is high and it carries social value, and between Khoisan language groups, Naro holds a relatively prestigious, esteemed position which was explained by Benji who stated Naro speakers have the luxury of being ‘lazy’ in speaking other Khoisan languages as his perception was that ‘everyone knows Naro’.
Naro has been strengthened by the Naro Language Project which has made Naro into a written language. However, there are competing ideas, from San and non-San, about how Naro should be used. For instance, in D’Kar, the NLP would prefer to hear Naro spoken by the pastor in the DRC Sunday services, yet the language used was either Afrikaans or Setswana. ‘Language ideologies are profitably conceived of as multiple because of the multiplicity of meaningful social divisions...within sociocultural groups’ (Kroskity 2000:12; 2004:503). So here age, gender, class, clan and elites all have the potential to produce divergent perspectives. This is iterated where the focus of attention is on the potential for conflict and contention about language use in villages. Yet this is not only amongst San but also among NGO actors, the Church and the NLP.

The people in positions of influence within the DRC were willing, and able, to work with the diversity of languages spoken, and so translation into Naro was provided. This system seems to maintain some of the past historical patterns of relations which have favoured Afrikaner or Tswana in positions of power and prestige. Through the provision of a Naro New Testament that was published in 2012, will the NLP’s accomplishments rebalance this? Moreover, in time when younger people, who have had more experiences at school, for instance Moses or Benji, or indeed, Kaoga too, take over positions of influence in the village, and/or in the DRC, will Afrikaans still be used in Church? Will there be a San pastor in D’Kar?

Moreover, Kroskity writes that, ‘members may display varying degrees of awareness of local language ideologies’ (Kroskity 2000:18; 2004:505). Yet at the same time, in anthropology we understand that discourse or ideology must be read from actual use or practice. Here we are concerned with the agency of the speaker and Kroskity (2004:505) notes:

a correlational relationship between high levels of discursive consciousness and active, salient contestation of ideologies and, by contrast, the correlation of practical consciousness with relatively unchallenged, highly naturalized, and definitively dominant ideologies.
In this chapter though, all three portraits of language use reveal a high level of consciousness. Even for Smallie, who challenged the dominant ideology the least of the three, there was a level of engagement and awareness of his language use and the practical and political implications of using English, a foreign language used by ‘Englishmen’, which distinctly ‘othered’ this language. This high level of consciousness is not surprising given the contentious political situation of San in Botswana and the position of Naro as a minority language, the ongoing NGO involvement in D’Kar which has supported cultural development, and the teaching and development of the written Naro language through NLP. The international indigenous movement is also invoked here as Moses alerted us, and language is intimately connected to the ways in which indigeneity is constructed and so those involved directly and indirectly in this movement are likely to be more conscious of language use, given its importance within this movement.

Differences in the use and ideas surrounding language exist between members of the same family in D’Kar. For some, Setswana was not desirable as it is associated with subordination. This association came from the way the government implemented an assimilationist language policy. Language carries culture, and language policy is symbolic of the social, cultural and political context of Botswana. Language intersects with ethnicity or tribal affiliation, which in turn links to the wider context of discrimination that San face in Botswana.

San parents want their children to have an education at school, although some would prefer them to be taught in Naro and English, leaving Setswana language out of the education system for their children. Looking towards the future then, the languages that are most desirable are Naro and English. Naro language was perceived as being important for cultural appreciation, and for pride in being Naro speaking San. English language was perceived as being important for those seeking employment opportunities, and to interact in international fora. The English language was recognised by the Government of Botswana and so proficiency in English language was also symbolic of participation in a national project of education,
development and modernisation, and symbolised an individual’s success in education. The wider implications for being recognised as participating in practices that were seen as ‘modern’ might lend itself to San being recognised and being taken more seriously and given respect within wider public forums and in political contexts.

Kroskirty writes that ‘members’ language ideologies mediate between social structures and forms of talk’ (Kroskirty 2000:21; 2004:507), which in other words means that speakers consciously tie their sociocultural experiences with the ways in which they use language. In this way, speakers themselves construct language ideologies, and consciously select the features of the social and linguistic systems that they do distinguish. For instance, the way in which Moses and Benji actively and consciously select Naro language to speak in, knowing that the responses they will get from those around them are likely to be negative. Thus, to positively identify with receiving a negative response to Naro language use is to subvert the social structure in which Naro speaking people, as San, are low status and that their language is not to be heard. After all:

The possibility that ethnic identities may be eliminated altogether under nationalism suggests that such identities do not coexist in the kind of multicultural harmony marketed in the mass media and promoted by liberal education, in which physical, cultural, and linguistic specificities become interchangeable and equivalent differences. In reality, in situations of cultural contact, equal status is won, if at all, through bitter struggle. (Buchhotz and Hall 2004:371)

Benji and Moses fight for their equal status and the equal status of their language by openly and actively speaking it in places which have attempted to erase all non-dominant languages.

Finally, ‘language ideologies are productively used in the creation and representation of various social and cultural identities’ (Kroskirty 2004:509). This is where shared language has been used to naturalise the boundaries between social groups, for instance in nationalism. Indeed, the ‘crash landing’ that I received in D’Kar was a clear indication of the understanding of how Setswana language was
perceived as ‘other’, and moreover that the power relationship held within this language was consciously rejected as I was told not to use it. Setswana was superseded by the use of the English language, which appealed to a more powerful status than Setswana holds within the dominant ideology.

The next chapter returns to Jude as it reveals the difficult decisions that San parents face when they are thinking about the future for their children. It maps how prominent San men and community leaders have more recourse to negotiate with government schools so that children may continue both informal cultural practices alongside formal schooling.
Chapter Six

Continuity, change and the production of dùù, a female initiation ritual

In Naro language, female initiation is described as dùùm kg’ài koe si ko qõò (she is going to the dùù place). Dùù is an eland, a large, fatty, and usually solitary antelope and is an important symbol in this ritual. The ritual marks dxae guu (lit. female grown), the passage from adolescence to adulthood. In the past it needed to occur at the time of a girl’s first menstruation, and undertaking the initiation supports her steps into womanhood through teaching her about relationships. By describing the dùù and some of the main problems associated with it, I reveal how voice is used both within and outside the village. Outside the village Jude, who is a local San elite, is able to negotiate with the school in order for his daughter to have permission to partake in her dùù. At the same time, San women’s voices are effective within the dùù practice itself. The dùù is part of a resistance against Tswana acculturation, and yet it also reveals where and how San voice has shifted in relation to what used to be practiced in initiations. The ritual can be understood both as carrying meaning within its particular practices, and also being salient in advocacy for/by San.

Remembering from Chapter One that voice is about what is said as well as the action, the body is a key tool used in voice-making. This chapter focuses on the particular use of San women’s bodies, and the ways in which womanhood is inscribed and recognised in and through the body. The chapter also reveals that there are different levels to San voice, as Jude’s public standing is also a necessary part of making San voices effective in their own right, rather than being dependent on non-San approval. This is partly what makes the initiation a practice of resistance as it supports the maintenance of positive cultural differentiation and identity-making as it is not dependent on the recognition of it from non-San. San struggle to maintain and uphold a positive cultural identity as the dominant rhetoric used in Botswana that being San means being ‘stupid’ and ‘worthless’ largely overshadows interactions...
that San have outside the context of their own communities. Another level is that of San women’s voices that are strengthened from within the group and through dialogue with each other and are able to make changes to the practice of the initiation.

Dorothea Bleek (1928:23) and Isaac Schapera (1930:119) called San initiation the ‘eland bull dance’, however, Lorna Marshall (1999) explained that the male role was given less priority than the female role during female initiation, and so she called it the ‘eland dance’. While Alan Barnard (pers. comm.) explained that in the 1970s the dance was referred to as duù gxoo (eland bull), during my fieldwork neither ‘male’ nor ‘bull’ was used by San in D’Kar when referring to the initiation. Like Marshall (1999), I too have omitted their use here. Within the village, the initiation was frequently only referred to as duù and this is the convention I use in this chapter.

Since 2012, the annual President’s Day in Botswana, has been changed to Heritage Day, suggesting a shifting national focus towards culture and heritage. Reports in national newspapers suggest that initiatives have significance in reviving culture (Gaotlhobogwe 2015; Mokwape 2015; Seretse 2014; 2015), and this feeds into a national discourse of cultural revival and heritage. In South Africa there are moves to ‘re-tradition’ through reinstating and reviving cultural practices and ‘indigenous knowledge systems’ that were otherwise suppressed (see Vincent 2006:27 for the case of virginity testing in South Africa). Duù can be contextualised within this wider rhetoric, suggesting that at the same time as asserting their cultural difference, San are simultaneously signifying a desire to be incorporated into the wider nation that supports and represents a number of different groups and their cultural practices.

Yet noticeably, while Tswana initiations, i.e. bojale (female) and bogwera (male) initiations for Setswana speaking groups are reported in newspapers, there have been no newspaper reports about San initiations (for bojale see Setlhabi 2014). In Botswana the dominant perception of ‘culture’ was based on non-San cultural symbols and practices. Although San cultural identity was being strengthened through duù within D’Kar, San culture on a national level was yet to occupy the same status as non-San, Tswana cultural practices. So within the village San were using their voices to make
and maintain cultural practices but their public voice surrounding diùù was relatively weak. A central issue San women raised about gaining permission from the school for the girl to take time off. Here the low perception and non-recognition of San and San culture affects their ability to practice this ritual at the same time as continuing to attend school and effectively being part of the broader Botswana society.

During the nine months I lived in D’Kar, I attended two San diùù initiations and I heard about a further two that I did not attend. Diùù initiations occurred more frequently than non-San initiations as all women in the village may be initiated at different times, depending on the time of their first menstruation. However, in 2009 a non-San, Kgatla bojale initiation occurred after nineteen years (Setlhabi 2014:459), and throughout history, bojale could take place every three or four years. In this chapter I show how diùù that occurred within D’Kar was not only redolent of life in that village, but also indicative of non-San influences outside the village. Like this, I locate diùù initiation within its broader social and cultural context in which San voice is contested outside the village, but holds a sphere of influence within the village. Here, we specifically note that women are able to influence the production of the ritual through voice. However, these changes are indicative of the influences of the Church and non-San culture with respect to women’s clothing.

**Issues for diùù**

Key issues for diùù included contradictions and pressures in respect of the initiation between the normative and ‘civilising’ pressure for San to attend school which ran alongside a perception that San were not really equipped for school. For instance, there was a general perception of San as troublemakers, illiterates, truants, thieves and generally as a group of ‘backwards’ people who ultimately hold back the overall development of the country. They ‘need’ to be civilised, but since these so-called ‘traits’ are viewed as ‘inherent’, the perception was that they are ultimately holding them back from participating, which in turn holds back the entire nation. A further
tension arose as some San bought into the normative pressure and wanted to attend school and to access their rights as San and as citizens, and to ‘modernise’. Yet, San also want to attend düù, while maintaining their school careers. The school must give permission for the child to take time off for the düù, but from the perspective of the school, giving permission for a child to leave only supports the perceived pattern of behaviour of San as illiterate, ‘backwards’ people who do not want to develop.

For schools and for many Batswana, the best place for San children is at school, where they will learn to read and write and become incorporated and included in the (Tswana) nation (also see the opening vignette of the thesis). If San girls left school without permission it would strengthen the perception of San as troublemakers who were not respectful of the rules. In these cases, returning to school meant the girls faced punishment from their teachers and bullying from their peers. This was not a very appealing prospect for girls who may already find school a difficult and challenging place to learn. It is common for initiated girls to drop out of school, especially if they miss their end of year exams as this would mean they would fail that year and would not progress through the normal government school system.

However, in the case that I discuss in this chapter, Qane, the young Naro speaking initiate was allowed by her school to complete her end of year exams while secluded within a hut, a common part of the düù initiation. This made it possible for her to return to school as she was operating with the permission of the school. Crucially, perhaps, the father of the initiate was Jude, a man who held a relatively high position in the community as a ‘leader’. There is an open question in this chapter as to whether more children will be treated in the same way as Qane, even if their parents do not hold such positions in the community.

A second issue was that since the düù initiation has never been fixed and has always been in a constant state of renewal, it is dependent upon the conditions of the lives of those who practise it, as well as the context in which it is located. As noted in the previous chapters, San are pejoratively distinguished from others and do not have their own rituals and traditions recognised as part of the broader cultural landscape.
of Botswana. This lack of recognition both on formal (school) and informal (interpersonal) levels means that it is hard to negotiate for girls to have their dùù.

In part one of this chapter I will contextualise dùù within its own history, and, for this particular dùù, within its local context in relation to kin. In this way it becomes obvious how the dùù is produced and who is involved, and thus whose voices are heard in this context. Interviews with one of the female singers, Qoba, and Jim, a male kin relation of the initiate, reveal the implications for girls who often either attend dùù initiation or stay in formal schooling. Part two of the chapter will describe ùù over the course of the week it took place. I reserve analysis of this ethnography until part three, where I will draw out contradictions, changes and continuities within dùù. By doing this I reveal how San voice within the village affects change to the dùù, and also reinforces the strength of Naro speaking women to produce and affect change to their culture. Although the chapter will reveal a number of important processes and issues, one of the conclusions is that San choose to participate in dùù, suggesting that value has been placed on this practice as being central to a Naro San identity which is distinct from non-San. Yet seeing as it is only this family and this girl who thus far has been given permission by her school to attend dùù, internal stratification between members of the same San village may benefit some over others in terms of having their voices heard/recognised now, and in the future.

Part one: Context of dùù

A rite of passage

Mathias Guenther (1986:278–281, 1999:164–179), Dorothea Bleek (1928:23), Alan Barnard (1980b:117–118), Isaac Schapera (1930:118–122), Lorna Marshall (Marshall 1999), David Lewis Williams (1981:41–53) and Winifred Hoernlé (1985) have written about female initiation practices amongst San and have described the symbolic and mythological meanings. However, there have been few detailed reports on the initiations which may reflect their private and intimate nature (Guenther 1999:165;
The most recent ethnographies are from Marshall (1999) and Guenther (1986; 1999), based on their fieldwork between 1952 and 1970. Since there are no descriptions of this ritual from the last forty years, this chapter adds to the ethnographic literature on practices within dùù.

*Duù* takes place at the time of a woman’s first menstruation (or as we will see, now also their second), and it mainly involves women, with a few roles for older men and for the father of the initiate. There are slight variations in the way *duù* can unfold which seem to depend on the group leading it. However, Van Gennep’s (1960) tripartite structure of separation, then margin or liminality, and then finally reintegration, offers a structural tool to understand this menarcheal rite (Guenther 1999:166; Silberbauer 1965:87). According to previous scholarly work, the initiate is first secluded in a hut away from the rest of the group, where she is not able to leave for the duration of her menstruation (Guenther 1986:278; Silberbauer 1965:84; Marshall 1999:189). This is a frightening experience for the girl (Hoernlé 1985:62), and sometimes the hut where she is secluded is far from the village (Barnard 1992:112). In the hut she is attended to by two or three old kinswomen (Barnard 1992:155), who bring her food, water and who teach her the ‘many food taboos that she must observe for varying lengths of time’ (Guenther 1999:166). Above all she is told about the danger her current menstrual state holds for men and their hunting weapons (Silberbauer 1965:84–86; Guenther 1999:166; Schapera 1930:119, 121).

During the second, liminal phase, women perform an eland (*dùù*) dance at night time. Women bare their buttocks (see a typewritten interview with ‘Mary’ by Drearley 1997:2 at D’Kar library; Schapera 1930:119), as they dance in a circle, or in a figure of eight, around the girl’s hut (Guenther 1999:166). Bearing buttocks violates a defined standard of ‘public decency’, which subverts normal standards of behaviour in this period of liminality (Guenther 1999:174). The dance steps of the women are reminiscent of the eland, an animal that is symbolic of plenty, and of being fat, which is also a rich compliment, and a sign of beauty and health in people (Lewis-Williams 1981:48). Moreover, the women wear a ‘tail’ while they dance, which is a further
symbol of the female eland. The eland is highly revered by San as the largest antelope in the Kalahari. Usually an elderly male relative will be the ‘eland bull’ and he joins the dance by chasing the dancing woman while putting his hands or small sticks to his head to imitate bull horns (Barnard 1992:155). Buttocks are associated with sex (Marshall 1976:244), and, indeed, the way the eland bull dances, in a ‘hunched-up position behind the woman… simulate[s] eland mating patterns…’ (Guenther 1999:174; Guenther 1986:280). Ambiguity is expressed as normal gender relationships and relationships between humans and animals are inverted. For instance, old people act like young people and gender is inverted as the initiate may handle men’s weapons and medicines (Guenther 1999:174).

During the final phase, reintegration, the girl is brought back into the community as a new woman. She might perform ‘womanly tasks’, handle men’s weapons (Guenther 1999:166–167), hit adolescent men with a stick or touch adolescent boys’ testicles to protect them (Schapera 1930:121). On reintegration she is given a number of gifts such as bead necklaces and skin blankets from relatives (Schapera 1930:120; Guenther 1999:167). She enters adulthood in a relationship of obligation towards the women who attended to her during her initiation, and may have to return some of the objects that she was given, ‘she is embraced by the spirit of communalism of her society, and its underlying ethos of sharing and reciprocity’ (Guenther 1999:167). As an initiated adult, she is now allowed to have sex and can marry. Giving birth to children will add to her new social status as a woman.

**Kinship relations**

Qane was twelve years old, and, like many young people in D’Kar, she studied at junior secondary school in Gantsi town. She stayed at the school hostel on weekdays, and came home at the weekends. Gantsi is only approximately forty kilometres down the road, and it was an easy journey to make, especially if she was driven there in her father’s vehicle. Qane loved singing all kinds of music including pop songs from
South Africa, and she was also part of a traditional dance group in the village in which she led the singing of traditional songs that other group members danced to (the same dance troupe that Grace coached in Chapter Four). The initiation rite was held at the time of Qane’s first menstruation. Even though Qane was making her transition to womanhood, the meaning-making in the dūù was done by people older than her.

Now I position Qane in the broader context of her kinship relations, mainly from her paternal side, as her father, Jude, held a conspicuous position in the village and this was perceived as being helpful in negotiating special circumstances for her to write her end of year exams while in dūù. The kinship structure of San has been described by Barnard (1978) as universal, which means that all people are classified as ‘related’. Through a system of naming, marriage and blood, all people can be absorbed into the kinship structure (Barnard 1978:69). However, rather than writing about the structural categories of kinship, here I illustrate kinship relations based on an interview with Jude, Qane’s father. For approximately one and a half hours, Jude gave a long list of kin, including his siblings and each of his siblings’ past and current partners, and the subsequent children from these relationships. While biology was important, as Jude showed by naming all of his blood relatives, only some blood relations were integral within the initiation. Like this, kinship was more about experienced and negotiated relations. By demonstrating kinship in this way, we move beyond structural categories, towards the ways that kin relate to one another; their relatedness. All those I interviewed about the initiation were members of the family who were named by Jude.

Jude (Figure 17, red triangle), is one of twenty-one children, and his (deceased) father, Sammy (purple triangle), had relationships with seven women with whom he produced children. The final relationship appeared to have lasted longer, evidenced by the larger number of children. Figure 18 shows that Jude has fourteen children from six relationships. The dūù took place in 2012 for Jude’s second to youngest daughter, Qane (see Figure 18, pink circle), a child from his marriage to Ntcisa (or ‘older Grace’ from Chapter Four, see Figure 18, orange circle). Jude and Ntcisa legally
registered their marriage, which is uncommon in D’Kar, and for San. To have a marriage certificate from the state is a sign of being ‘modern’.

**Figure 17**

*Illustration of relationships showing Jude, his siblings and father.*

**Figure 18**

*Illustration of relationships showing Jude (red), and his wife, Ntcisa (orange) and his children including Jim (black), Moses (green) and Qane (pink).*

**Figure 19**

*Illustration showing Frank (yellow) and his children who include Qoba (brown), Kgaba’xae and Nco’xae, the ‘singing sisters’*

Frank (deceased) is highlighted in yellow in Figures 17 and 19 and his children include Qoba (Figure 19, green circle), Kgaba’xae and also Nco’xae. I have named
them the ‘singing sisters’ as they are renowned in D’Kar for their singing abilities, and are often requested to sing at diùù and other events in the village. The singing sisters are also in the DRC choir, and were central at Qane’s diùù. Qoba, Kgaba’xae and Nco’xae are Jude’s nieces, and, therefore they are cousins to Qane - we met Nco’xae in Chapter Five when she was upset about her young son, Koaga, speaking Setswana. I interviewed Qoba after this diùù, and the chapter is partly informed by this interview.

**Jude’s high social profile**

Qoba suggested that Jude’s high social profile led to the successful negotiation of his daughter’s diùù with her school so that she could write her exams while in seclusion. I introduced Jude in the previous chapters, and here I draw specifically on his role as a community leader, as a member of the DRCC as well as a Kuru employee, to show how he fits into the overall picture of D’Kar. By understanding Jude’s position as a community leader, this suggests that only particular voices are heard within the District as other less prominent families are unable to negotiate the same things for their children.

Jude speaks Naro, G/wi, Afrikaans, Setswana and some English and, as we learnt in Chapter Five, this was not unusual in this region. Jude maintained useful employment relationships with Afrikaans speaking farmers, and this gave him a strong economic foundation. Jude was also a Church elder, and had been part of the D’Kar Reformed Church Council (DRCC) since the 1980s. Church elders helped the pastor, van Buren, to attend to the spiritual needs of the Church, and also more generally, DRCC members meet to discuss matters to do with the land and the village. Jude often took a leading role as a translator between the Afrikaans speaking pastor and the Naro speaking congregation during Sunday services at the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC). The DRC continued to officially own the land of D’Kar, and only fully
baptised members of the Church, like Jude, were recognised by the DRC as owners of the land and only these people were able to make decisions about the land.

Being baptised meant that the pastor, Van Buren, recognised that person as living a sober life, as attending Church each week and refraining from ‘cult-like’ activities. Van Buren explained that ‘cult-like’ activities were different to ‘cult-ure’, in that ‘cult-like’ activities made people act from fear. God, he said, made people act from love. Although Jude was central within the DRC, dìùì is based on practices that may be frowned upon by the pastor for being ‘cult-like’, suggesting ambiguity around involvement and membership in the DRC. Nevertheless, Jude’s acceptance by the Church gives his voice a particular resonance and authority that distinguishes him from others.

Jude was also one of three ‘Custodians’ who were employed by the ‘Custodian Unit’, an advocacy arm of Kuru NGO. From conversations with Jude, I realised that, for him, the role of Custodian was about maintaining San culture and history so that younger generations of San ‘don’t forget’ what happened in their cultural past. I asked him about marriage practices, and his answers revolved around what happened in the past rather than what is happening in the present. Notably, Jude’s discussion of the past was different to that of other elderly people in D’Kar who talked about their own experiences, or the experiences of their parents.

Yet Tanaka (1980: 94, 110) writes that ‘San do not concern themselves…about past events, nor….do they keep a constant trained eye on the future’, and so accounts of history taken from the stories of their relatives suggest that history follows this understanding of time. History takes a generational and oral path. This path is based on immediate or present relationships through stories that, unless orally described from older generations to younger generations, will not be passed on. Tanaka explains that a focus on the present time has to be understood in reference to the egalitarian principle of ‘generalised reciprocity’ – where sharing/giving is frequent but is not measured or exchanged with a need to be immediately reciprocated in exact kind or type. Guenther (2006: 247) explains that ‘reciprocity can be manifest in talk’,
and in this way sharing stories is part of generalised reciprocity that is foundational to egalitarian societies.

However, Jude described at length a history of marriage that he, his parents or his grandparents did not engage in. This suggested that Jude had knowledge of and referenced written histories which were recorded by European settlers and researchers. This kind of history is based on written records, which link to a delayed-return system as there is a sense that they are written down for a future time. In turn this suggests that Jude engages with history outside of a system of generalised reciprocity and towards one that depends on delayed responses, relationships and ideas that exist outside immediate relationships found in the family or kin structures. This is potentially another way that Jude is distinguishable from other community members who involve themselves less in this production of and way of understanding history.

In 2011 and 2012 the Custodians were concerned with a project named ‘San Values’ which culminated in the launch of a small booklet in 2012 called *Naro San Values* (Letloa Custodian Committee 2012). The booklet contains ten values which were compiled after consultations with different San groups in Botswana and South Africa. The idea of reconciling the past (as values) within present development and NGO structures drove this project. In being part of the project, Jude supported the use of past values within contemporary contexts, and he played a crucial role in producing the written record of this. This is reminiscent of the Luo in Kenya who are thought of as ‘Traditionalists’ and as ‘tribalist’ and as having a strong group identity that is based on shared ‘culture’ and ‘tradition’ (Geissler and Prince 2010:88). Much in the same way as Naro San Values were codified in D’Kar, Luo tradition has been codified and written down as a set of rules. Through the codification of the values, Moses and his father explained that they envisioned the booklet being used by schools and teachers so that they might understand San, rather than guessing or making up an unfavourable moral code for them. Like this, the codification, much like the map of D’Kar (Chapter Three), attempted to make legible the illegible, only
in this case it was about values, rather than land. The map was by the DRC, who were outsiders on the inside, whereas these values were for the consumption of non-San outsiders - outsiders who were cultural outsiders, and in many cases in positions that often served to subordinate San. Here codification was being mobilised in a way to assert the moral and cultural value and worth of San.

Finally, Jude was identified by other residents as a ‘community leader’, and although he never used this term to describe himself, he often fulfilled roles that suggested that he took this position seriously. For instance, he acted as a spokesperson, was an important voice in the community and was someone who residents turned to in times of public disputes, especially disputes with people from outside the village. During fieldwork there was a kgotla meeting in D’Kar about a new government law which means that people must now apply for a licence to gather morama nuts, a wild food that many rural dwellers rely on as a seasonal source of nutrition and sustenance. My interpreter, Zach, who attended this meeting, explained that Jude had stood up in the kgotla and said that the new law was no good as it restricted access to this important food source that many rely upon. Jude was a person who residents in D’Kar expected to have a public voice, and moreover he was someone that non-San local representatives and politicians were used to hearing speak. He was turned to, and moreover, he was listened to.

**Main functions of dùù**

A San woman, and D’Kar resident, explained that the most important thing about dùù was that the girl was taught what kind of man to accept as a partner and how to get a husband: he must give her presents, and in turn she must look after the fire and do the cooking. This woman foregrounded how dùù prepared a woman for her roles in relation to men. However, as Lewis-Williams (1981:52) wrote, the implications of dùù go beyond fertility and marriage partners, as the initiate has the power to renew the balance of life.
I asked Jim (32, Naro speaker), Qane’s (half) brother (Figure 18, black triangle) about initiation and although he explained that dùù was the most important thing for a woman to do, he explained that male initiation was no longer practised. According to the literature, men practised initiation in 1928, 1930 and 1966 (Bleek 1928:23–25; Schapera 1930:122–126), but in 1980, Barnard noted that male initiation rites no longer took place in the same way as described by previous ethnographers. He reported instead that, ‘they [Naro speaking San] do have a simple and optional ceremony to bring success to young hunters’, known as hunting magic (Barnard 1980:117). In this ritual small cuts were made between the eyes and on the arm. However, I never heard of a male initiation or about hunting magic during my fieldwork. Neither did I note any scars on men’s bodies.

Jim explained that if a woman did not have a dùù, she would not be allowed to do a number of things. For instance, an uninitiated woman was not allowed to touch berries and wild foods in the bush, and if she did, the berries would go bad and become inedible. Moreover, the berries and other wild foods would not grow well in the coming season, and this would affect everyone, as they would no longer be able to eat them. An uninitiated woman was not allowed to touch a new born baby: if she did, she may kill the baby. According to Jim and his wife Ncisa (32, Naro speaker) who were due to have a new baby in the coming months, this was the reason so many babies in D’Kar died in infancy. An uninitiated girl, especially a girl who had ‘been up and down with boys’, i.e. not just having one boyfriend but having (or thought of as having) many, would not be allowed to touch their new baby. He and Ncisa explained that they would be very strict about this rule in order to protect their child. For Jim, the impact of dùù for the community was a matter of life or death.

Indeed, Lewis-Williams (1981:51–52) wrote that the benefits of dùù affect the whole community, including the general safety and ‘harmony’ of the community in relation to water, land, food, as well as fertility and womanhood. Jim explained, through the death/life of babies, the problems of multiple sexual relationships between uninitiated women and men, and the poisoning of fruits, the importance that
\textit{dùù} had for the balance and harmony of the community. Interestingly though, Lewis Williams (1981:50) never specifically referred to the health of babies, or specifically about women having multiple sexual partners. This suggests that although harmony still remains central to the practice of \textit{dùù}, there were different ideas about what ‘harmony’ meant and how it could be achieved.

Looking towards the broader literature on non-San practices in Botswana, there are rules about sexual activity between men and women that help to contextualise those described above by Jim. Julie Livingston (2005:191) explained how child disability for Setswana speakers was understood as a sign of moral transgressions on the part of the child’s parents. Specifically, ‘[w]omen who depended on a series of boyfriends to provide food for their children reluctantly accepted the risk of mopakwane [a disease caused by breaking the sexual rule after the birth of a child, and which causes impairments of the child] as the price...’ (Livingston 2005:54). Here child disability was attributed to the mother’s sexual behaviour, in having multiple partners after giving birth, and to parents not ‘following the rules’. Jim’s warning about the health of babies echoed this non-San, Tswana rule, a reminder that \textit{dùù} practices do not exist in isolation from wider ‘African’ or, more specifically, Tswana beliefs and practices and the moral rules of the wider society in Botswana. \textit{Dùù} practices added to and also reflected close cultural contact with Setswana speaking groups, and some of the shared ideas that exist between groups.

Not only is initiation about teaching young women about their womanhood, but Jim also revealed the importance of this practice for the well-being of the entire community. Women are in a potentially powerful position to maintain and continue their cultural traditions (or not). San women are recognised from within the community as carrying this power. The ritual can be understood as both carrying meaning within its particular practices, and also being salient in advocacy by and for San.
School or initiation?

As we heard above, Qoba was one of the singing sisters (Figure 19), and in an interview she explained that the main problem of dùù was that girls were not allowed time off school to attend them. Qoba explained that girls have ‘a second chance’ and can be initiated on their second menstruation as well as their first. Given that there were no past records of this, it suggested that this convention has changed. The practice has been made flexible in order to accommodate the difficulty that some San girls face if they are at school during their first menstruation and are not allowed time off school. Of course, if the girl is still at school for her second menstruation the problem would persist, however this new convention may help to negate some of the difficulties that girls have, doubling the opportunity for girls to be initiated. Yet what this reveals is the flexibility of the practice to meet the demands of a changing social environment.

Difficulties in attending dùù were not a ‘new’ phenomenon and Guenther (1986:278–279) noted that the farmers who San worked for, or the non-San neighbours of San who lived in government settlements, often did not like the ritual and could make it difficult for San to attend these dùù dances. While there have been struggles to maintain this ritual for years, the current challenge comes from schools. This is redolent of the current social situation for this group of San who have access to formal schooling and a desire to attend.

Qoba explained that she had been one of those girls who were not able to have her dùù, as her government boarding school did not give her permission to leave.

For us [San] it’s free [there is nothing stopping people from attending dùù] but the treatment from the government is the problem for us [as there are rules and practices that make attending dùù difficult for all those girls who want to]. For example, myself… I was supposed to write the exams for the end of year examinations for Standard 7. But they [the teachers] refused [to let me leave school] and so I didn’t even go into dùù. I was just writing my exams. So I didn’t be there [did not attend dùù].
All my sisters are having that [diùù] except me and the younger children from our family. My child and her [sisters’] child haven’t been [in diùù] because of [/due to] the same problem I am facing.

Qoba, 2011

Bihela Sekere (2011:83), a G/ana speaking San man and the author of this academic article, also cited initiation as an issue that San faced in succeeding at school, presumably because of the difficulties for San girls who want to return to school after diùù. If the girls are not given permission they can be bullied by teachers and students for being ‘troublemakers’. Moreover, if they missed important exams or lessons, the schools were unsympathetic in helping the girls to catch up with missed work. In Botswana, missing exams means the student must re-sit that year before they can progress through the school years. The school could refuse to allow a child to retake the year and so she must pay to re-sit the exams through a distance learning course, or attend an expensive private school where she could also re-sit the exams. Most of the time these alternative paths were difficult as the costs were too high. Often girls simply did not re-sit their exams, and never returned to school.

If San girls remained in school it meant they would probably experience their first menstruation without the guidance of their parents. They would not attend diùù to learn about what new behaviours were expected of them, how they were to find a husband, and how to behave as a woman. At a school hostel, adult guidance was likely to come, if at all, from a Setswana speaking adult, whose customs, traditions, culture and ideas about adulthood differ. Potentially this creates further issues for the community, and for women now as well as in the future. San women and girls’ voices are silenced in non-San spaces, such as school (but also more broadly as revealed in Chapter Four), which makes it hard and mostly impossible to be initiated as well as educated in a formal school.
The implications of not having düù

Qoba was not permitted time off school which meant that she did not attend her own düù. Qoba’s sisters sometimes explained that Qoba’s bad luck in life was due to her not attending düù. For instance, Qoba was once married but this had not lasted and, moreover, she was a melancholy kind of character. Both of these things were thought of as symptoms of her not having had düù. Qoba’s other siblings who did have düù, but whose marriages had also broken down for various reasons, were not spoken about as being unlucky in the same way and they were not as melancholic as Qoba. The well-being of the individual, and the luck or bad luck that she would face was tied into düù.

However, even though it was exam time at school, Qoba explained that Qane was allowed time off school, and could also write her end-of-year exams while in seclusion. Like this, she was a special case:

Qoba: Qane, she was lucky because her parents asked the teachers to give her the [exam] papers to do while she was just there [in seclusion for düù]...but what is happening [normally] is that they [the girls] have nothing to do with the papers [i.e. if the girl leaves school to attend her düù she does not write her exams] and the teachers are refusing [to allow her to sit the exams]...because what they [the teachers/school] know [think] is that sometimes the sister [of the initiate] could help them answer that [exam], which is why they [the teachers/school] are refusing [to allow the girl to take the exams home with them].

...If the teachers say no [when the parents ask to take the exams home, or for time off school] but still the parents will take the child [home] and put her [in seclusion for her düù]. And she won’t even write anything [she will not write her exams and so will fail the year].

Jenny: So she [Qane] was lucky.

Qoba: She was lucky. That was the first time for that to happen [for a girl to be given the exams to write at home]. Sure sure.

Jenny: Why were they [Qane and her family] the people to have it [exams given to the girl to write at home] first?

Qoba: I don’t know whether [it is because] he [her father, Jude] is the leader of the community or what, but it hasn’t even happened to his elder children. This was the first time.

Jenny: So now does everyone in the village know this [that it is possible to
take the exams home]?

Qoba: They doesn’t know, they doesn’t know.

Jenny: So we should tell them, no?

Qoba: It’s no problem, we can even tell them. But still the teachers, I don’t know how they are, sometimes they can be good to other [some] people but they can [be bad to others]. But if you can tell them [other residents about Qane writing exams in diùù] they can say ‘ahhh, you [the teachers/school] did this to this person [allowed Qane to write exams at home during her diùù] but now you are refusing to do it to me [i.e. for their daughter]’. And it will be another problem again [it will cause jealousy if one family or person is treated differently to others].

Qoba, 2011

Jude being a ‘community leader’ was mentioned by Qoba as potentially being helpful in negotiating for his daughter Qane to leave school, and to be allowed to write her exams at the same time. For Qane, school and initiation became commensurable where for others, including Qoba, they were incommensurable. Jude’s social status, as a community leader, was thought to afford him the opportunity to negotiate the situation in which both initiation and school were valued, and the choice between the two no longer needed to be made. Qoba explained that other, less well-known San who were not community leaders, would not be treated the same, and so the knock-on effect of this preferential treatment was, according to Qoba, going to be negative. She anticipated that others would feel resentful that their children were not allowed to do this too. It set Jude and his family apart from others in the village.

It was the first time that Qoba had heard of the school taking a flexible and understanding approach towards diùù, yet, she noted that Jude had been a community leader for a long time. This might suggest that, optimistically, schools were now realising the importance of diùù for San, and so are becoming more flexible in order to help girls attend diùù whilst also remaining in school. However, Qoba was dubious that Qane’s case would mean that all San girls could now do the same. Rather, she felt that only certain families were given preferential treatment. San with a relatively
high social position have more recourse to negotiate with non-San, so instead of
signifying an all-encompassing change in perspective around dùù, this example
suggested that schools recognised Jude as a respectable community leader and this
meant he, though not San in general, could more easily negotiate with them.

While San community leaders who were listened to like Jude were thought to
be able to successfully advocate on behalf of their daughters, it was uncertain if more
girls will be permitted to do the same thing. It partly depended on Jude’s motivations,
would he advocate for girls who were not his daughters? It also depended on the way
the school understood and received the information about what dùù meant. For
instance, rather than understanding and contextualising dùù within its broader
significance for the balance and harmony for the wider community, the school might
believe that they were doing Jude a one-off favour, as they respected him as a leader.
Qane continued with school while being initiated, but would other San parents be
able to negotiate the same for their daughters?

What follows now is ethnography of the week-long dùù in D’Kar. In order to
give a description of this ritual as it was experienced; most of the analysis has been
reserved for part three. This section of the chapter reveals the different ways San
voices look and sound, how these have changed over time, and the aspects of voice
that remain more constant.

**Part two: A description of dùù**

**The dùù place and the daily week-long dance**

The dùù ceremony took place in late May and early April, and lasted for six days. It
was held in Jude and Ntcisa’s yard where their two sons, two daughters, as well as
grandchildren and two daughters-in-law lived. This was different to previous
observations in which the dùù took place in and around a hut that was purpose built
by the initiate’s mother outside of the camp, or in the grandmother’s house (Barnard 1980:117; Schapera 1930:118; Guenther 1986:278; Drearley 1997:1).

Next to Jude and Ntcisa’s main house, which was a large brick structure in which the family often sat to watch television and where they slept at night, there was a small ‘traditional’ hut with thinned out grasses as walls and roofing. This was Qane’s seclusion hut and during diùù, the hut was covered using plastic sheeting for protection against the occasional April rains as the grass roof was not waterproof - it was old and had not been replaced (see Figure 20). The need for a waterproof cover suggested that the hut had not been built for living purposes, and rather was built for show. Although the base of the hut had been concreted it had been built in the design used by nomadic San. It had been built as a reminder of houses used in the past and so was reminiscent of heritage objects in a museum.
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*The hut where Qane was confined, with plastic tarpaulin draped over the grass to make it waterproof. To the left was the new cooking area, however all the cooking was done behind the hut under the shade of the tree. In the foreground the shade of the tree that we danced around is visible.*

In contrast, the rest of the yard and the main house were constructed using ‘new’ designs and building materials such as cement and brick. Normally this hut
was not used to sleep in; rather it was used to store cooking pots and wood for burning on the fire. Its use during the dùù suggested that the past was being evoked as it authenticated the dùù within a memory of the past. It also suggested that Jude and Ntcisa lived differently in relation to other residents, some of whom had small wooden homes or who had this old traditional style hut but who maintained a waterproof grass roof. In other yards there were no structures built for show rather than for daily purposes.

During the dùù, Qane was secluded in the hut (Figure 20) where she was provided with food and bathing water by four older women or ‘dùù-takers’, as Qoba explained, who stayed in the yard and looked after her. Qane’s maternal great-aunt was her primary care-giver, and the other three women helped her so she would not forget anything, and this matches previous reports (Barnard 1992:154; Guenther 1999:166; Drearley 1997:1). More women came and went, and among them included Regina (42, Herero speaker), a Herero woman, and her Herero mother, Gabby (65, Herero speaker). Herero have a different language and set of cultural practices, dress and kinship system. Yet Qoba said that Regina ‘likes to dance’ dùù, a comment about her ability, as much as her enthusiasm to learn how to conduct dùù. Herero families in D’Kar wanted to initiate their daughters with San dùù, which suggests a local bias towards San practices in initiating girls into womanhood. This phenomenon was not unusual in that Herero are a relatively strong, rich, robust group who are able to absorb different aspects of cultures without undermining their own.

Each night beside the entrance to the seclusion hut, the fire that was already lit was made bigger so that women could come and dance. There was an open invitation for all women to attend (also see interview notes taken by Drearley 1997), and on occasion, there were up to fifteen women in the yard. They sang, clapped and danced when they felt in the mood to do so (Guenther 1986:280). The women passed around a small cup of beer that was brewed in the village, and that they concealed within their clothes and bags, quickly sipping and then passing the cup to the next woman. The dancers made a figure of eight pattern as they moved around the hut.
and fire to the music (see Figure 21). It was a happy, joyous time and Qoba explained that she always preferred the dances during the week when she knew that she could come back the following day and dance again, rather than on the final day when the celebration is over.

Each song brought a different mood, and although there were no words to the songs they all carried meaning that filled the night air (Marshall 1999:195–196). Some songs were more energetic than others. The women danced in a single-file line with up to four or five and sometimes more women at once all following in the wake of the person in front - no one danced on their own. Some women danced more than others. No special clothes or adornments were worn during these nights, but the dancers revealed their buttocks by raising their skirts. Some women also pulled their knickers down but this was not compulsory. In the past dancing was done wearing

---

**Figure 21**

*Diagram depicting a section of Jude and Ntcisa’s yard where the initiation took place. The direction and path of the dancers in relation to the singers and the hut is indicated.*
only a leather apron at the front and a set of beads for a tail at the back, thus baring their buttocks at all times (Drearley 1997:2). Clothing practices reflected the practical everyday living situation for these women who wear knickers and skirts.

The eland bull

It was Thursday and it was the second to last night that Qane spent in the seclusion hut. Unlike the previous nights, a number of men stood around a vehicle on the road outside the yard and some were drinking beer. Like before, the women were sat in front of the hut with their backs to the doorway, facing the fire. I sat down and joined in by clapping. This night felt different, and Jude and Moses appeared from the main house and stood near the tree, something that had not occurred during previous nights. All the women continued to sing, clap and dance.

An old man appeared, and he joined the end of the line of dancing women and held his hands up to his head, depicting horns: the significant eland bull. The dancing women were energised by this and the atmosphere became more jovial and excited than before. At this time I was also dancing, copying the women’s hop-like eland steps. Since I was last in line, the eland bull began following behind me but another dancer excitedly jumped over and joined in behind me, and in front of the bull so now he chased her. I was relieved not to be in the direct line of the bull as the ‘chase’ had a distinctly sexual element to it. We continued dancing around the fire and the back of the seclusion hut. However, by the time we had made it back to the tree near the main house, a drunk man and woman had entered the yard. They were visibly intoxicated and began to argue loudly in Naro next to the fire and dancing place. I was told the man was looking at other women in a sexual way and the woman, his wife, was annoyed by this. All of a sudden the dancers stopped, let their skirts drop back down and went to stand with the other women who had stopped singing and clapping too. They all had their backs to the door of the initiation hut and the eland bull had disappeared.
As the couple argued more men entered the yard. After about ten minutes a younger man came to me and passed on a message from Jude. I was invited to come back the following night as now people were arguing. Anyway, he added, there was only a little firewood left, suggesting that the dance would have finished soon anyway. I thanked him and left the yard. I did not hear any more singing that evening. The men who had been outside on the road had now dispersed either inside the yard or elsewhere and the road was empty as I walked home. I thought about Jude and how upset he looked that people were disrupting the dance, and how he had not wanted me to witness it.

Reintegration: The final day of dùù

At nine o’clock in the morning on the final day, Saturday, the dùù yard was full of more women than had been present throughout the week. Ntcisa, Qane’s mother, who had been conspicuously absent from the previous days, was now busy. She was wearing a beautiful African-print dress, a special dress for the occasion. A goat had already been slaughtered and the women, though not including Ntcisa, were in the processes of preparing it. The head had been removed and was singed in the fire. The skin was scraped of its hair in preparation for cooking. Jude had asked me to bring a camera so that I could document the day, a privilege that I accepted - today was when Qane came out of the hut and was reintegrated into the community as a woman.

We sat under the tree at the back of the hut and there were three large barrels of home-brewed beer near the main house. Like other nights, the women were sipping beer, but now it was daylight as they continued to share it from a single cup (Figure 22). One of Qane’s older brothers, as well as her father’s brother’s son (Qane’s cousin), were summoned. They stood by the door of the seclusion hut and bent over. Qane emerged from the hut with her head covered with a purple scarf. She was given a stick, and she hit each of these young men on their backs. Lewis-Williams (1981:51) noted a similar practice amongst Ju/’hoan, and Guenther (1999:175) noted that this
displayed female control over males. She went back inside the seclusion hut until the food had been cooked and was ready to be served.
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*Figure 22*

*Barrels of home-brewed beer in the cool of the shade for guests and participants.*

Qane still had a purple scarf draped over her head as she came back out of the seclusion hut. Like Lewis-Williams (1981:51) reported, she had been instructed to look downwards and the scarf helped with that. Although earlier when I had been allowed into her hut to greet her, Qane had shown me her traditional leather clothes that she said she would wear, and she now wore a knee length pair of shorts with her leather apron over the top, as well as a cotton t-shirt. Qane was shy about wearing the leather clothes that revealed so much skin in front of so many people.

The day after this however, when only the people of her household and the four old women and ‘diuì-givers’ were present, Qane did wear only her leather clothes which consisted of a front and back apron, as well as decorative necklaces that were presents from her mother and other relatives. She was comfortable with wearing the traditional dress in the safety of her household and close kin, but in front of the wider
community she wanted to cover up more. Qane was able to change and influence the clothing that she wore during the public part of the initiation.

Black markings had been drawn on her face and she had two black marks down the front of her shins. The markings were of the gemsbok or oryx, an animal revered for its beauty, although later I was told by Jude that they were drawn on wrongly on her face as he said that the women who drew them were drunk.

Qane served a plate of food to all those who were present in the yard, and then went back into the seclusion hut. At this time there was a lull, but soon the singing sisters arrived to collect some traditional leather clothes that Jude and Ntcisa had in their house (Figure 23). The sisters returned, only two were wearing leather clothes, and one still wore her normal ‘Western-style’ clothes. At around three o’clock all the women were on their feet and rather than the previous days when they had their backs to the door, they had now all turned to face the door to the seclusion hut. The only man present was Qane’s father, Jude. He opened the door to the hut and meanwhile some women had already begun to reveal their buttocks and they started to dance in eagerness and anticipation of the celebration.

An elderly Naro speaking grandmother (approximately seventy years old), Dcoo, was wearing the traditional leather apron that covered the front, with a bead tail hanging down between her buttocks. She wore nothing on her upper body and I was told that this was the old attire worn for dìùù. However, a few minutes later Dcoo put a bra on as her daughter had told her off saying that she should not bare her breasts. It surprised me that the older generation listened to the younger generation in matters of dìùù, something that I associated with elders. Only Mary, a woman renowned for being a healer, remained topless, and although she was wearing a leather apron at the beginning, by the end of the day she only wore her fabric knickers. It seemed that Mary was the only one who could bare her breasts without social rebuke, whereas Dcoo was told to stop embarrassing herself and was discouraged. It was appropriate for Mary who was perceived as an authentic healer, to bare her breasts, the attire of the past, due to her healing skills that were required.
during the ìììà. Women’s bodies and their clothing were being contested, and there was shame around baring their breasts. The older woman’s actions carried less weight than the younger healer’s carried, revealing the contours of which woman’s voices carry weight, and who is recognised for what kind of voice.

The two singing sisters were joined by four other leather-clad women. They entered Qane’s seclusion hut and I was ushered inside by Jude who wanted me to be close by to take good photographs. After instructing her for a short time in Naro, the leather-clad singers exited the hut with Qane in tow. As we emerged from the hut all the women started to sing and clap, even those wearing ‘Western-style’ clothes. Qane was still instructed to keep her eyes down, and the singers stood around her in a protective huddle making sure that she was always close to them. The women who wore the leather clothes took a more central role and they generally led the songs. These women took a central role in leading and shaping the initiation, and their voices led the performance and their bodies were clothed in a way that marked them out as having this special role. Unlike previous nights, each individual dancer now chose to dance where they liked. It was very celebratory.

**Fighting**

There was an elated feeling in the air and the dancing continued in the yard between the seclusion hut, the water tap, tree, and the main house (Figure 21). Just at this jubilant part of the celebration, the proceedings were interrupted. An extremely drunk woman stumbled to the ground and another woman who had participated in dancing in a few of the preceding nights, started to shout about the beer, saying that she wanted to drink it all and not share it with anyone. She removed herself from the group, dramatically turned her back to everyone, and folded her arms across her chest in defiance. All the attention had shifted to these women. The singing, dancing and clapping had stopped.
Meanwhile, the extremely drunk woman was rolling around on the ground and help for her to stand up was offered but she started to lash out at her helper. This quickly disintegrated into a physical fight, between the extremely drunk woman, and what seemed like everyone else. One woman even removed the baby she was carrying on her back to fight her, and these two semi-clothed women ended up rolling

Figure 23

An example of some leather clothes. From the top: a leather bra, which can vary in size and length. In the past this was not part of the attire. In the middle: a large back apron, tied around the waist. Finally, at the bottom: a front apron. These clothes were handmade and similar ones were worn during traditional dance performances. Qane wore the middle and lower pieces when she was reintegrated, although with her other clothes on top and underneath. The singers wore all three pieces. The old woman, Dcoo, wore the front apron with a set of beads (not pictured here) instead of a back apron.
underneath a 4x4 vehicle as they grappled in the sand. All the attention was on the
fight, as everyone positioned themselves to watch. Jude stepped in after things had
already begun to cool down and he gave the extremely drunk woman her shoes,
calmly told her to go home and sent someone to help her get there. The following day
this woman had a black eye and a sheepish look about her.

Richard Lee (2003:160-161) notes that for Ju-speaking San ‘the new Ju culture
is based on selling and drinking beer...’ and that ‘Ju drinking behaviour resembles
that of their Herero and Tswana neighbours...Ju drinking parties are loud and
rowdy...sometimes they take a nasty turn and fights break out’. Lee has also written
about violence and fighting in Ju/'hoan society as being frequent and that ‘fights are
of short duration...and involve wrestling and hitting at close quarters’ (2003:114).
This was certainly the case here, as the fight was short and involved rolling and
wrestling to the floor. Moreover, that there is a drinking culture resembles that of
Tswana people. For Lee, the frequency of the arguments is part of the maintenance of
non-stratified, egalitarian societies.

Although traumatic for me as an ethnographer witnessing violence between
relatively old and over-intoxicated women, the celebrations continued. The sun had
just set and a fire was lit in front of the hut. Mary performed some healing to remove
the bad energy from Qane’s body that was generated from the fight. She did this by
sucking out the badness from Qane’s stomach and torso and then coughed up what
looked like phlegm, and spat it in a pile near to the fire. The celebration continued on
into the night. Even though there was fighting and disruptions, healing was used to
resolve the potential damage that this might have had on Qane. Healing has been
conceptualised as central to addressing emotional and social issues as individuals
come together to facilitate singing and dancing and to create an expansive sense of
community (Katz et al. 1997). Healing relieves the physical pains of living in an
egalitarian social system (McCall and Widerquist 2015:32).
Part three: Problems, implications, continuities and changes in dùù

Symbols

Comparing this dùù to what has been written before, the continuities and changes reflect the contemporary living situation in D’Kar. The key symbols within the initiation have remained present, although there have also been some shifts. The eland dance remained central to the initiation, and the eland itself was a significant symbol - indeed the ritual was commonly referred to just as dùù (eland), signifying its continued metaphorical importance. The symbolism of eland ranged from the eland-like dance steps that the women used around the fire and hut, to the eland bull joining the dance, albeit for a very short time, and finally, to the beaded tail of the eland worn by old Dcoo on the final reintegration day. The baring of buttocks with the dance step symbolised the swishing tail of the eland who was ready to mate with the eland bull, who chased her. The singers and dancers interchanged roles as they wished, which was mirrored in Lorna Marshall’s account of !Kung or Ju/'hoan initiation (1999:196). The dance took place around a fire that was lit outside Qane’s seclusion hut and, as previous reports suggested, the dancers made a figure of eight pattern (Guenther 1999:166).

In general, fat is the most desirable part of any animal and since the eland is the largest antelope found in the Kalahari landscape, it symbolised being well-fed and healthy. The eland was an important animal as it is big and fat. Moreover, it is a solitary animal, suggesting it has human qualities. The day after the initiation, when I was instructed to take more photographs, Moses asked who I thought was fatter, me or Qane, his sister and the initiate. I replied that Qane was, to which he grinned and agreed. At the time this had no more significance to me than being only a physical observation. In retrospect though, he was probably commenting on the ritual significance of the fatness of pubescent women. During dùù, the girl was considered to be ‘in a condition of extraordinary potency’ (Lewis-Williams 1981:53), which might
also help to explain why Moses pointed out the ‘fatness’ and thus ‘health’ of his sister at this juncture. A woman’s fatness was a sign of her being beautiful, fertile, healthy and achieving adult status. This status was beneficial to all as it would eventually lead to the renewal of the community, through childbirth.

The old-style hut that was preserved like a heritage site in Jude and Ntcisa’s yard, was used as the seclusion hut during dìùù. Even though this hut was normally disused, by using it in the initiation it created continuity with the past. It was maybe more crucial for this family, who lived in a large modern house, to draw upon the past through the use of this hut. The hut was also symbolic of the way in which this family, and especially Jude, understood their relationship to history: as something to preserve through heritage.

Clothing symbolised change and continuity, and draws attention to the influence that women have in changing the ritual, which reveals something about how women’s voice is heard in this context. Since only one old woman wore a beaded tail, it suggests that this has become less common instead of the more favoured attire of the leather apron and leather bra, or just everyday ‘Western-style’ clothes. Baring flesh was something that younger San women were consciously monitoring. For instance, Dcoo was told to put on a bra and Qane chose not to uncover more of her skin when she was in public view. The ‘old’ attire was not as desirable as the less revealing clothes. I was told to take photographs during the ritual, at specific times when only the leather-clad singers were invited to pose. The people who were valued for their skills in singing, dancing or healing were expected to wear leather clothes, whereas for others this was not a requirement or expectation. As part of a ritual performance, leather clothes were symbolic for those who were key producers of this cultural practice.

Literature on specifically Naro initiations such as Bleek (1928:23) or Guenther (1986:278–281) have not mentioned ritual facial or bodily markings. However, Marshall’s (1999:200) description of ritual markings drawn on the body of the !Kung or Ju/'hoan initiate on the final reintegration day, was partly congruous with the
practices found at this ðùù. This suggested that this ðùù was influenced by initiates of the Ju/'hoan maternal kinship line. Nevertheless, there were also clear differences to what Marshall wrote. Firstly, the colour of the markings was black, rather than red (1999:200). Secondly, the markings were drawn on the face and shins only, not the chest, back, abdomen and throat (Marshall 1999:200). Moreover, Marshall wrote that these markings were to keep sickness away; however, in this ðùù I was told that these were the markings of the gemsbok, an animal renowned for its beauty. By drawing this on Qane’s body her beauty was evoked.

In Chapter Four, Grace was also concerned with her beauty and the beauty of her children. Is beauty an aspect of San identity that is becoming more dominant? Does a focus on beauty and covering up suggest an internalisation of the ways in which the identity of San is imagined by non-San and that these practices reinforce the negative associations and consequences of being seen as too ‘naked’ and with San women as being beautiful and worthy of being ‘taken’ by non-San men? These questions encourage us to think about the agency of San women to affect changes to the ðùù using their voice to make demands in this setting.

**Social/kin relations and alcohol**

Qoba explained that since she was not initiated herself, in the past this would have meant that she would not have been allowed to take part in initiating other women. She explained that she was now able to claim that she was old enough to participate as she had a child and, moreover, she had learnt the ðùù songs and dances. Rather than having the validation of having her own ðùù, she was able to negotiate her participation through her social relations. ðùù now allowed the participation of women who had not been initiated as long as they could socially negotiate their womanhood through the relationships they had made, the children they had given birth to, and the skills they have learnt from others within the village which included
learning the songs sung in dùù. The rules around dùù were changing and they reflected flexibility in dealing with the current issues that uninitiated women faced.

Kin beyond the household were still crucial within the dùù and older kinswomen held the whole ceremony together. Jude and Ntcisa, the initiate’s parents, took minimal roles and Qoba explained that ‘the mother does not have power’ during dùù, meaning that she does not have potency or control to help during dùù. This was similar to G/wi female initiations, in which the mother of the initiate was relatively unimportant in the ceremony (Silberbauer 1965:87), and in Ju’hoan female initiations where both parents of the initiate did not take leading roles (Marshall 1999). The initiation shows that although in broader society, and in public spheres San women are not listened to, here in a woman’s domain in the village, women are the leaders and broker the ritual, at a time when her mother is unable to do any of the usual work in the household to look after her daughter. The initiation becomes an example of women’s resistance to encroaching understanding of womanhood. Naro speaking San women largely take the decisions about this ritual, and are recognised as the leaders.

However, the role of men in the dùù is also shifting. On the final day, Jude opened the door of the seclusion hut so Qane could reintegrate into the village. For Silberbauer (1965:87), the father had a role to play in ‘opening her eyes’, i.e. reintroducing his initiated daughter to everyone, which suggested a similarity in the role that Jude took during this dùù. It was unclear from these former reports if the father of the initiate remained present throughout the reintegration part of the ritual. However, during this dùù he was present and he stood near the fire on the night that the eland bull danced. While men were not supposed to be nearby (Guenther 1986:279), Lewis-Williams (1981:44) wrote that male researchers were allowed to be present as long as they were a safe distance away, and Barnard (pers. comm.) explained he witnessed a female initiation from a relatively short distance away too. While the role of the parents remained fairly minimal, Jude was always in close
proximity to the ritual and this was helpful, for instance, to help send home the fighting woman.

While this initiation was produced by the women, there is also an underlying tension around the role of the father and of men. The father was needed to maintain peace and calmness amongst people who could be volatile. This suggests that there is a sense that his presence was in part an authority figure who could lead the group. At the same time, women complained that in general men no longer listened to them as they would often turn up at the ritual when they knew they were not allowed to be there. This later phenomena suggests that there is a shift in terms of the egalitarian ways of understanding gender roles and responsibilities. Men are not respecting the rules of the dùù and are making their presence felt at the dùù which is known as a female-only ritual.

Alcohol became integrated within the initiation, yet a local rhetoric blamed alcohol for many social issues that San faced and therefore it was not obvious that it should have been incorporated within dùù. Most women drank alcohol throughout the dances during the week and they explained that this alcohol helped them to stay strong and dance throughout the night. It was probable that some of these women were dependent on alcohol. The incorporation of alcohol was symbolic of the significant amounts of alcohol dependence in the village. However, since the women used alcohol as a tool for negotiating their own participation in the dùù – they made demands to be supplied with alcohol on the final reintegration day – it also suggests that alcohol is part of the everyday exchange relationships. As the initiation was reliant upon the wider participation of kin outside of the initiate’s household, the parents of the initiate bought alcohol for the final day, meeting the demands made by the women. Participants were in a position to negotiate the terms of their involvement.

Alcohol and abuse of alcohol was cited by San in D’Kar as being a ‘new’ invention. San did not see alcohol as a ‘San thing’. Sandy explained that her own mother was an alcoholic, but that alcohol was ‘not known’ by San in the past, and that
it had been introduced to them by non-San like Kgalagadi and Setswana speakers. This claim is seen elsewhere in the literature (Lee 2003:160-161), yet at the same time alcohol is seen as being another facet to San communities – albeit a socially destructive one. Incorporating alcohol into the initiation ceremony in a formalised way, as in making it part of the terms of agreement for those participating, the claims made by those stating that it is not a ‘San thing’ are more likely commenting on this as a way to make sense of the destructive effects that it has.

Moreover, if ‘…liquor provides indigenous peoples with a means to respond to the perceived threat of being ordered and incorporated into the wider and culturally ‘foreign’ society’ (Molamu and Macdonald 1996:150), then its use reflects a coping mechanism for these difficult relationships outside the village. We can then understand that the claims made by San that Kgalagadi and Tswana speakers ‘force’ them into drinking are another expression of how they feel positioned in relation to these groups. It was noticeable that an Afrikaans speaking white man, who was pitied for being abandoned by his family, was discussed by San in D’Kar in terms of him being coerced into drinking by the Church as the Church wanted him to sign over his land deed to them. Here, again, it was evident how alcohol abuse and dependency was framed in terms of an unequal relationship of power between individuals or groups. Ultimately, alcohol was part of the negotiations used by the women participants who demanded it from the parents of the initiate, and alcohol abuse was framed in terms of an outcome forced upon people within a perceived unequal relationship between groups.

The role of the eland bull in this initiation was rather small; indeed he only danced for about three or four minutes before a drunk man and woman argued and the dance stopped. Even though it was not the eland bull himself disrupting proceedings, a locally understood conclusion that alcohol consumption threatened the practice, appeared cogent with this experience. The desired participation of the eland bull in the dùù needed to be balanced alongside the negative attention from the
over-intoxicated people that this drew in. This was managed and mediated through healing when Mary healed Qane.

The healing performed on Qane can be understood as part of a broader discussion on the generative effects of healing rituals in San societies. The effect of such practices is to draw the entire community in to mitigate threats to the social system, and towards the maintenance of social harmony (McCall and Widerquist 2015:32). Healing is seen as being crucial in maintaining an egalitarian social system in which there are social and emotional issues (Katz et al. 1997). Here, Mary’s healing mitigated the pain of the fight which was generated around the community’s social rebuke of the extremely drunk woman who, I was later told, ‘got away lightly’. Her behaviour was inappropriate as everyone knows that you are not to turn up drunk to such events. I was told that in other villages in the District she would have been severely beaten up with weapons, such as sticks, as they would not tolerate this kind of behaviour. Clearly, the fight was not just a drunken brawl, but part of the social sanctioning of behaviour that has been observed in egalitarian societies.

Conclusion

The chapter described a dìùì initiation ritual for a young Naro speaking girl in D’Kar. The ethnography adds a detailed contemporary account of this intimate time in a woman’s life to the body of anthropological literature.

In relation to San identity, this ritual is part of a self-contained and referential process of identity formation and performance. ‘San voice’ is strengthened through the production of and performance of culture. This is where voice consists of speech and action that pertains to things that distinguish San from non-San – this ritual is performed by San. Culture is central to San group identity (as we noted in Chapter One) and a sense of the group is maintained through expressions of culture.

Maintaining a San voice – speech and action that looks and sounds ‘San’ - is crucial to maintaining San culture and identity. Moreover, through the practice of the
ritual, San voice is actively and overtly used and performed. In turn, this strengthens the look and sound of that voice from within itself, rather than being defined and dictated to by those outside the culture. This means that the culture and identity are being produced based on a dialogue happening within the group where San voices are more likely to be understood in their own terms and are therefore given the power to be effective. A possible example of how strongly this practice is being maintained is that Herero women such as Gabby and Regina want to learn from San women and to be part of conducting these initiations.

A tension arises as this is part of a process of resistance against the acculturation of San into Tswana culture, customs and language. By maintaining a ritual practice, San culture, identity and voice is insulated from attempts to silence, change or erase it/them. In relation to advocacy, rituals are powerful and critical in maintaining San voice as it is this voice which is crucial in both the expression of identity, and the maintenance of it, especially in response to majority and dominant groups. Women take a dominant role in the initiation, and they control the content of their cultural identity through what is practiced as part of the ritual. This means that the initiation maintains its relevance and usefulness for women and the community. Through these changes in practice we then see how San identity is imagined and practiced differently and how it changes.

Moreover, within the ritual certain women take leading roles in dancing and singing, and the initiate herself is able to influence the clothing that she wears in public. Within the ritual different woman have different kinds of voice. For instance, the healer, Mary is able to behave and look different to other women like Dcoo during the ritual. These differences can be viewed through the clothing that women wear and the ways in which they police one another – for instance Dcoo was told to put on a bra, whereas Mary was not. In egalitarian societies there are differentiated roles, where authority is given to those who carry the skills and qualities that are appropriate for that role. It is appropriate for a healer to bare her breasts though it was not deemed appropriate for an old woman to bare her breasts.
This chapter described a case where the seemingly disparate institutions of formal schooling and initiation were, as Ngwane (2004:170) wrote, comprehended as ‘constituent parts of a single, though by no means self-enclosed, world’ - both school and initiation were parts of Qane’s world. Outside the village, the düù faced most difficulty from the influence of school which could stop girls from attending their düù. Many San girls and parents valued school and at the same time did not want to lose their cultural identity through the loss of this practice. There was a tension between the government schools and San communities as often girls were not able to partake in düù while also continuing at school.

However, this is in the process of being rewritten, for instance, by people like Jude who was perceived as being able to negotiate with the school so that his child could attend düù at the same time as maintaining her schooling. As a result, Qane straddled two different forms of social institutions: initiation and formal education. The former gives status within the village and between San, as it makes full members and brings health to the individual, the family and to the community more widely. School, however, is more useful for status outside the village. Employment opportunities were primarily available to those with academic qualifications, and English language skills were important for applications for jobs and grants and to be taken seriously as full and contributing citizens in Botswana.

Yet, if only the daughters of prominent San leaders are able to continue at school while also being initiated, will düù become an aspect of an emerging ‘elite’ San identity? More broadly, this tension highlights the issues facing indigenous elites, who in having a privileged position within a minority group, face structural exclusion from the majority culture, as well as social differentiation from the minority/indigenous group they represent. In this chapter, this differentiation resulted in Qane being able to participate in both school and düù in ways that had not previously been possible for San girls. How will this change the meaning of the düù, and düù practice? Will more children be allowed to maintain access to school as well as being initiated?
San choose to participate in dùù and this ritual rooted an identity as San which was distinct from non-San. Dùù can be contextualised within a wider rhetoric of cultural revival in Botswana, which suggests that at the same time as asserting their cultural difference, San simultaneously signified a desire to be incorporated into a nation that supports and represents a number of different groups and their cultural practices. Yet because San cultural practices lie outside of the broader social and cultural landscape of how the majority conceptualise their nation and national culture, there is also a sense that the dùù is part of a dialogue between San that is part of a resistance against assimilation to Tswana culture. By maintaining this practice and even taking girls out of school regardless of whether they are given permission is critical for the community to socially reproduce itself.

The maintenance of this practice is central to understanding Naro-San womanhood. For people like Qoba who was not able to have her own dùù, being able to participate in other young women’s initiations is as important (if not more) for her to maintain her cultural identity. The effect of not having been initiated puts her at risk within her community in terms of her status as a woman. However, because she is listened to and recognised within the group, she is able to negotiate her womanhood by being part of those who perform the initiation. Qoba’s voice was effective as she was able to demonstrate with her body, through having given birth, her knowledge of the songs and dances which was demonstrated through her wearing her cultural attire, that she was in fact a woman who has the capacity and knowledge not only to be understood as a women, but to also initiate others into their womanhood too. For those women who are unable to have their own initiation, continuing to learn the dances, songs and bodily practices of the initiation is a potent and important way to maintain their San identity and to use their voice.

San women have a voice that is productive and authoritative. Women are able to make changes to the ritual, such as the clothing that is worn. Although this reflects the relationships that San have to ideas and structure that come from outside the village (such as the Church which may have influenced the ways in which the naked
body is viewed and understood morally), there is also a sense that within this space and practice women have the ability to affect their surroundings in ways that in public spaces outside the village they are not able to (for instance, Grace’s voice was silenced in Chapter Four). Advocacy centred on making sure that San can continue to actively perform and produce this initiation supports the ongoing dialogue between San that is critical in strengthening their voice as being distinct and valuable. Dùù is part of a broader conversation that San engage in about cultural loss and identity as well as being critical in the making of womanhood, and the health of the entire community.

The next chapter moves beyond the village to think about the ways that San men who were living outside the village retrospectively narrated their life trajectories. Choice and success in education and employment was important, and the Church was a constant source of validation. In many ways the following chapter offers an opposite perspective from this one in that it focuses on men who are the outward ‘face’ and ‘voice’ of San. While this chapter has been about the internal production of voice in a San community, the following one is about the voices of San who have chosen to leave the village to pursue a different course of action outside of the community. The following chapter is about masculine San identities of advocates in Botswana. Ultimately, this will help us to reflect on the key themes running through this thesis: voice, recognition, egalitarianism and identity.
Chapter Seven

'I'm a traditional-modern man': narratives of ‘modern’ San men inside and outside the village

In D’Kar village, Moses (25, Naro speaker), a San informant, described himself in the following way: ‘I’m a traditional-modern man’. This is an oxymoron yet it makes sense within recent literature about tradition and modernity which no longer understands these as fixed or bound entities or sets of practices (Latour 1993:10). Rather, modernity and tradition are a construct of the project of modernity itself and, as Latour (1993:11) professes, ‘we have never been modern’. Moses’ self-description attests to this perspective, as neither category alone fulfilled a satisfactory descriptive purpose (also see Marsland 2007 for modern traditional healers in Tanzania). While other San would occasionally, but not often, use the words ‘modern’ and/or ‘traditional’ in their own narratives, Moses was unique in describing himself in this way, yet by using this description he alerted us to the importance of these categories. Moreover, running throughout my fieldwork, modern and/or tradition were evoked through the common symbols that San used to position themselves and narrate their own lives.

I asked Moses what he meant by being ‘modern-traditional’, and he said that he was ‘traditional’ because when sitting around the fire it was the men who speak. The women, who although were allowed to be present, were there to listen, or as Moses said, to ‘learn from the wisdom of men’. Literature on San is renowned for revealing differentiated but egalitarian gender relationships within San communities (Barnard 1980:122; Marshall 1976:176; Shostack 1981). Yet what was also interesting was the example that Moses gave, which was to talk about the selling of cattle. He explained that to make this important decision (to sell cattle or not, and to sell which ones) was definitely something in his household that would be discussed and decided amongst the men of the household, yet in other San households in D’Kar I noticed that women had more of a say about these matters than how Moses was presenting
this idea. Bollig et al. (2000:97) reported that in D’Kar there has been an ‘increasing gender power differentiation’ and solidifying gender roles (also see Becker 2003:18). Becker (2003:6) notes that often ‘very real gender issues’ have been neglected due to ‘the myth of a timeless and coherent San society with a high degree of relative gender equality’. Similarly, Anne Soloman writes that ‘insufficient attention has been paid to the predominantly negative stereotypes of feminine gender and that the notion of egalitarianism fails to come to terms with the complexities of San gender organization’ (1992: 232). For Moses to make a specific reference to gender as a defining feature of ‘traditional’ forms of decision making suggests that he was drawing from a different set of practices to orient himself as a San man in relation to women.

This chapter then is also an exploration of manhood, in the context of changing social, economic and gendered spaces. Like Ngwane (2004) who wrote about younger South African men’s appropriation of labels such as ‘the schooled’ or ‘the educated’, in relation to older men whom they pejoratively called ‘barbarians’ or ‘simple natives’, this chapter follows men whose image of ‘proper men’ revolves around the positive appropriation of education and progressive identities. While I do not write about intergenerational conflicts between older and younger men as Ngwane (2004) does, it was clear there was some friction between the men. For instance, one younger man said about a particular older San man that he was ‘just a stupid old man’, and that being unschooled was an indicator of his ‘stupidity’. A lack of formal education was seen as improper manhood (Ngwane 2004:167). In the previous chapter we learnt that men no longer had an initiation, which was once a traditional way of conferring manhood. Is schooling and education becoming part of the ways that younger men form their own identities as men?

In Chapter Four, I focused on Grace (22, Naro speaker), a woman who embodied values such as marrying outside the village and enjoying the benefits of life in town. This chapter is about San men and their perceptions of modernity. Three men were living inside the village including, Moses, Benji (24, Naro speaker) and Jude
Five other men were living outside the village, including Cgase (25, Naro speaker), Ncabase (28, Naro speaker), Murugan (35, Khoe speaker), Khanx’a (30, G/wi speaker) and Robert (30, G//ana speaker). I compare these men, who were living inside or outside the village, in terms of how they narrated their lives, i.e. what they said. While there is a disjuncture between what they said and what they did, here I focus on narratives of modernity in which San identify with markers of modernity that exist within the village, as well as those markers that exist outside the village.

In Africa and elsewhere ‘modernity has been realized...as a kind of totality constituted by contrasting, often disjunctive, possibilities’ (Weiss 2004:6), and this chapter adds a San narrative within these possibilities. It maps what it means to be ‘modern’ for San men through markers including marriage, travel, being a spokesperson and an association with the institution of Church. There are echoes to Mayer’s (1971) study of urban Xhosa in Townsmen or Tribesmen, in which some Xhosa remained ‘tribal’ in their attitudes even after spending a long time in the city. They rejected Christianity and school, and called themselves ‘Red’. Others took on signs of the wider society, converting to Christianity and they called themselves ‘school’. Yet this approach relied on an oversimplified opposition between tradition and modernity in which school and Church is associated with a Westernised, foreign culture which stood in contrast with the primordial values carried in initiation practices (Ngwane 2004:168). Rather, it is often through institutions of modernisation that tradition can be produced, maintained, transformed and reinvigorated, ‘the resources accruing with modernity – in the form of jobs - provided the very possible conditions for maintaining the lifestyles people associated with tradition’ (Ngwane 2004, :169). While some San men had strong positive narratives around ideas and practices that were physically, and ideologically ‘inside’ the village (‘Red’), the ‘traditional’ part of ‘traditional-modern’, this chapter focuses on men who value ideas and practices that were physically, and ideologically ‘outside’ the village (‘School’), the ‘modern’ part of ‘traditional-modern’. I also note that these categories are not fixed or separate but actually co-create a dialectic and that (re)produce one another.
At the same time as looking towards the future, San men looked retrospectively at their lives and narrated ‘modernity’ as foresight and choice. These narratives ran alongside a rhetoric of ‘empowerment’. Empowerment is a term that has been popularised within development spheres. It has also been used by the Government of Botswana and by San men themselves. For instance, Murugan, a city dwelling San and the coordinator of Botswana Khwedom Council (BKC), who we met in Chapter Three, talked about the importance of building ‘personal empowerment’, and ‘group empowerment’ for San. He explained that ‘personal empowerment’ is needed before ‘group empowerment’ of San can be attained. What Murugan described as ‘personal empowerment’ appears in some literature as ‘self-esteem’ (Braam le Roux 1998:2, 3; Hays and Siegrühn 2005:32; Saugestad 2001:218; Suzman 2001:2). For Murugan, ‘personal empowerment’ is measured by the inclusion and participation of San individuals in all political and social spheres, starting with Church groups and PTAs.

‘Participation’ and ‘empowerment’ are buzzwords found in development discourse more broadly. Participation has been associated with ‘social movements, and with the struggle for citizenship rights and voice’ (Cornwall and Brock 2005:1046). Participation has been used to help people gain political agency, and ideas about its benefits have attempted to shape the way in which development is done, for instance involving local people in making decisions about their own development goals. Participation (or lack of) in the development process has been an issue for San in Botswana and has led Nthomang (2004) to present the development situation as continuing colonisation (also see Turpel 1992:580). ‘Empowerment’ has been taken up by a number of different ‘progressive’ groups to emphasise the building of personal and collective power (Cornwall and Brock 2005:1046). However, a prominence of individual and personal issues being central to politics has been invoked in neoliberal, capitalistic and individualistic ways that dilute the emphasis on creating an equitable world (Cornwall and Brock 2005:1046). It is this critical analysis of ‘empowerment’ as a departure from building an equitable world, and as
part of an individualistic project that draws us towards a tension that underlies the narratives that I focus on in this chapter.

These development buzzwords provide a sense of direction and also legitimise development interventions (Cornwall and Brock 2005:1044). By using these buzzwords, Murugan invokes development as part of a normative experience for himself and San, and as a key part of what the Botswana Kwedom Council (BKC) is involved in. In presenting himself in this way, Murugan legitimises himself and BKC as key developmental actors. Evoking development is poignant for San in Botswana who are frequently charged with the accusation of ignoring or avoiding attempts made by the government to develop them.

A critical evaluation of ‘personal empowerment’ in relation to egalitarianism suggests that it has come to represent an individualistic project, which not only follows a critical analysis of such buzzwords, but also questions the extent of the ongoing practice of egalitarianism. ‘Empowerment’ and ‘participation’ are part of ‘development-speak’ which has become normalised and imbued with nation-building and good-citizenship practices. This chapter critically analyses the narratives of San who frame their own experiences and the experiences of other San using developmental buzzwords. To briefly recap from Chapter One, Ncابase already explained that he did not agree that San are egalitarian, and referenced the beatings that parents give their children as evidence to support his claim. Absent from the narratives expressed in this chapter is explicit reference to egalitarian values. This is not due to an omission by myself as a researcher but rather reflects the way in which this particular demographic of San want to self-represent.

San are often not confident or comfortable in public (e.g. Chapter Four) or institutional environments and they often shy away from participation; i.e. they are not ‘personally empowered’ to speak up within non-San environments. In Chapter Four, we were reminded of how speaking out and being confrontational is not part of how San imagine resolving conflicts. This chapter, however, is about men who are ‘personally empowered’ to speak in public. Chapter Six argued for the inclusion of
San girls in both school and initiation, and here I continue this thread as San men continue to want to be included in all aspects of social and political public life. Yet a clear difference for men was the absence of the traditional male initiation. San men are using their voices to be recognised by people outside of their own communities, and they do so using a rhetoric of ‘modernity’, ‘development’ and of ‘being established’ which draws on some key symbols that are used by the dominant society, rather than using terms that the community itself engages with (as in Chapter Six).

What follows is a short vignette which, partly through an ethnographic omission, opens up and highlights key markers of modernity and of ‘personal empowerment’ that were used by San men, and which will be revealed in narratives throughout the rest of the chapter.

**A ‘nice fat Bushman’**

In 2014, a San man from the village, Benji, suggested that I might contact, in his words, a ‘nice fat bushman’ who was now working abroad. As mentioned in Chapter Two, I prefer to avoid the term ‘Bushman’ due to the connotations towards a ‘primitive’ that it conjures. I have utilised it here however as Benji plays with this ‘primitive’ image in a challenging and defiant way. Benji’s description toyed with popular images of ‘bushmen’ as thin, bush-dwelling, hunters, rather than as fat, office-working expatriates. I made contact with this ‘fat bushman’ via Facebook, and we set up a meeting at his office where he introduced himself as Ncabase. Ncabase was approximately 5’6” (168cm) and he had a large protruding stomach that was visible through his white shirt and open grey suit jacket. He had a ‘goatee’ beard and two furrow lines between his eyes, shiny pointy black shoes, and a tie. He wore a stern expression which gave the impression of him being serious and important.

After being led into his office, I began by asking about his history, family and education. His story was familiar and I was puzzled as I was sure that he must have known another man whom I had met and interviewed a number of times in Gaborone.
in 2010, and whose name was also Ncabase. After I described this other man he turned and said, ‘That Ncabase is me… I am the one’. I was shocked and embarrassed – how had I not recognised him? Yet, neither had he recognised me. I remembered him as a man thinner than his San friends, and he had often worn a baseball cap that almost dwarfed and covered his face. Slowly things began to make more sense and, I exclaimed, ‘but you are fat now’, and he said, ‘a lot of people are saying that’. I estimated that he had gained about three stones (approximately 20kg) since I last saw him in 2010 and from photographs on Facebook, his weight gain was rapid from about 2012 onwards. This considerable extra weight had changed the shape of his face, to the point where I no longer recognised him. Nevertheless, his stern manner was much the same as it ever was.

Ncabase’s enlarged body can be used as a metaphor for his relationship between the ‘self’ and the ‘social’. His body, in being fat and in being geographically far from Botswana, signifies a difference from his previous situation as a thin man in Botswana. Being fat reveals that he does not struggle for food, and this is part of a broader common narrative in Botswana around ‘success’ and ‘wealth’ which contrasts with the condition of ‘poor’ people living in villages like D’Kar, many of whom are living hand to mouth. Working in unreliable piece jobs, scraping by on government destitute packages, or relying on old age pensions to feed whole households is normal in the village.

Later I told Benji that neither I nor Ncabase recognised each other, and Benji just laughed, and said, ‘I told you, you knew him’, as he revelled in his ability to play with stereotypes. During my fieldwork Benji played with his own image as he wore fashionably ‘modern’ trainers and clothes, yet he also told me that he was a ‘real bushman’. For instance, he said that some San assume that he is not able to ride a horse, something that he is actually highly experienced in. For Benji, a ‘real bushman’ can be closely linked to a ‘farm worker’, (a description noted in Chapter Four, that denoted a lowly San who works as a cattle herder) who probably lives at a rural cattle post where riding horses is needed for transport and to herd cattle. Riding a horse
was a quintessential skill that a ‘real bushman’ knows. It was something that was not expected of Benji who dressed like a modern city boy.

Benji had warned me of Ncabase’s size, ‘nice fat Bushman’, and so this was as much of a factor that Benji used to describe him, as Ncabase’s fat ‘disguised’ him from my own memory. Although it is possible to be fat without being ‘modern’, the markers of Ncabase’s position, as a person living abroad, working in an office, wearing suits, suggests that he is ‘full’ of wealth, food and ‘education’: markers of modernity and development. Moreover, Ncabase was, as Murugan said, ‘personally empowered’, as he occupied a prestigious position of employment. Ncabase could be seen to be empowered as his skills and expertise were being recognised, utilised and valued in an environment that frequently excluded San.

In this chapter I move beyond narratives of the body to reveal how San men conceived of, narrated and presented their own social identities. I do not seek to locate ‘real identities’ behind these narratives, but rather I understand the ways that San enact or perform social life (Ferguson 1999:97). The narratives used by ‘modern’ San men were constructed as part of their own strategies of survival within a system, in which they were under a ‘situation of duress’ (Butler 1990:177–178). In other words, San men were negotiating their position within the broader context of the politics of minority/majority ethnic groups in Botswana. Social identities are formed and negotiated in relation to others who must bear witness. This means that San must navigate stereotypes as ‘not being modern’ or as being ‘backwards’ or ‘undeveloped’ as these are commonly accepted assumptions held about San by the wider non-San population. I argue that San narratives are being written against these stereotypes and Benji’s description of Ncabase as a ‘nice fat bushman’ evidences just that.

I begin by re-introducing Jude, a village dwelling man who we met in Chapters Four, Five and Six. I build upon, and reiterate some key markers of Jude’s life in relation to ‘personal empowerment’. A narrative of being ‘an established man’ used by Cgase, a San man who was living outside the village, draws striking parallels to the markers that Jude embodied, including being a spokesperson, being ‘legally’
married and how his involvement within the Church validated his position as a ‘community leader’.

**Jude and Cgase: Being ‘established’**

We met Jude in the previous chapters. He embodied the archetype of an ‘established’ man, a description used by Cgase (25, Naro speaker), a San man who though lived outside of the village, was originally from D’Kar where his mother still lived. In 2010 and 2011, Cgase was enrolled on a BA in Business Administration at the University of Botswana and he lived in Gaborone city. Based on the striking parallels between Cgase’s depictions of what he wanted to achieve and what Jude already had, it is useful to think about Jude alongside Cgase’s description of himself.

Cgase explained that in order to ‘be established’ he needed a house and a car, a legal state marriage, children, and he aspired to be a spokesperson too. He needed a brick house, and said that he would keep the ‘dark’ one, i.e. a hut made from organic material, as a reminder of his tradition. Strikingly, Jude was living with his wife, Ntcisa in a house that was made from bricks which stood next to a permanent ‘traditional’ hut (an oxymoron because ‘traditionally’ homes were non-permanent) with a cemented base and old worn out grasses. The normal daily use of Jude’s ‘traditional’ hut, or as Cgase said, ‘dark house’, was to store wood or cooking pots. This hut was used in Jude’s daughter’s dùù (eland) initiation dance (Chapter Six). Jude kept a 4x4 vehicle, and occasionally a mini-bus in his yard too. Cgase’s aspiration for a brick and traditional house as well as a car mirrored the reality of Jude’s home and yard. I wondered if Cgase looked up to Jude as a role model in his aspiration to be an ‘established’ man.

Cgase also specifically mentioned that being ‘legally married’ was necessary in his social image as an established man. Again, this draws parallels to Jude, who, without being requested to do so, showed me his marriage certificate that he kept safely in a folder with in-built plastic wallet pages. This suggests that he also highly
values his legal marriage to his wife as being noteworthy. On 28th June 1995 Jude was ‘legally married’ to Ntcisa. Although this was the sixth woman that he had children with, this was Jude’s only legal marriage. Being married in the eyes of the law and the government, as opposed to being what I would describe as being ‘socially married’, was an important part of Jude’s identity that he wished to highlight to me. Many couples in D’Kar are socially recognised and accepted as being married, yet even the longest lasting couples were often unmarried in the legal sense. Interestingly, I never heard of any weddings in D’Kar during my fieldwork, and being married was a rare status there.

Jude and Ntcisa’s marriage was not presented as a religious bond but as a lawful one, yet the important lasting impression of being married legally was the validation of the relationship as monogamous and ‘until death’. Ncaba has also commented on marriage:

This institution [marriage] has taught me a lot. [H]ow to be a good husband and father...taking care of someone’s daughter and above all your own son or blood. It is a blessing from God.

Ncaba, Facebook post, 2015

Monogamous, lasting relationships are preferred by the government, and this also mirrors a moral marriage according to Christian values. A legally certified marriage is a symbol of a commitment to living morally through monogamy. Marriage, in the eyes of the government’s legal system, was one marker of a person’s value and position as a ‘modern’ and moral person who is committed to a monogamous and everlasting heterosexual relationship.

One difference between Cgase’s narrative of being ‘established’, and Jude’s ‘established’ life, was that for Cgase, being established was also about signifying that he was ‘educated’. Yet Jude was not formally educated. Formal education was only widely available from the 1970s and so when Jude was a small boy, attending school was not the norm. Cgase’s narrative of being established therefore matches a broader social shift where education has become a normal part of a San experience. Jude
encouraged his son Moses to attend school and university, which further suggests that education is part of the contemporary way that modernity is imagined and signified. Jude’s ‘modern’ thinking valued formal education even though he himself had not experienced it. In comparison with Jude, I heard about other parents who were scared of sending their children to school as they themselves had not been and so did not trust the system.

This narrative of being established draws on the accumulation of particular symbolic, material and social markers which have come from outside San communities. This narrative suggests a shift away from sharing and gift exchanges that foreground much of the literature on San. Rather, we are reminded that San have been part of broader social life in Botswana and that structures and institutions such as education, marriage and the Church are now central to self-representation reflects these contemporary shifts.

**Ethnicity, morality and belonging**

The men in this chapter identified as being Christians and were active in one Church or another. While I do not analyse Church attendance in relation to belief, I understand the role of the Church on a level of discourse and as part of the way that San research participants narrated their social identities. Church was not necessarily about God, but about the Church itself, as an institution and the moral values and social benefits that alignment with the Church brings.

Church sets a moral tone, and in Gantsi District this has been mapped onto ethnic hierarchies. For instance, the relationship between Jude’s Naro speaking San mother and his white Afrikaans speaking father, Sammy, was probably a bone of contention for Sammy’s white Afrikaans speaking parents. To demonstrate this, I draw a parallel between Sammy and ‘Oom Jimmy’ a character from a fictional book about residents of a village in Botswana’s Kalahari. I do this because many of their circumstances are similar:
His [Sammy’s] life had not gone the way the God of his parents would have wanted. At least, since most of his grown-up children had joined the church at D’Kar, perhaps their souls would be saved, he thought. But…[h]e could never again take the step towards the religion of his parents. The sinful, disrespectful way in which he had chosen to live would never, ever be forgiven by the God he knew as a child. (le Roux 2001:35 emphasis in original)

Church and religion play a strong moralistic role. For a white man to have a San wife and to have children together was sinful and disrespectful in the eyes of Sammy’s parents’ God: a moral framework that was taken from and validated by the Church.

Furthermore, this had social implications that were visible within ethnic relations between Afrikaners and San. These relations have been depicted in detail in Russell and Russell’s (1979:88–90) ethnography of the Kalahari. For instance, the following description of a white Afrikaans speaking man and his San wife and children, again, might be a description of Jude’s father Sammy or one of his contemporaries:

He was twenty-four when he got his first child from a Nama [San] woman, with whom he slept under a tree, not daring to bring her into his father’s house…. “I’d go to her when I needed anything like washing my clothes, and when she was near me we slept together, and then she’d go back to her own people”. When he got the baby he “told the whole lot about it….I did not hide it and they were angry, but what does it help to hide anyway?…” The weight of disapproval came from the white women. “They still talked to me, but they held themselves superior. They did not want me to think that I was now going to get a white woman”. (Russell and Russell 1979:90)

Even though it was condemned by the Church, it was common for white Afrikaans speakers like Sammy to have a child or children with San women. Yet the ‘frank acceptance of paternity and its implications, entail[ed] social exclusion’ (Russell and Russell 1979:89–90) from the white Afrikaans speaking community and therefore most men in this situation did not publicly announce such progenies. Sammy, however, lived with his Naro speaking wife and had many children with her, deciding to publicly stand with her and their children. This showed loyalty towards
his partner and their children and bravery as he would have probably been excluded by his white friends and possibly his white family too.

Jude was brought up with ethnically mixed parents and his father was potentially not accepted into either San or white Afrikaner society, being an outsider in both communities. However, Jude described his father as speaking fluent Naro, and as ‘knowing everything’ about being San. He asserted that although his father was white, culturally he was more aligned with being San. Jude identified as being a Naro speaking San and his son Moses was also a fervent advocate of San ‘issues’, suggesting that Jude passed on a San identity to his children. Since Moses described himself as a ‘traditional-modern man’, ‘traditional’ meant identification with being ‘San’, which he also told me was connected to his language, Naro (Chapter Five). Moses presented himself as San but in a modern way.

Jude speaks Naro, G/wi, Afrikaans, Setswana and some English (Chapter Five), although he specifically highlighted Naro language as a marker of his identity. He emphasised that he values his mother’s culture and language (Naro) over his father’s (Afrikaans) and explained that as a family they spoke Naro at home. He made sure that all Kuru NGO meetings were translated into Naro, thus making a political (and social) statement by identifying as San through language.

However, Jude’s knowledge of the Afrikaans language was cited by other San in D’Kar as a marker of his close relationship with his white father, an outsider and ethnic other. Here Jude’s mixed ethnicity, which was signified through language, was used by some San as a maker that devalued and undermined his position and identity as San. I heard a resident complain that Jude did not belong in the village, as the village was ‘for Bushmen’ or San. This suggested that Jude’s ethnicity was being understood as non-San. Being San in D’Kar held more currency than in other places, as D’Kar was the only land that San legally owned. To be defined as non-San meant being thought of as an outsider who did not fully belong in D’Kar.

The resident explained that Jude had come to D’Kar years ago and had asked Cornelius de Bruin, the pastor at the time, if he could stay in the village for a short
while. He went on to say that he was granted permission but never left the village as he said he would. ‘We knew Jude’s father [Sammy], and [we, the San residents of D’Kar] told Cornelius not to let him [Sammy] come’, the resident explained. There was a sense of injustice that Jude was allowed to stay in the village, which was in part due to his mixed ethnicity, but also potentially from a negative local perception of Sammy who was well-known in the region. This resident expressed the opinion that Jude had overstayed his welcome and meanwhile had taken over positions of power in the village and in the DRC. Could this opinion be part of the egalitarian ‘levelling techniques’ used to humble the leader? Jude was perceived as thinking he was better than everyone else, an assumption that was underwritten by ethnic relations and hierarchies that have historically shaped the social landscape of this region (Chapter Four). In other words, since Jude had a white father, and as there has been a history of white people ruling and dominating social, economic and political life in the District, it was presumed that Jude felt a sense of entitlement to a social and ethnic status that was hierarchically above San. Of course, Jude’s prominent positions of leadership within the DRC and community only served to strengthen these perceptions. These levelling techniques and criticisms did not change the structures of power and authority in the village as Jude remained central to the organisational bodies of the village. The perception of Jude as being ‘white’ was corroborated as he remained outside the effects of ‘fierce egalitarianism’ that levelling upholds. In other words, Jude was still in prominent positions within the village, and had been for many years.

When I asked Jude about his membership within the Church, he explained simply that his father had taught him about the Bible and God and so he ‘already knew about these things’ before moving to D’Kar. He explained, however, that he had never attended a Church service until he came to D’Kar. I wondered if this was out of choice, or at least partly because until 1964, when the mission station was set up in D’Kar, there were only separate white and ‘coloured’ Churches in the District that did not allow San to attend and thus would have excluded him and his ethnically mixed family (Russell and Russell 1979:106–107). Within Jude’s narrative, it was a
natural and logical step for him to become a member of the Church at D’Kar when he moved there in 1970.

Scathing remarks from another San resident explained that there was a suspicious ‘mass conversion’ to the Church by members of Jude’s family. This resident’s sceptical remarks again alerted me to a perception that Jude was only in the Church in order to benefit from the high status position that the Church promoted, such as being on the DRCC and acting as a translator in Sunday services. Clearly, Jude occupies an ambiguous position in the village as his ethnic status made him an outsider while at the same time increased his opportunities for employment and social recognition, for instance, within the Church. This alerts us to intra-ethnic differences and the contours of ethnicity within a San community.

**Church and public speaking**

Cgase explained that he was the only one in his family who attended Church. He was also on the board of a student-led Zionist Christian Church (ZCC) society at the University of Botswana. The ZCC is a popular South African church. The student society met weekly in a lecture theatre at the University of Botswana’s main campus and I attended one of these meetings. Cgase was introduced onto the stage of the lecture theatre by two pastors from the main local ZCC church who came to give sermons. Cgase stood easily and charismatically on stage while he delivered a passionate and well measured motivational speech in Setswana, and for the benefit of me, their guest, partly in English too. He invited and encouraged attendees to join a trip to South Africa where, as part of a wider ZCC directive, they would meet other members of the ZCC. Most ZCC Church groups frequently visit the ZCC headquarters in South Africa.

Although other student members of the group also went up on stage to speak, none inhabited the stage as easily or comfortably as Cgase. One student even commented on Cgase’s proficiency as he encouraged others to come prepared to
speak at the meeting, ‘so that when the likes of Cgase has stood and spoken, it is not like you can say, “oh well he said everything”’. This comment suggests that he held a strong position within the group as others may have felt shy or inferior to speak after Cgase, who said ‘everything’: the perception being that there was nothing left for others to contribute.

Cgase gained a status within this group due to his ability and desire to contribute, as well as his ability to speak calmly and confidently in front of his peers, and superiors, in the Church. When Cgase’s peers commented on how well he spoke in public, the practical training of this kind of meeting was highlighted. Speaking on a small public stage such as this ZCC student society, was a practice platform for Cgase, a place where his public speaking skills were trained and his techniques tested. For instance, Cgase was also part of Botswana Khwedom Council (BKC), an NGO that lobbied the government on issues to do with San, and where clear and confident public speaking would be needed. Moreover, in 2015, Cgase spoke at the international United Nations Working Group for Indigenous Peoples (UNWGIP) meeting, where public speaking skills are necessary to take this role. The reception that Cgase experienced within the ZCC group demonstrates how having a public voice can contribute to a positive social image.

Cgase chose to participate within the construction and production of a Christian discourse in and around the Church, and like this, his public voice was legitimised within a Christian space. The Church is a relatively safe space for public speaking, as opposed to the controversial space of political advocacy work that Cgase is also interested in. At all public meetings in Botswana, someone is asked to lead the group in prayer in Setswana language before the meeting commences. At a meeting in D’Kar, Cgase was asked to conduct this opening prayer. By being asked to perform this, Cgase’s position as a person with authority was strengthened. Alignment with the Church runs alongside a discourse of morality in Botswana (Dahl 2009:24), and so being part of the Church also strengthened Cgase’s position as a moral person. Being willing and able to perform the leading of prayers in public meetings, as well as being
recognised as someone who can perform this, was a privilege that afforded him a position within as well as outside of the Church. Leading public prayers is a part of social life in Botswana, and it is recognised as a role for those who are conversant in a Christian rhetoric, and who are confident enough to speak in public. Moreover, through performing these roles, men like Cgase are nurtured further as people who can take on public speaking roles and each time they are listened to, they are recognised as such.

In the coming months Cgase explained that he wants to be a ‘leader’ and mentioned that in later life he wants to become a politician. In 2015, a Facebook post suggested that Cgase was becoming more involved with the political coalition party, the Umbrella for Democratic Change (UDC), although the full extent of his involvement was unclear. His training in public speaking that his involvement within the ZCC society enabled was good preparation for a future in politics, where public speaking will be a necessary and important skill. Cgase articulated himself confidently and in doing so he was rewarded with respect and reverence from his peers. Cgase was ‘personally empowered’ to speak in public and in the future he will have confidence and conviction when, he hopes, he will publically address the nation in party politics.

Indeed, Jude’s public voice and presence was not only limited to the Church, as he acted as a spokesperson for the community more broadly and was known as a ‘community leader’. Jude was present at formal occasions in the village, especially those relating to the Church or to public events put on by Kuru. Even when he was not present, for instance at the public launch of a book called, *I Don’t Know Why I Was Created: Dada Coex’ae Qgam* (Gollifer and Egner 2011), a book that was based on the life of a deceased San artist from D’Kar, his name was mentioned during the proceedings. He was clearly a central character in many activities in the village.

Moreover, Jude attended a *kgolta* meeting when the government announced the introduction of official permits for gathering wild foods from the bush. During the meeting Jude stood up and, in Setswana, expressed outrage at the new law, and
at the extra unnecessary pressure this would put on residents to feed their families. Speaking out against this new law and on behalf of residents was to stand up for the livelihood practices of village residents and it was important in terms of his role and responsibilities in the village as a community leader. Other residents did not have the confidence to speak up in these kinds of formal situations, making Jude’s voice important. His ability to speak up in Setswana, in situations dominated by non-San revealed that he was ‘personally empowered’, in comparison to other residents.

The parallels between Cgase and Jude in terms of public speaking are stark. By speaking in Church and in public, Cgase and other San, were recognised as moral people to listen to. Being a spokesperson was about having the confidence and skills to speak out in public; being ‘personally empowered’. Both San and non-San recognise spokespeople through listening to what they have to say. Where for Jude, this was about being a community leader and a pillar for the residents of the village to lean upon, for Cgase, this went hand in hand with being educated and articulate and ultimately he hoped that this would lead to a career in politics. Cgase’s aim to be a politician, the ultimate spokesperson, built upon, yet went beyond, Jude as a village spokesperson. However, a presence in Church was foundational to both these men’s experiences of being publically visible spokespeople. In both cases, the Church legitimised these men in the public sphere and promoted their voices as meaningful and powerful.

The following section shifts as we focus more upon a narrative about education, employment and travel from an interview with Khanx’a, a 30 year old San man. Within his narrative, the Church also emerged as a source of moral validation in relation to employment. In understanding ‘modernity’, this section brings together education, wealth, and employment while at the same time draws on travel outside of the village and relationships to ethnic others.
A lack of employment opportunities in the village

I met with Khanx’a (30, G/wi speaker) a number of times in Gaborone. When I asked about his life, he began with his full name and where he was born, ‘somewhere in the heart of the desert…somewhere in the ‘80s, I’m told’. Khanx’a did not know his exact age. In 1997 he went to primary school, and then to junior secondary school. In 2000 he went to senior secondary school in Gantsi and in 2002 he completed Form Five (the equivalent of A-levels in the UK). If students fail their end of year exams, they are required to repeat that year before progressing to the next one. This can slow down a student who is unable to pass the exams as the government does not allow a student to retake the year. Instead, if the student wishes to continue, s/he must look for financial support to either pass distance learning exams (i.e. via BOCODOL, a distance learning institute in Botswana), or pay high costs to attend a private school (this is also the case for girls who miss exams due to initiation, Chapter Six). Throughout his primary and secondary schooling, Khanx’a did not repeat any years, and he explained that he showed a high proficiency in these academic environments. This was a source of value and pride for Khanx’a, revealing how education is part of a positive self-narration for himself (and other San).

Khanx’a explained that in his village the Kgosi (chief) and the elected local councillor occupy the top level employment opportunities, then next on the rung is work as a foreman on the Ipelegeng Programme which is a government work programme that is also known as the ‘Drought Relief Programme’ (Pnina Werbner 2014:13; Republic of Botswana 2011b). Working as a foreman, Kgosi or councillor are the only jobs in his village that reflect a person’s level of education. All other jobs involve working on the land as a labourer, which, as we know from Chapter Four, were positions described in a derogatory and encompassing way as ‘farm work’. The assumption about San in Botswana was that they are only farm workers, binding them to this role alone. A labourer is an entry level job, meaning that no educational qualifications are needed to gain employment in this sector. After completing secondary school in 2002, Khanx’a lived and worked for three to four months in his
village as the foreman for the Ipelegeng Programme, a position that although still fairly low paid nevertheless set him apart from others in the village. Narrating job opportunities in the village in this way suggested that Khanx’a’s aspirations to occupy recognised positions as an ‘educated’ member of society mirrored Gase’s desire to achieve markers of being ‘established’ and ‘educated’ too. The type of job acquired signifies their educational position.

In D’Kar, however, there were more employment opportunities which came from the NGO whose headquarters were located in the village. Skilled and unskilled jobs were available in the NGO, primary school and kgotla, as well as the Ipelegeng Programme, elected councillor and Kgosi. There were more jobs available in D’Kar than there were in Khanx’a’s village, although neither village offered as wide a range of employment opportunities compared to other places. For example, employment in central government offices meant moving to their headquarters in Gaborone, or to local government headquarters that were located in Gantsi town. There are more employment opportunities outside of the village for those with higher levels of education.

After working as a foreman, Khanx’a was employed as a translator for missionaries from the World Mission Centre (a South African missionary group). Khanx’a explained that:

As someone from the area I was going around interpreting. Of course they were paying me for that. I was also a member of the Church, because of my services that I was doing outside of the Church, going around and spreading the word of the Gospel. So that is what I was doing in [the time] between school and [attending the] University of Cape Town.

Khanx’a, 2012

Alongside being from that place and thus knowing the local language, Khanx’a identified that working, unpaid, for the Church was how he came to gain paid employment as a translator on the missionary project. Khanx’a highlighted that the benefits of being aligned with the Church go beyond the Church, as they were translated into a paid employment opportunity. Being asked to work for people who
spread the word of the Gospel was a privilege as it meant being recognised and validated as a moral Christian. Moreover, working as a translator meant acting as a meaning-maker between residents and English-speaking outsiders. Both Jude and Khanx’a acted as spokespersons or translators, essentially behaving as middle-men between two communicating groups of people, and the Church validated them in these positions.

**Travel opens the mind**

*We must elevate the people, expand their minds, equip them, differentiate them, and humanize them.*

*(Fanon 2004:137)*

We met Ncabase in the introduction of this chapter, where his body revealed his status as wealthy and successful. Travel was important for Ncabase, in terms of ‘opening your mind’. For instance, he recognised that the ethnic diversity of living abroad was an opportunity to learn a lot from others:

Since I have a son, a small boy, I thought it [moving abroad to City X] was an opportunity also for him. City X being, I don’t know, being the centre, because everybody who goes abroad, or wherever, will pass through City X. So in City X, what I have observed is that almost everybody is here, if you want to see Africans [they] are here, [as well as] Chinese or people from Asia. Everybody’s in City X. So you, this [job] it also opens your mind. You can learn a lot from other people, than if you maybe go to a different [post in a different country], then there you will find few people, even in terms [of] colleagues... But here [in City X], almost everybody is here.

*Ncabase, 2014*

Value is attributed to living abroad in City X as it is Ncabase’s perception that ‘almost everybody is here’, i.e. nearly all ethnic groups from across the world are represented in London, is an advantageous benefit as it presents opportunities for Ncabase, and his son, to mix and learn from a variety of people. An example of the kind of learning that this might entail came from his narrative about spending time in Norway.
As part of his MA, Ncabase went to Norway ‘for a semester…in 2009 to do some courses from the Master’s in Indigenous Studies’ at the University of Tromsø. The links between the University of Botswana and the University of Tromsø were forged by academics who assisted in opening the Research Centre for San Studies (RCSS) (Bolaane and Saugestad 2011). Due to Ncabase’s relationships with academics in RCSS, he was able to access links to international others, thus highlighting the importance of going through major channels and institutions (see Chapter Three for an example of missing these channels).

Ncabase explained that what is most striking from his time living and studying in Norway is how it helped to change how he thinks about and consumes alcohol. Before going to Norway he never drank alcohol, and as a member of the Church it was easy and expected that he would avoid it. In Botswana in general, there are polarised perceptions about alcohol consumption and these perceptions mapped onto Church attendance. Drinking culture in Botswana, as Ncabase mentioned, was often extreme, and people would drink like there was ‘no life after tomorrow’. Consumption could be excessive and based on dependency. For Ncabase, as a moral and sober Church-goer, alcohol consumption was condemned and in these circles, alcohol is often discussed as a social and personal problem: drinking is perceived as a drain on society. Many Churches in Botswana promote sobriety. People who drink alcohol, however, say that they know how to have fun, and although they would probably frequent Church less often, they still identify as being Christian. Those who drink alcohol often condemn sober Church-goers as judgemental people who think they are morally superior.

Ncabase explained that it was now possible for him to enjoy alcohol without becoming over-intoxicated, a dynamic that he did not understand while in Botswana. He learnt this from socialising with a university professor at her home in Norway. This has had a lasting effect on his ideas and practices around alcohol consumption, an aspect of life that he considered to be a significant issue for San. He witnessed how a glass of wine can be consumed with dinner and that this did not
have to predicate over-intoxication as it normally would in Botswana. Ncabase explained that through travel and socialising with people outside of the village, he moved beyond popular narratives in Botswana, and created his own discourse. This narrative revealed the kind of benefits he envisions for his son while living in London, another place where he will be exposed to difference.

Ncabase went on to explain that through behaving as a role model, when he went back to Botswana he was able to show other San how to drink moderately, with the hope that they would be able to learn from him. Acting as a role model meant acting in an exemplary way and so that those who might not have the level of education or the experience of travel that he has, may also be encouraged to broaden their experiences and choose a different way of living. Ncabase’s self-narrative was about behaving differently to the majority of his San and non-San friends, family and fellow citizens, and that his different behaviour offers something that others might emulate or learn from. This also mirrored Benji, who in Chapter Four explained that he thought about the street children who sniff glue at Choppies Mall in a different way to other San who have less experience of formal education.

Cgase also valued working and living with ‘others’ from outside the village and, ‘let me learn from others’, was his wish. Cgase wanted to experience different and new ways of living, yet he explained, his parents said ‘don’t work outside’ of the community, which suggests that they value experiences outside the village differently. Cgase explained that he wanted to get out of the village because ‘educated people look at things from different angles’. Like before, Cgase makes a distinction between himself as an educated man and as someone who aspires to move away from the village, whereas elders, who are more likely to be uneducated, would rather remain within the village.

Leaving the physical village is intertwined with an ideological shift. Cgase summed this up by explaining that being educated means you ‘see things from different angles’ i.e. it changes your outlook on life. There is a paradox, as moving away from the village normally occurs before a person is employable, as secondary
and tertiary education (more than primary education) are located in institutions outside of the village and attending school already means learning things that come from outside the village. To be successful in an educational environment is, to a certain extent, to absorb and take seriously ‘other’ perspectives and practices. Yet parents advise against these shifts, for instance, when they advised Cgase to find employment within the village. Yet Cgase, and San like him, had already made an ideological shift, and valued ideas from ‘outside the village’, as their schooling has been built up from being outside the village and learning from people other than parents and kin. Cgase wanted to find employment that will continue to reflect an ideology that values ideas, people and experiences that are from outside the village.

**Marriage outside the village**

While ethnically mixed marriages have been common within Gantsi District, some San perceive mixed marriages as unbalanced and as compromising the integrity and dignity of San. For instance, one San woman said that non-San men treat San wives as ‘slaves’, and never allowed them to leave the house, tirelessly making them do lots of housework. This woman explained that even if it meant that they had no money, she would prefer to marry and be with a San man as they treat her well. She expressed sympathy for San who are living with and/or are married to non-San as she narrated them as suffering.

Cgase explained that in D’Kar families want their children to marry ‘inside’ and, for instance in Chapter Four, Grace was encouraged to marry her cousin, younger Jude. Yet Cgase continued to explain that he wished to marry someone from outside of his village, which suggests that this would be someone from a different ethnic group. Again this echoes Grace who had a relationship and children with her Kgalagadi boyfriend from ‘outside’ the village. Making relationships outside the village can also be understood as part of a discourse about ideologically moving beyond the village (though not necessarily physically moving since Grace still lived
in the village). Through marriage partners kinship becomes an aspect of life, alongside work, that has the potential to be negotiated outside of the village. Some San seek marriage partners from outside the current kinship structure and from outside their village too. In doing so, they intentionally redefine who becomes kin, and who does not. Like this, they ideologically and physically engage with ideas and people from outside the village.

Cgase described this ideological shift as ‘breaking that shell’, i.e. that he and other educated San are breaking down the fear that parents and other San have about living and working closely with ‘others’ from outside the village. Rather, Ncable described this as an ‘opportunity’, as something to learn and grow from, and not to fear. Fear of the outside is a marker of a lack of ‘personal empowerment’. San who move beyond the mould set within the village, and who are more willing and eager to live and work, and in some cases also marry, outside the village, are ‘personally empowered’ to make their own choices.

Overall, there was a difference in how travel outside of the village was valued. For many people within the village, ‘outside’ was symbolic of danger and threats. We heard about this in Chapter Four when Grace’s mother identified the high danger for her daughter, even saying that being friends with non-San might kill her, as it had done to Grace’s aunt. This came with a warning against movement, both ideologically and physically, from the village. Whereas others, such as Grace, Cgase, Khanx’a and Ncable, valued ‘opening your mind’, and ‘learning new ways’ of doing things that came from working, living or marrying ‘outside’ the village.

The benefits of different jobs

Khanx’a had been an assistant researcher on a project run by the Kellogg Foundation that was based in D’Kar. The job was to find ‘gaps’ where the Foundation could help and assist people to access government funding, ‘even to help them write proposals [for government grant programmes]’. Khanx’a explained that in terms of
remuneration the Kellogg Foundation research job was advantageous as the pay reflected his high level of education, however he explained that there were problems with the project.

First of all, Khanx’a was the ‘under-study’ of his Zimbabwean boss, yet he felt that he was not given the opportunity to learn from this person in the way he had imagined as his boss was blocking him from learning. This kind of reasoning echoed back to Murugan, for whom ‘personal empowerment’ was paramount for positive shifts towards San ’group empowerment’. Working under someone who did not fulfil his duties in terms of training or developing for Khanx’a meant that he was being undervalued and thus not being fully empowered to take on roles with more responsibility.

Secondly, he continued,

I was based in D’Kar, and D’Kar is the so-called headquarters of the so-called uuurmm, these NGOs and, [the] Kuru Family of Organisations they are based in D’Kar and so everybody is there. Mind you, there is also the politics, with regards to how [the] Kuru Family of Organisations or Kuru has been treating the people in D’Kar. Which most of the people, if not all, are unhappy with…but you have been there [so you should know].

Khanx’a, 2012

Khanx’a was given an office next to/in the same building as the Kuru offices which meant he was automatically thought of as being part of this NGO. He explained that the residents saw no difference between him working for the Kellogg Foundation or working for Kuru, the NGO that many residents have been dissatisfied with for a while. Khanx’a was not seen as part of the village or as someone who was assisting them, but as a contentious outsider. Thirdly, he explained that it was difficult to find suitable housing in D’Kar and so he was commuting to and from Gantsi town each day, which as much as being inconvenient would have also added to his expenses. There were few social benefits as the job was not respected by residents, his boss was not willing to train him properly, and he was viewed as an outsider which made it hard to find a place to live in the village: a narrative of an undesirable job.
He left his two year contract with the Kellogg Foundation after only two months as he was offered a well-paid, desirable, ‘permanent and pensionable’ job working ‘for the Government of the Republic’. Khanx’a worked in two different government offices. He explained that he was transferred to a different office because his superiors had identified and recognised him as a dependable, reliable and valuable employee. Yet Khanx’a also explained, ‘I believe in the Almighty God. God chose City X for me’. Khanx’a maintained trust and ultimately an enduring gratefulness to God for this opportunity.

The government offers more

Now we go back in Khanx’a’s timeline to when he applied for a government job, just before he started his Master’s degree. His narrative about a job offer from the government at this time helped to build up a picture of how he retrospectively valued the options, especially in relation to gaining further educational qualifications and the corresponding remuneration for those qualifications,

I was actually recruited [by the government] in 2009…and I declined to take the offer because I was still a student. I told them I was still studying. Because they [the government] do not hire with that…qualification of Master’s, they take [BA] degree [applicants and the job and the pay reflects this level of qualification]. That is why I told you that [the] Kellogg Foundation will pay me for a Master’s [i.e. pay reflecting a Master’s level of qualification], but the government said ‘this is a [BA] degree offer’. But then I had to choose. In monetary terms I was getting less, [the] government was offering less, but this one [this job] they were offering more.

Khanx’a, 2012

Khanx’a explained that it was in his interests to study for his MA before taking a job. Ultimately, the level of remuneration from holding an MA degree would be higher than what was expected from a BA degree, and moreover having secured a university place as well as funding he had the chance to study. After completing his MA the job that was originally offered by the government no longer provided a salary that
reflected this higher level of academic qualification. So at this time, the Kellogg Foundation job paid a salary that reflected his MA level of education. However, after two months of working for the Kellogg Foundation, the government offered him a different position in the government which Khanx’a narrated as ‘offering more’. In this section I examine what other factors led Khanx’a to describe employment within the government as ‘offering more’.

In relation to working for the government, Khanx’a explained how working for NGOs was unstable, as it is dependent on the continued support of outside donors. For instance:

This one, [the job with the Kellogg Foundation, I thought that] I don’t know if it will last because it also depends on somebody’s funds, that is donor money, so if the donor says, ‘oh no [i.e. the donor pulls out]’ this time around, what happens to you? So these are the things I was weighing [up] and looking into. So then I decided that I will [would] prefer the government [job].

Khanx’a, 2012

In comparison with working for an NGO like the Kellogg Foundation, Khanx’a explained that there are security benefits in working for the government. For instance, in D’Kar there are frequent scares and rumours such as, ‘there is no money’, which will jeopardise the paid positions in the village. Job security in Kuru NGO was described by Khanx’a as precarious. In comparison, government jobs are ‘permanent and pensionable’. Once you have a job in the government you are employed for the rest of your working life, hence they are ‘permanent’, and after retirement you will receive a pension. The government also pays half the cost of private health-care insurance for its employees, their children and spouse. Government employees are offered a reduced rate for the rental of their home.

The welfare benefits of working for the government are much greater than working for an NGO and for someone like Khanx’a who has lived or who is living on a minimum income or on the margins of society, wages and welfare benefits are critical in assessing employment opportunities. This reasoning bears a weight that, as Pnina Werbner (2014:21) writes, many who have had money and security while
growing up sometimes forget. The government does not offer unemployment social security, and so losing one’s job can rapidly lead to destitution (Pnina Werbner 2014:23). Just through having a secure and predictable wage, employment from the government means that workers join the ranks of a ‘labour elite’, or a ‘privileged cohort’ who have secured their future through employment that provides a pension (Pnina Werbner 2014:19, 21).

Khanx’a explained that working for the government means withdrawing from being politically active, as he put it, to be ‘outspoken’ about ‘San issues’ (see Chapter Three for ‘San issues’). Working for the government entails curtailing his political voice, as speaking in opposition to the government, his employer. Speaking out could result in him being sacked.

Indeed, Moses explained that different San have been offered jobs in the government, although he said that they only offer jobs to those who have been politically outspoken and who are a potential threat to the status quo. For instance, during my fieldwork Moses was offered employment in the local government, although his cousin and nephew, Benji, advised him against taking the position as it would run counter to Moses’ projects of public advocacy. When the offer was open, Moses spoke longingly about the financial security that employment in the local government would provide. Eventually though, he turned down the job and afterwards narrated that he never wanted to take it. I wonder if he would accept a better government position if one is offered to him? After all, there are many benefits of working in a highly secure and financially stable job that has such welfare benefits.

Working for the government is more widely recognised in Botswana as legitimate and respectable employment. Working for an NGO means being peripheral to the government, whereas working for the government means being validated and approved by the central governing body and authority in Botswana. To work for the government is to be accepted and recognised as valuable, recognition that for many San has been largely absent from daily interactions and everyday encounters.
Robert (30, G/ana-speaking), a San man from New Xade with a BA degree in Public Administration, offers a voice that is most condemning of employment in NGOs as he rhetorically asked, ‘Why do all enlightened San work in NGOs?’ This statement was loaded as he emphasised that ‘enlightened’ San (here meaning San with university degrees) were employed only within NGOs, rather than in more powerful government positions. His emphasis indicated that he perceived this as being reflective of a wider social and political situation of San in Botswana, as people ‘unworthy’ and unqualified to take these positions of higher status in government. Robert’s perception was that San are excluded from participating in positions of employment within the main governmental body.

Robert’s question also interrogated wider political issues surrounding civil society in Botswana which is supposed to engage in mutual state/society interaction (Botswana Council of Nongovernmental Organisations n.d. accessed 20-11-2014). However,

Mutual public interaction between civil society, state, academics and the private sector…does not mean that the government readily accepts opposing views ‘…[and, for instance, politicians and leading members of the judiciary have questioned NGO representation of ideas and interests’. (Maundeni 2004)

Ideas from NGOs may or may not be taken on board by the government, thus potentially marginalising NGO voices. Within the broader context of Botswana’s polity, the potential for affecting political change is weaker in NGOs than with the government, a view that is prompted by Robert’s narrative.

Here then, Robert identified structural inequalities as excluding San from certain areas of social life which have political consequences which may benefit from Nancy Fraser’s (1995) perspective on how structures affect recognition. Fraser writes that ‘in many cases women and men of racialized ethnicities of all classes were excluded on racial grounds’ (1997: 77), suggesting that exclusion from participatory parity is common, even when everyone is ‘formally and legally licensed to participate’ (1997:78). She draws attention to the informal ways in which
subordinated groups are affected in public domains where they are often spoken over and interrupted, or the discursive ways in which discussions are framed and where subordinated groups are either silenced or encouraged to say ‘yes’ when really they were saying ‘no’ (Fraser 1997:78). Of particular interest here is Fraser’s (1997:78) identification of ‘participatory parity’, the ability of all adults to participate in all social and political life as peers, as being central to social equality. Participatory parity requires that all adults are included within these institutional spheres as inequality in access to these institutions contributed to social equality.

Robert’s perception that San only find employment in NGO positions, rather than positions in central government, reveals his perception that San do not participate as equals due to them being excluded from structures and institutions. Moreover, this can be linked to Murugan who, in Chapter Four, explained how participation in local institutions such as Church groups and Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) was a key way in which he, as the coordinator for a San advocacy NGO, Botswana Khwedom Council (BKC) advocated for change. For both men, there was a desire to have San in local institutions and in positions as managers and civil servants too. For these men, there was injustice due to the lack of participatory parity in government institutions as well as local level institutions.

Benji went on to explain that it was possible for Jude and Moses to mould their own roles as the Custodian Unit within Kuru’s existing NGO structure, suggesting that there was some flexibility in terms of creating and finding employment in this sector. Previously there had been no Custodian Unit and Jude and Moses had created these positions themselves. Other San voices within the village described Moses and Jude as self-interested and they were perceived as creating their own jobs only in order to provide themselves with an income. Indeed, Jude and Moses received a monthly salary for the duration of their contracts, and there were few, if any, practical improvements to residents’ lives as a result of the work of the Custodian Unit.

As a counter narrative to this critique, Moses explained that the non-San Kuru managers were unsupportive of the plans to make serious political advocacy claims.
For him, the reason for not making more of an impact was because the real decision making powers were out of his hands. Moses, like other San, said it was time for San to take over the top NGO positions and let San manage and have a say over the major decisions in the NGO. He understood that he was being held back and restricted under a management team who attempted to stop, rather than assist, driving political agendas because it was not in their non-San interests to do so. Moses explained that the stronger the San claims become, the weaker the non-San positions become. Non-San managers, he continued, have a personal interest in holding back support for San political advocacy projects as they are fearful that they will lose their jobs as San will take them over. Indeed, a Management Leadership Development Programme (MLDP) was created to train and educate San so that they would be ‘personally empowered’, i.e. able and qualified to take over leadership roles within NGOs. Similarly to Khan’ a who was working in the Kellogg Foundation job, Moses narrated that he was being held back by non-San leadership.

Conclusion

This chapter has developed an understanding of how ‘modern’ San narrated their social identities, build their voice through the way they speak and how they use their bodies, for instance where they are located/living and what they look like, for instance wearing shiny shoes and suits. It began by understanding San in this chapter as being ‘personally empowered’, in that they have self-confidence to speak up in public, and are competitive within the world of work and education. ‘Personal empowerment’ is a term that was used by Murugan (Chapter Three) as a way to describe the current project that the BKC engages in. By being educated, and being spokespeople San not only showed that they are ‘modern’ and capable, but at the same time this actually empowered them further as they received affirmation that they make valuable contributions that others listen to. This was affirmed through the recognition they received in wider public contexts as by being listened to, San are validated and recognised and as their voices are heard in broader contexts, so their recognition also
broadens. Furthermore, travel and experiences outside the village, employment, and corresponding remuneration for the level of education, and being enabled to train and develop further were important aspects of these men’s narratives. San men narrated their social lives within specific conditions as being part of a minority group. These men also considered their ability to use their political voice as they narrated the choices they made in relation to employment in NGOs and the government.

Although there was a political agenda to being ‘personally empowered’ - to take over positions of power – there was also a sense that these positions and the ‘empowered people’ who took them, compromised either their political agenda or their social standing. For instance, to work in the government meant that San were unable to speak out about San issues, as they were seen as being oppositional to the government. This led to the perception that only outspoken San were offered employment in the government. We are reminded of Eisenberg and Kymlicka’s (2011:5) warning of co-option of minority elites into token positions of power and prestige that hide underlying issues of assimilation and exclusion of the minority group. By working for the government the needs of the group were being undermined through the foregrounding of the rights and achievements of individuals.

Moreover, in terms of social standing being compromised, it is interesting to note Jude’s ambiguous position in the community. He was given a position to speak on behalf of the community in the kgotla as a community leader, yet at the same time his belonging in the village was contested by other residents (Chapter Seven). ‘Elites’ in the village were thought of as being different, and for Jude this difference also intersected with his ethnic heritage as a child from ethnically mixed parents. He was half white, which was perceived as part of an explanation for to his desire to have an elevated position in the village – as a white person, it was perceived that he felt entitled to an elevated position.

These perceptions can be understood within egalitarianism as a type of levelling mechanism, where Jude’s elevated position was counteracted by social
pressures to reduce his power within the village. This mechanism however is based on current and past ethnic relations being taken into account, and Jude’s ‘whiteness’ was used against him to make a case for his difference. Yet at the same time, he was also expected to take on the role of a leader in the appropriate space to do so. For instance, in the kgotla meeting his role was clear in that his skills and abilities were needed then in order to make clear the views that most people had in relation to the new lawful requirement to have a permit for gathering wild foods – that they opposed this new law and found it to be unfair and in many ways debilitating in terms of their culture but also in terms of their ability to provide for their families. This suggests that the authority to speak here was given by the community to someone whose skills were relevant and most applicable to the task at hand. This actually follows an egalitarian way of giving authority – based on skills.

However, since the dominant structures in the village revolve around institutions that originate from outside the village (the Church and NGOs), authority is also imbued in members of the community using a hierarchical structure too. In Chapter Six, we saw how Jude’s position might serve to reinforce his difference from other San as he was able to negotiate for his child to have time off school for her ìùù, yet this was not guaranteed for other children. In Chapter Five, the use of language in the Church suggests that hierarchies between language-speaking groups exist. Those who are in positions to translate the Church service into Naro are in more elevated, or at least visible, positions too. These same people are also on the D’Kar Reformed Church Council (DRCC) and so make decisions on behalf of the wider community. Boehm et al. (1993) write about the leadership style of egalitarian societies as being a ‘reverse dominance hierarchy’, where instead of the rank or position being dominant the rank is itself dominated by the group. Yet being part of the DRCC is based on the position/rank conferring authority, rather than on the group or community conferring authority upon a person.

Moreover, since the negotiations with the school (Chapter Six) lie outside of the village structure, those who are able to be most effective are those who are
recognisable as leaders by people outside the village. This suggests that being confident and recognisable in ways that the men in this chapter identified as important, is necessary for San who feel they are being restricted by non-San in institutions that come from outside their village. San must be recognisable by non-San to access these so-called ‘privileges’ which are not otherwise conferred by non-San institutions, such as schools. Otherwise, the knock-on effect is that the cultural practices continue being unrecognised and devalued and may eventually cease to be practiced. In Chapter Six, I revealed the particular markers and symbols that San foregrounded as being important to display or acquire in order to become recognised by non-San.

While elders or parents in the village often told their children to remain within the village, ‘empowered’ San no longer want to stay in the village. Voices from within the village echo the Xhosa ‘Red’ distinction, in that there is an effort to maintain and value things from the village which may also be linked to ‘tradition’. However, to these San, warnings like this are a sign of their fear. It is a sign that these village voices were not ‘personally empowered’ like they are. Voices within the village warned that ethnic others from outside the village were dangerous, yet connections with outsiders were perceived as advantageous by the men in this chapter. Like this, these men pioneer and forge relationships outside the village, much like the Xhosa ‘school’ group who take on aspects of town life.

For the San men in this chapter, ‘old ways’ were viewed as a shell that needed to be cracked open. These men wanted to open up more possibilities that they perceived as existing beyond the ‘shell’ they were given through their tradition or culture. Value was placed on learning new ideas from outside, as this offered these men a choice. In terms of being ‘personally empowered’, choice is a powerful rhetoric as it suggests that they take responsibility and control of their lives. By leaving the village, these men could make choices about, for instance, the way that they wished to drink alcohol (e.g. Ncibase) and this came from exposure to different spectrums of
experience than what was offered from within the village, or even from within Botswana.

Their narratives remind us that this is not a simple process, however, as there were other attempts to be ‘traditional modern’ men, and for instance Cgase wanted to keep a ‘dark’ house as well as building a brick house, to maintain links with his tradition. At the same time a gendered narrative was used, for instance when Moses spoke about the traditional aspect being that women listen to men’s wisdom. Yet a common thread was the stability and legitimisation that the Church offered San men. Legitimate social identities in Botswana were often part of Church narratives. Like this, the narrative of modern San men constructed social identities that ran alongside a broader rhetoric of being educated, developed and modern within Botswana, and indeed in Southern Africa.

Yet a critical engagement with voice being used specifically for recognition, suggests that it is drawn away from producing it in its own terms. Like this, voice changes, as the way of speaking adapts to the requirements of the acceptance of the dominant group who will confer legitimacy, or not. This tension is one that Povinelli (2002) noted as being ‘cunning’. It suggests that attempts to make recognisable a particular voice or identity to individuals and groups outside of the in-group will likely meet challenges including changing the meaning being communicated. More broadly, it suggests that given that voice – which includes language, speech patterns and bodily action - is central to identity, by changing aspects of voice, identity also changes. While identity is never a fixed or static category, at the same time making changes to appease the dominant group is likely to further inculcate the dominant culture into voice, inscribing that dominant mode of being/speaking/behaving on the bodies of the speakers.

In the final chapter I reflect upon the research and engage in a discussion that includes my contribution and opportunities for further research.
Chapter Eight

Conclusion

A central aim of my Ph.D. has been to highlight the multiplicity of voices, aspirations and interests of San. I argue that ‘voice’ is central to the San social and political struggle for recognition. Although my initial research interest was university educated San, through the research process (Chapter Three) this study became a broader investigation of San in the towns and villages of Botswana. Some of my research participants were young and others were old. They included advocates and community leaders but also ‘ordinary’ San from D’Kar village. In this concluding chapter, I reflect upon the findings of this research in relation to the key emergent themes of advocacy, self-representation, identity and gender, and the political and social (egalitarian) tensions that arise from them. I argue that all San voices legitimately represent themselves. This runs contrary to a perception held by San and non-San that only voices and individuals who are recognised by the majority population have a legitimate voice. I examine this through the daily battles for recognition that take place for ‘ordinary’ as well as a minority of educated and elite San.

In this chapter, I draw together the issues of gender, language, culture, class, voice, identity, egalitarianism and self-representation as they intersect in the daily lives of San. Non-recognition has shaped San experiences, and yet this thesis suggests that an explicit attempt to gain recognition might lead to voice taking on dominant forms of speech and action, thus diluting San voice.

When considering egalitarianism, using voice in ways that mirror the dominant group (Setswana speaking) in Botswana may undermine the effectiveness of the social sanctions and levelling techniques found in San non-dominant egalitarian societies. San use levelling techniques to humble the leader. The San elite hold precarious position as being part of an elite is both to represent the group (as advocates) and be differentiated from the group that they represent. This is more
precarious than ‘ordinary’ San who, while they might be contradictory in their discourses and practices as elites, do not claim a position as speaking for or representing the group. Effectively, San elites use voice to make claims to those outside the village and although their potential to advocate for the benefit of the community and to promote egalitarian values is there, the community often criticises them for being individualistic and self-serving.

These criticisms can be understood as levelling techniques to maintain equality in egalitarian societies by humbling their leaders and supporting consensus-based decision making, and supressing self-serving behaviours. Yet, since elites actively engage in structures of power within institutions that come from outside the village, they are no longer reliant upon a flexible egalitarian social and political structure that must respond to levelling techniques and other social sanctions. This further differentiates elites from other ordinary San, as they appear to be relatively immune to social pressures from their communities. Moreover, some San elites express the desire to ‘break free’ from ‘the shell’ of their village and communities, suggesting that they are purposefully moving away from a reliance on their communities in terms of seeking social and personal recognition. I argue that by relying on the dominant group to recognise them, these non-dominant indigenous elites rely on the same power relationship that has served to reinforce the so-called ‘worthlessness’ of San: in other words, relying on a relationship that reinforces their non-recognition as humans of equal status.

Social and political intersections

In the thesis I sought to explore how San have managed and navigated a public perception of who they are alongside their own self-representations. In this respect I have been concerned with how different members of San communities position themselves in relation to other San, as well as within the wider Botswanan society. There were two ways in which this occurred, one of which was articulated by my
research participants as ‘advocacy’. Moses, for example in Chapter One explained the need to use the label ‘Ncoakhoe’, which to him encompassed all Khoisan-language speakers. Murugan also expressed the need for San to be identified as a group, but he preferred the use of ‘San’. Here both advocates identify themselves as members of a distinct ethnic and cultural group. The sense of political group purpose was often what drew San advocates together as they spoke about ‘San issues’ that affect all San. The second way that San research participants positioned themselves was through their individual self-representations. San self-representations as both ‘traditional’ and ‘modern’ drew upon a number of markers such as language, ‘culture’ and ‘advocacy’ and gendered ways of being and these representations helped to build their status as ‘established’ and respectable but also to promote strength in their difference.

Many San are worried about losing their culture and want to maintain their language and traditions (Chapter Five and Chapter Six). Yet San who are in the public sphere and politically lead this struggle do so using the same frameworks that are critiqued by San for being oppressive as they marginalise San voice. Voice, as I indicated in Chapter One is not only what people say, but it is about the way in which they say it, the language that they use and how they look as they speak. In stating this I drew on Butler’s (1990) performativity theory, and Mauss’ (1992) phenomenological ‘bodily techniques’. A key claim here is that the hierarchies that have served to suppress San voice in the past might be reproduced by San elites who lead this struggle. This emphasises the tension between representation and recognition: in seeking recognition, the way that elites represent themselves and others often adheres to dominant forms of action or presentation and speech.

### Advocacy and its implications

In this section I will outline the tensions around advocacy and voice faced by San living in Gantsi District, and the manner in which San negotiated these tensions.
The advocates in my research were often self-appointed San men who drew on key tropes such as being educated, employed, ‘fat’, or attending Church, which afforded them status and reputation as being ‘established’ (Chapter Seven). This reminds us of ‘big men’ in Melanesia, a term used to refer to ‘male leaders whose political influence is achieved by means of public oratory, informal persuasion, and…skillful conduct’ (Lederman 2015:567; Read 1959). In an egalitarian society, a successful leader is one whose skill is to facilitate discussions in order to reach decisions and who avoids confrontation (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011). Egalitarian systems command a rejection of individual accumulation of power and authority, yet at the same time there are ethnographic reports (Read 1959) of how the individual pursuit of wealth can be understood as part of personal autonomy – a central attribute that is revered in a leader. This autonomy can be used to further push the objectives of the group:

Big men make their names not simply by mobilizing wealth for personal network ends…but also by successfully orienting their own and their clansmen’s respective network interests to collective projects. (Lederman 2015:568)

While San advocates jeopardise their positions within their community as equals as they differentiate themselves, they also seek to represent the needs of their group, arguing that by promoting themselves they also promote the interests of the group. This highlights a narrow precipice that San advocates walk along as tensions emerge if they are perceived as compromising themselves or neglecting the needs of their community whilst they promote themselves under the guise of doing it for the benefit of all San.

For instance, Jude and Moses, who between them represented their community in the kgotla in Chapter Seven, and at the Naro Bible Dedication Day and in Church in Chapter Five, were differentiated in negative ways by San community members, yet at the same time were representing the needs of their community. In the kgolta, Jude spoke for the community against the negative impact that government changes to the law about gathering wild food would have. At the Naro Bible Dedication Day, Moses positioned himself as a spokesman for the community, in a
setting that was otherwise dominated by non-San and by non-indigenous values that were linked to the missionary Church. Moses spoke in English however, and thus the role that he played in terms of representing his community was questionable, especially since comments made about Jude and Moses belonging to D’Kar were made partly in relation to their language use. Finally, in the Church, Jude was the translator during the Sunday service, meeting the needs of the Naro speaking congregation to hear the service in their own language. In all of these cases, representation was occurring in situations that involved San engagement with non-San structures, or at least structures and institutions that have more recently been brought to the village by non-San actors.

Jude and Moses’ differences from their San community were largely articulated through ethnic and linguistic distinction. For instance, they were seen by other San residents of D’Kar as ‘Englishmen’ or as ‘white men’ for speaking English, and were thought of as different because of their mixed parental backgrounds (Chapter Five and Chapter Seven). Yet at the same time, other San from mixed parentage were not differentiated in the same ways, suggesting that their voice was perceived as being ‘San’, whereas Jude and Moses’ voices were less ‘San’. The general perception of Jude and Moses in the village, and the positions and roles that they take on suggests that they were perceived to be local elites. While their statuses were elevated and differentiated, their difference was also a point of tension as their belonging in the village was undermined due to their differentiation.

Yet it was also clear that while residents vocalised, often disdainfully, their perceptions of this family, they also relied on them at times when a San public voice was needed. In an egalitarian political structure, authority is imbued by members of the community in those who have the right skills for the job/task. Therefore, at times when Jude and Moses were deemed to have the best skills for the particular task, they were given the authority to take central influential positions. At other times, when their skills in public speaking or speaking in English were not in demand, their differences were not praised or enjoyed by the residents of D’Kar. The way that the
D’Kar community related to Jude and Moses suggests that the community is largely relating to them in egalitarian ways, whereas it is less clear how Jude and Moses’ behaviour is being shaped by these social sanctions and levelling techniques.

A focus on the dominant framework used to discuss minority group politics, which is based on bounded ideas of self and group identities, and often cultural or linguistic stereotypes (which I outlined in Chapter One is the foundation to the ‘politics of identity’), serves to reinforce groups and individuals pitting themselves against one another as a generative or productive way of understanding politics. Largely the men in Chapter Seven who identified with key markers of the dominant society, engaged in this politics as they made a distinction between what was ‘dominant’ and what was ‘minority’, and aligned themselves with the former. In the vignette in Chapter One this politics is also reinforced by Mpho, the driver of the safari excursion. Abraham actively rejected Mpho’s idea that just because he ‘wore clothes’ and lived in the city he was different to San who lived elsewhere. Abraham’s response was defiant as it changed the terms of the debate that Mpho was trying to have, and rejected this politics of identity that was wrapped up in place of residence, clothing, employment and physical appearance.

However, the men in Chapter Seven approached dominant ideas with more of an open and receptive acceptance, and have begun to claim makers of the dominant society as their own. However, Povinelli (2002) alerts us to the difficulties that minority groups face in gaining recognition within this structure that is based on ideas of identity that are largely stereotypical and relatively fixed representations that have formed over time from within particular historical trajectories. It is a trap of sorts, for as soon as the indigenous person reaches towards dominant groups’ mode of being and speaking, they become peripheral to their own group and at the same time they are not fully accepted by the dominant group. This type of politics reproduces categories that serve to reinforce difference and hierarchy.

Yet this is only part of the San story. My work also reveals how ‘normal’, rather than elite, San find subtle ways of being heard and of articulating their own
identities. For instance, in the subtle ways in which the women in Chapter Four and Chapter Six articulate themselves in situations that are both internal and external to the village. While there are varying degrees of success and challenges along the way, it also reveals how San women make themselves heard.

By focusing on what San do and say (for instance, through the initiation in Chapter Six) within and between one another, the subtle mechanisms used and daily negotiations reveal how San use their voices in ways that do not adhere to identity politics (Chapter One). Rather these voices, though aware of these dominant tropes, actually build and shape San identity from within. San are not isolated from ‘others’ from ‘outside’ and the changes made to the initiation reveal this. However, it does show the agency of San, especially of San women in affecting and shaping cultural practices and forms of identification.

My findings and the recent literature on egalitarianism problematize the presumed equality within egalitarian San societies, as current practices reflect stratification that seems to have more in common with other rural peoples found in national borders than with San forbearers (Dieckmann et al. 2014). For example, in Chapter Seven Moses’ self-representation was relational to San women, who he said were supposed to listen to the ‘wisdom of men’ around the fire. This suggests that within D’Kar gender stratifies social positioning in relation to decision making.

Although equality is said to be the foundational aspect of egalitarianism, some literature does also account for unequal egalitarianism (Gregory 2014). Woodburn (1982: 421) explains that the term ‘egalitarian’ describes societies of ‘near-equals’, but that the ‘equality is not neutral, but that it is asserted, constructed and maintained’. He focuses on ‘certain societies in which there is the closest approximation to equality known in any human societies and about the basis for that equality’ (Woodburn 1982: 421). This suggests that egalitarian societies are ordered in terms of being more or less equal to each other, but also that ‘equality’ is the primary function of egalitarianism, a social system that systematically eliminates distinctions between individuals.
Helliwell (1995) challenges us to rethink the notions of ‘equality’ and ‘inequality’ in egalitarian societies within a discussion of ‘autonomy’. ‘Equality’ is not a synonym of ‘egalitarian’ and these two terms do not necessarily go hand in hand. For instance, Leacock writes:

I prefer the term "autonomy" to "equality," for equality connotes rights and opportunity specific to class society and confuses similarity with equity. Strictly speaking, who can be, or wants to be “equal” to anyone else? (Leacock et al. 1978: 247).

Rather, autonomy is about holding ‘decision-making power over their [your] own lives [life] and activities’ (Leacock 1978: 247). Choice is often central to the understanding of autonomy, ‘the degree to which people are able to follow their own desires’ (Strathern 1987: 16). So the absence of social, economic, political and economic constraints over activities and desires helps individuals and groups to be autonomous. Melanesian literature on egalitarianism also equates leaders with autonomy, suggesting that personal autonomy is enacted within the personal relationships that are fostered:

Each person’s social network makes possible the enactment of interests that converge partially – and may also regularly conflict – with the collective (and, in Highland New Guinea, typically male) projects of clans. (Lederman 2015:568)

Boehm et al. (1993) suggest that egalitarian systems do not oppose leadership but on the individual level have a ‘love of autonomy’ and also hold group values or ethos highly and so, ‘difference between individuals is only permitted insofar as they work for the common good’ (Godelier 1986:109–110). Autonomy, that is the ability to follow your own desires, is believed to be a prerequisite for individual and group achievement (Helliwell 1995: 359). For leaders to have personal autonomy in an egalitarian society can lead to the betterment of the group. Leaders hold the potential to unlock possibilities for other members of the group to use their voices.

On a global scale, historical and contemporary systems of power and domination have cemented and maintained a power hierarchy in which indigenous peoples are located at the bottom. Indigenous elites attempt to readdress this balance
by playing on the same field as those who have historically marginalised them. Yet at the same time, their autonomy to act, behave and speak (voice) in ways that are distinctly egalitarian, or ‘San’, are also curtailed by their desire to be recognised within a different set of ideas that relate to the majority group. As such, they have to negotiate between these modes of representation and the terms of the debate they wish to engage in that have been set before they begin.

Some advocates explained that they were involved in a San ‘movement’, suggesting that they were part of group action that involved ‘voice’ that speaks for ‘the people’, to structures and hierarchies. This was demonstrated in Chapters Three and Seven where I met with influential San in Gaborone city. These San were politically aware and as a consequence, they raised a number of ‘San issues’, which were a set of problems that affected San as a group. These issues include poverty; difficulties in education and school such as bullying; exclusion from employment in government institutions and decision-making fora; being bullied while in positions of employment; and not being able to speak their own language in school or in any public setting. The central tension the San ‘advocates’ and others I worked with faced was how to represent themselves as ‘modern’, capable and powerful in their political claims for San issues, while at the same time conveying their distinct cultural identity from the majority of the nation.

Similar issues were also evidenced in D’Kar village, but here the focus tended to be on issues of land and the Church. Jude was rejected by some residents as not belonging to the land. Jude spoke Afrikaans which helped him become a central figure in the D’Kar Reformed Church (DRC) Sunday services where he translated for the pastor into Naro. In Chapters Six and Seven, Jude advocated on behalf of D’Kar residents in the kgotla and was perceived as being able to negotiate with his daughter’s school in Chapter Six. Jude was perceived as being different from other residents and his use of Afrikaans language was a marker of this difference. However, being marked as different had both positive and negative impacts for Jude because this same marker, language, was also used by San residents of D’Kar to undermine
his claims to belong on the land (Chapter Five). Residents would rely on Jude to advocate for them in situations where outsiders were involved, but the level of inclusion Jude enjoyed within the village was curtailed by his difference. His exclusion from a broader acceptance of belonging to the village could be understood as a levelling technique used to humble the leader (see Lee 1969). However, since the Church and NGO still operate as central organisational institutions in D’Kar, and have had relatively fixed managerial positions, these levelling techniques were unsuccessful in terms of changing the leadership and figures of authority in the village (Chapter Seven).

Working for the Government of Botswana was a position that many San research participants aspired to. By occupying a job which had high social status, Ncabase – a San man – had achieved this goal. He explained how non-San expected San to be ‘useless’ and often mistreated them through constant discouragement in schools and workplaces (Chapter Seven). Ncabase’s achievements in education and in being employed by the government challenged those who held and used stereotypes such as ‘stupid’, ‘lazy’ or ‘primitive’ to reconsider these negative and damaging labels. Moreover, Ncabase understood the strength of his position in being a role model for other San. However, he explained that since working for the government, he had become less outspoken about San issues (see Einsenburg and Kymlicka 2011:5 for co-option and other dangers of elites and identity politics). It was ambiguous whether employment with the government was an act of advocacy, or if it actually undermined the ability for San to act as advocates. Ambiguity surrounding this was also present amongst San themselves who had no single plan for the future, but rather had a number of ideas being headed by a number of people who disagreed with each other about these plans. Moses, as seen in Chapter Seven, was offered a job in the local government, but he and Benji had come to the conclusion that the government only co-opted outspoken San to work for them in order to pacify their political voices. As a consequence, Moses declined the job offer, suggesting that they perceived that government jobs were likely to undermine any projects of advocacy that they may wish to engage in.
The literature on San foregrounds egalitarianism as the foundation of San communities (Tanaka 1991; Woodburn 1982). In Chapter Six it was deemed that Jude’s high profile is what led him to be able to negotiate for his daughter to have her initiation. Yet other families from the same village were perceived as being unlikely to negotiate the same thing. Where this act of local advocacy might have a wide scope for the whole group, Jude’s actions were seen as being individualistic and largely benefitting his immediate family. This strengthened a perception of difference between Jude and his family, from the rest of the community and indeed it may also strengthen an experience of difference, as only daughters of high profile men, like Jude, might be able to continue at school at the same time as being initiated.

While Jude’s actions in lobbying the school made use of his position and skills to achieve a positive outcome from this, what might be called a particular form of local advocacy, at the same time, since he was not acting on behalf of all girls, the action was limited in its effectiveness. It suggests that this may have an elitist effect, where only the children of prominent men are able to be both initiated and to remain in school. The scope to negotiate is limited to only a certain few people within the community, which gives them an unfair advantage that may only be equalised through group advocacy. However, the practice of the initiation was perceived as being under threat from the school, and so by being able to hold it in the first place was an active way to respond to this threat. Having the initiation had a wider effect on the community, as not only were those women who were unable to have their own initiations able to affirm their status as women by performing the initiation for other girls, but also the health of the whole community was also supported through this practice (Chapter Five).

The broader point being made here is that there is no clarity, even amongst the advocates, about how to engage in political action. Did Jude’s negotiation with his daughter’s school in Chapter Six count as an act of ‘advocacy’ even though others in the village were doubtful that more families would receive the same treatment from the school as Jude’s family? This remains unclear. A tension for ‘ordinary’ San
was about the position of self-appointed ‘advocates’ who the community perceived as working for their own individual benefit, while claiming that they were acting on behalf of the group’s interests.

In the next section I pick up on the personal dimension of voice and narration as my research participants expressed aspirations for themselves and their families. This was evident for those who presented themselves as advocates and others who did not. I draw on markers of being ‘traditional-modern’ including romantic relationships, the names given to children, language, education levels, and employment as well as being a spokesperson, to reveal the variety within the ways that San self-represented in their narratives and practice.

**Identity, language, gender and self-representation**

There was a strong sense amongst some of my research participants of a group identity. However, this did not mean that their individual aspirations were of no concern to them. The way in which Grace and other young people imagined their romantic relationships and how they named their children suggested a move away from historically common (egalitarian) practices of kinship, towards one that was focused on how they wished to represent themselves: as ‘traditional-modern’ people. Grace had a non-San boyfriend, and this ran contrary to what her parents and aunts desired for her, as they wanted her to marry Younger Jude, her cross-cousin, which was in keeping with Naro kinship practices. Even though Grace’s family encouraged the continuation of the Naro naming system, she named her child using an English name that was outside of this ‘traditional’ practice. Grace was a ‘traditional-modern’ woman and through her family she had links to the Naro kinship system, yet she also made choices that were independent of this (Chapter Four).

Womanhood was associated with sex and reproduction and women’s bodies were sexualised (Chapter Six). One of the key markers of a woman’s sexual power and ‘potency’ was said to be signified by her ‘fat’ (Chapter Six), a marker of her sexual
maturity, reproductive power and the ability to bear children (Soloman 1992:301). As they reach menarche, girls undergo a dùù as an initiation into womanhood. Dùù was perceived by male and female D’Kar residents as important to maintain the health and wellbeing of the San community. Uninitiated women were perceived as a threat to the health of new-born babies and to the fertility of the environment (in providing food). An important finding was that there was pressure on young girls from the school authorities for them not to miss school and undertake the initiation. This led to an increasing number of girls who had not undertaken the dùù. Having said this, in Chapter Six there were signs that the practice was commonplace.

Qoba who participated in Qane’s initiation (Chapter Six) had not been initiated (in the recent past she would not have been allowed to participate). Qoba was able to gain a degree of affirmation of her sexuality and self-identity through her participation in the dùù. Her inclusion in the practice meant that her womanhood was recognised by San women and by San men too. Qoba justified her participation in the initiation by drawing on her knowledge of the dùù songs, as well as having had a child – another way to establish and affirm her female sexuality. This suggests that the initiation affirmed Qoba’s identity as a woman, alongside other markers, such as childbirth.

Issues of identification and self-representation were not only confined to practices such as kinship or revealed in the initiation, but were also present in the way that San research participants used language. While some San accepted code-mixing between Naro and Setswana, some rejected code-mixing and others purposefully used Naro as a way of asserting their own identity (Chapter Five). The use of Naro language was in some instances part of a wider political statement for the purpose of maintaining cultural distinctiveness. For others still, the use of English language was an assertion of a position of difference from the majority of the San population. Different voices in relation to language manifested in tensions. This was captured in the fact that despite the completion of the Naro Language Project’s translation of the
Naro New Testament Bible, the D’Kar Reformed Church still carried out its Sunday services for a Naro speaking congregation in Afrikaans or Setswana languages.

The multiplicity of voices about language came from both San and non-San and this was partly because language was understood as carrying culture, as articulated by Moses in Chapter Five. San culture was sometimes described by San, and non-San, as being ‘lost’ or ‘forgotten’, connoting identity as being embedded within language (see Low 2008). Language has been a focal point in development projects with groups of San who value cultural preservation and continuity, and language was also used by San to describe difference, and to make or break claims to belong. For instance, Jude cited Naro language as a marker of his identity as San, but at the same time, other residents drew upon his use of Afrikaans language to undermine his claims to belong to the village as San. Language was widely used in D’Kar as a descriptor and signifier of identity, and thus at times when English language was used to communicate, for instance in Moses’ speech at the Naro Bible Dedication Day, it is easy to understand why claims against his belonging were raised.

In Chapter Seven Moses expressed his desire to be known as ‘traditional-modern’, which reflected a self-aware response to popular representations of San that were frequently used by non-San in Botswana, as ‘backward’, ‘primordial’ or not-modern people. San men faced pressures in relation to wider processes of national development and perceptions of success in a modernised nation. The Church remained part of common discourses on modernity and morality in Botswana, and this was reflected in the actions of old and young men, who were living both within and outside the village. Church environments often supported spokespeople by providing a robust platform from which to speak, validating and strengthening their claims. Speaking within Christian spaces was likely to help San be heard by non-San, and this was evidenced in Chapter Seven when Cgase was revered for his ability to speak in public by members of his non-San Church group. These kinds of experiences
help San individuals to build key skills, such as public speaking, that help to promote them as leaders, or ‘big men’ (Sahlins 1963).

Further markers of a ‘modern’ San identity were reflected in Ncabe’s ‘fat’ body (Chapter Seven) which signified his position as someone with money and resources who had travelled far from home. Being a spokesperson, educated, married and employed were markers through which male San research participants represented themselves.

An underlying and emerging aspect of self-representation was marked by the use of social media. This is not peculiar to San. Indeed, indigenous people across the globe have been using the Internet since the 1990s (Landzelius 2006:5). Facebook was part of a normal form of communication for many San. There are regional and village Facebook pages with a restricted readership where information is disseminated (for instance, about the water pipe project, Chapter Three) and discussions on this page are encouraged by Moses who is the author and original creator of the page. After returning from the field, an open access (WordPress) blog was set up by the San Youth Network (SYNet) which posts short articles from San writers about different issues, for instance about girls’ experience of school, climate change, language, education, marginalisation and San women’s issues.

A focus on the Internet queries the ‘positioning and performance of identities mediated electronically’ (Landzelius 2006:3), and suggests that websites written by members of particular indigenous groups for an indigenous audience self-represent differently than websites written for a broader audience. The former appeals to a more intergroup identity and the latter to more stereotypical images (Fair 2000:203). Landzelius (2006:5, 9) calls the former inreach and the latter outreach. Inreach pertains to localised interests of information dissemination or expert knowledge and outreach ventures might range from tourist promotion sites to cyber movements (Landzelius 2006:9). The Internet cyberspace gives rise to situational, adaptive and multifaceted aspects of identity (Fair 2000:203).
The Internet and social media help to create opportunities to share experiences with other indigenous and marginalised groups, and draw on their international contacts with NGO workers, researchers, journalists and other such people who tend to parachute in and out, into a shared space. For those who wish to ‘know things from outside the place they have ever known’ as Grace told me in Chapter Four, or who aim to break the shell of their culture, as Cgase told me in Chapter Seven, the Internet offers opportunities to engage with audiences outside of their local contexts. Cyberspace can help to bridge physical distance that otherwise is too expensive to travel.

Yet these opportunities on the Internet are still only accessed by those who have the necessary materials and technologies (computers, and/or mobile phones with Internet access). It is key people who take the time to produce and develop an online presence and these people tend to be ‘elites’ (e.g. Moses) who have writing skills (in the English language which is necessary for outreach ventures), contacts, and access to an Internet connection and technology. Yet ‘normal’ San also engage on social media, albeit in different ways, in local languages, and use photographs to depict their ‘street-styles’ and to promote their dance groups, rap groups and other popular forms of art and expression. Clearly the Internet and especially Facebook is an everyday part of life for many San. Future work might include a detailed analysis of these online spaces as extensions of identity formation, and of their productivity in terms of inreach and outreach agendas, but it also reveals the wider social and economic differences within the group.

**Contribution and opportunities for future research**

This work has opened up an analysis of voice to include both speech and action and this suggests potential for further anthropological research to adopt this framework to interrogate other relationships between groups. By framing voice in this way, this work reveals how an emic concept, that is, one that the research participants used,
alongside ethnographic observations, can reveal complex sets of socio-political relations that cut across ethnic, linguistic and cultural boundaries. Voice here is useful as it includes the body in what might otherwise be a linguistic approach.

While San maintain connections to cultural traditions, such as female initiation (Chapter Six), they also value a type of ‘modernity’ experienced in towns and schools, and in travel and the Church (Chapter Four and Chapter Seven). Focusing on both aspects of society is a necessary component of research that complements literature on San school-dropouts. This work focuses on San who have completed formal education, have well-paid jobs, make decisions and who potentially live as expatriates in other countries.

Moreover, this work interrogates voice in relation to egalitarianism, as San engage with non-egalitarian societies, institutions and structures. Hierarchies and social stratifications that historically emerged from non-San societies are evidenced within this ethnography. Rather than dismissing or accepting egalitarianism, I have sought to complicate the category which offers both a broad theoretical framework as well as specific daily practices. Leadership roles that elite San take are contested as levelling techniques and are ineffective. Elites in the village are centrally positioned within institutions and this protects them from egalitarian social sanctions. Indeed, this protection helps to differentiate elite experiences from ordinary San experiences in the village.

Elite San voices look and sound different to other San voices, for instance in the language used, or the kind of house that is lived in (Chapter Six). Elite voices reveal a tension between San self-representations and group representation. This suggests that when headed by San elites, advocacy is likely to engage in approaches that challenge the ‘old ways’ of doing things. Even though elite San can advocate on behalf of San, as evidenced in the kgotla, at other times there was a perception that their efforts were for individual gain.

One of the interesting findings that emerged from my research was that educated San in particular were increasingly occupying ‘non-traditional’ roles. There
was increasing evidence of San travelling abroad and working in mainstream Botswanan society. It was Moses who alerted me to this with his categorisation of himself as a ‘traditional-modern’ man (Chapter Seven). It suggested that the aspirations of the government for equality and for the development of the nation through education and employment will perhaps be met and that in the future there will be more acceptance of San as equals. What it certainly does is offer the possibility of future research to test this out.

An interesting development since my fieldwork in terms of policy was the Remote Area Development Programme’s (RADP) ‘Affirmative Action’ plan that was launched in 2013. It was reported to have assisted 1,211 Remote Area Dwellers (RADs) to access tertiary education and 360 RADs to access formal employment opportunities (Republic of Botswana 2013:52-53) and appears to address the concerns of research participants who wanted greater participatory parity in all spheres of life. Future research directions may investigate what effects this ‘Affirmative Action’ has had in relation to the perceptions that San have about their recognition, and moreover, if it has helped to shift negative perceptions of San in Botswana. This work suggests however, that initiatives like ‘Affirmative Action’ are far more complex than what is often portrayed by those who produce them. Recognition involves economic, cultural, political and social factors. The journey towards recognition also involves shifting attitudinal perceptions of San, something that my research participants sought through their projects of ‘personal empowerment’. Since 2014 I have noted a change in the way in which newspapers have been reporting on San, and there have been more positive, compassionate and complimentary pieces (Motlogelwa 2015a; ‘The Constant Flow’ 2015; Tsiane 2015b). Further research might reveal the impact of ‘Affirmative Action’ on attitudes towards San in Botswana.

I have opened up a discussion about gender by suggesting that womanhood was being produced in relation to sex and bodies, ‘tradition’ and perceptions of their ‘domesticity’. Manhood however, was conferred through markers of ‘modernity’ that were largely found outside of the village and these included education, employment,
travel and being a spokesperson. Within the village though, there was no longer male initiations, suggesting that men no longer had a way to ‘traditionally’ affirm their masculinity or root a group sense of belonging to a particular masculine identity. Alcohol seemed to exacerbate any conflict or problem. Further research could focus on gender and specifically look at the ways in which masculine identities are being constructed in the village. Potential areas for exploration in relation to this include football, wage labour and alcohol consumption as these activities were male-dominated.

Male San research participants, like female research participants, were responding to the contemporary world around them. A set of expectations about manhood was mirrored in non-San perceptions of masculinity. Koreen Reece (2015:186) writes that manhood among Tswana in the southeast of Botswana was acquired by demonstrating generosity and the ability to provide resources and care, as well as the successful negotiation of marriage.19 Marriage and resources were part of how male San research participants narrated their own identities, suggesting that these were shared traits of masculine identity between San and non-San in Botswana. Indeed, this links to broader patterns of social change towards the adoption of Tswana values and practices as San practices were ‘forgotten’ or had shifted, for instance, funerals in the village were said to be taken from Tswana practices. Further research could investigate perceptions of non-San influences on lifestyles and practices, and in particular could focus on rituals, or consequences of their absence, as in the case of male initiation.

One of the surprises of the research, which I could not have predicted at the outset, was the underlying importance of gender and gendered relations. It was an issue in relation to discrimination in town (Chapter Four), ‘tradition’ and initiation

---

19 Reece goes on to say that a man’s ability to secure a marriage is based on his track record in being able to ‘mobilise his own kin in negotiating connections with another kinship network’, and to show ‘his willingness and success in negotiation requires of and confers on him public recognition that his generous expenditures of money cannot’ (2015: 186-187). This ultimately helped him to negotiate and deal with conflicts in the family, known as dikgang (issues).
(Chapter Seven), and the health and continuity of the community (Chapter Six). It was men who occupied the positions of high status in the community. Their gendered identity was represented in terms of their relations to women, marriage, education and employment. They were the main spokespeople in the D’Kar Reformed Church (Chapter Five).

My work is ubiquitous for other minority groups and indigenous people worldwide who have also been subject to highly politicised and overly deterministic definitions of their identity. These politicised, and often romanticised or pejorative determinisms affect the way in which San or other minority peoples relate to themselves and others. I have argued that the stereotypes that are often used in Botswana to describe San - such as ‘primitive’, rather than ‘developed’, ‘backwards’ rather than ‘progressive’, ‘traditional’ rather than ‘modern’ - do not serve to well represent the lives of my research participants who purposefully combined, conflated and straddled these labels. San research participants often used these labels, or markers of these labels, to position themselves in ways that force us to reconsider San identity as a set of multiple and interconnected markers that draw upon ‘traditional’ as well as ‘modern’ ideas and practices. My work suggests that there are even more possibilities for working with emerging indigenous ‘elites’, who mediate most visibly the contours of these categories. This is especially relevant in projects of recognition in which spokespeople or ‘advocates’, who are often ‘elites’, face the challenge of taking leading roles in representing others who may disagree with their perspectives. An overarching question to explore further is to ask in decision making, conflict resolution and authority (rather than in sharing), how do those from an egalitarian society do things differently to non-indigenous people from groups who are in similar economic and social situations?

Future work may investigate the intra-group politics of those claiming recognition. In this way a needs-based approach to research could identify key areas that may help to push forward advocacy projects to achieve positive changes for the
future. I am aware, however that this would involve less explanatory and more prescriptive methods of investigation.

Finally, another way forward is to work collaboratively with my research participants. This may involve incorporating aspects of what San research participants called ‘personal empowerment’, training and especially remuneration in any research proposal. Collaboration may involve being active in creating research methods that engage San research participants in research processes. This would feed into and support San self-representation and voice, but may also support San who wish to be consulted by their government in order to build and encourage positive relationships between San and the government, and more broadly between minorities and majorities in Botswana.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Electricity Map of D'Kar 2005, obtained from Botswana Power Company Electrical Line Survey