

Power and powerlessness: when support becomes overbearing—the case of outsider activism in the resettlement issue of the Basarwa of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve

Sethunya Tshepho Mphinyane

Sociology, University of Botswana
Centre for Cultural and Media Studies, University of Natal, Durban.
E-mail 201512625@stud.und.ac.za

The focus of this paper is on the role of outsider activists who are supporting a group of Basarwa resisting relocation from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) in Botswana. The role of non Basarwa activists is problematized in order to unravel some of the complexities surrounding advocacy, especially its bearing on the relative power of the 'supported'. The paper argues that in the case of Basarwa who are currently being forcibly relocated by the Botswana Government out of the CKGR, oftentimes the voice of 'outsiders' who eloquently expose the human rights abuse of their subjects becomes more dominant than the local voices. This is especially so when the advocacy is done using Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs).

Introduction

For small states and island sites, for inner city communities and for remote regions of Africa, the electronic adjacency offered by new technology provides a new and viable path into the decision-taking centres of world technology and resource allocation. In cooperation and in complaint, the collective voice of the previously marginalised can be articulated through the new information communication technology with sufficient iterative possibilities for the polished and rehearsed political claim to emerge and succeed. The voices of large numbers of disparate interests can be recorded and acted upon without systems grinding to a halt: direct democracy is now possible, and community information networks are set to play their part in developing a world where collective complaint brings appropriate social change and action (Communities Online 2000).¹

New information technologies have ushered in a new era of hope, where democracy can be enhanced and negotiated without hindrance of geographical boundaries. This is an optimism that has led many NGOs, particularly those with a political statement to make, to seek to draw the attention of the 'powers that be', as well as a global public, to an otherwise obscured problem. Sharing in the belief that the Internet is a very important resource to intensify their campaign for better treatment of 'tribal peoples' by national government and multinational companies, Survival International and a Botswana-based human rights group, Ditshwanelo, have also gone Internet.

This paper seeks to problematise the presence of these 'outsider' activists in terms of their tendency to perpetuate a global image that 'tribal peoples' are helpless victims who need 'manly' international support if they are not to be forced to 'extinction' by their absolutely ruthless national governments. I argue that as much as many of these actors claim not to disregard the local efforts of the people themselves to fight their own oppression, the picture painted in the Internet (perhaps to persuade their audience of the need to rally behind these people) is a direct opposite. The presence of local efforts is often replaced by the advocates showing what they are doing to help the 'victim.' It is not the

people themselves communicating directly with the global audience in the web, and the imbalance in power relations between those intervening and the recipients of such support is evident.

By outsider activism, I shall refer broadly to interventions by non-Basarwa actors, both from within Botswana and foreign NGOs and their academic advisors. I will particularly focus on the interventions of the United Kingdom-based Survival International and the Botswana Centre for Human Rights, Ditshwanelo. I seek to explore the possibility that the dominant presence of 'outsider activists' in their protest against forceful relocation from the Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve (CKGR) by the Botswana government is actually muting the voices of indigenous Basarwa. I want to suggest that the process may be creating a situation where Basarwa appear as if they are only being 'influenced' by the outsiders, as the government keeps claiming, without seeming to be at the center of the struggle, or even leading it. As a result, the position of government that Basarwa should not be treated any differently from other citizens who have been resettled before has hardened. According to the latest news reports "Minister of Foreign Affairs Mompoti Merafhe and his Local Government counterpart Margaret Nasha...disclosed that they would resent any undue foreign intervention in the Basarwa issue".²

The situation of Basarwa in Botswana.

The Basarwa of Botswana are a member of the category of communities variously known as 'tribal peoples', 'first peoples' 'indigenous peoples', or 'marginalized minorities'. The International Labour Organization (ILO) Convention No. 169 defines indigenous peoples and recognizes their aspirations for self-control, and control over the maintenance and development of their identities, language and religion. The Convention also refers to the responsibility of governments to work together with the peoples to protect and guarantee their rights, especially on land. The United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP), has gone even further than the ILO, in recognizing not only individual rights and freedoms but also group rights for indigenous peoples (Saugestad, 2001). In this paper, I will use the term 'Basarwa' to refer to such people in the Botswana context. While the term 'Bushmen' is widely used in large audience-oriented communication to immediately draw the attention of the audience to the subject, within the Botswana public discourse, 'Basarwa' is more readily understood. My choice of 'Basarwa' over other even more politically correct and specific categories as Khwe, and Gwi, is telling of my political positioning in the matter. I am at once as much part and parcel of the public discourse as I am critical of it.

Half of the aboriginal Basarwa population in Southern Africa live in Botswana, while a third of the population are believed to be in Namibia. My focus is on a small group of them who live in the Central Kgalagadi Game Reserve, (CKGR). According to a Survival International Urgent Action Bulletin, "At over 52,000 square kilometers, the CKGR is one of the largest protected areas in Africa. About 1,000 people live there permanently. Another 2,500-3000 have customary land and resources rights. The majority of the inhabitants are Khwe. Though nomadic hunters and gatherers, they are now settled for much of the time in a number of villages, the largest of which is Xade..."³

The government of Botswana is Survival International's contestant in defining a 'development' path for Basarwa. Saugestad observes that the position of Basarwa in contemporary Botswana is a very sensitive issue, where the government has engaged in muting Basarwa and in the guise of cultural neutrality, tried to establish a cultural hegemony that 'silences' those who do not share the same cultural premises.⁴ According to Saugestad, although the old belief that integration is achieved by treating all citizens exactly the same way has long been rejected by indigenous organizations, the government of

Botswana is still bent on using all possible measures to enforce it. The attitude of the government of Botswana as articulated repeatedly by the Ministers of Local Government, (eg. Mrs Margaret Nasha at a press conference on February 14, 2002) is that the current living conditions of Basarwa at the CKGR are of another era, over a hundred years out of date. Efforts to bring them closer to 'civilisation' have been going on since 1986 following a Fact Finding Mission appointed to review the living conditions of the 'San' populations residing in the CKGR. Government issued a directive stating that the peoples living within the game reserve be relocated to areas outside it. From that point to this date, pressures have been brought to bear on the people to leave the CKGR. This has led to a series of protests mainly from outsider NGOs, but significantly in Botswana, from the first ever Khwe NGO, the First Peoples of the Kalahari, which was established in October 1993, and Ditshwanelo, the Botswana Centre for Human Rights. Most significant outsider support came from the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA).

Contested feminization of Basarwa

Activism, especially 'outsider' activism, has tended to create a team of those with knowledge, and therefore power, over the distant 'others' in need of assistance. By the same token, this renders Basarwa as among those who are known about, in a process described by Edward Said (1995) as *Orientalism*. The narratives by these outsiders (especially Survival International, Ditshwanelo, and academics like Robert Hitchcock, Isaac Mazonde, and others) on the plight of Basarwa of the CKGR are often describing the perceived helplessness of Basarwa over their relocation to places outside the Reserve. It would appear that other than the support they get from local and international 'external' pressure groups, Basarwa themselves can only helplessly watch, for better or for worse. These narrators have depicted Basarwa in the CKGR as always reacting to government demands out of fear, or as being debilitated due to alcohol abuse induced by helplessness, or as dependent on the First People of the Kalahari as their only ethnic representatives.

I use a sex-reversal metaphor, as I seek not so much to make a simplistic and crude analogy, but to unravel some of the latent functions of the 'anti-politics machine'. I find this angle most compelling because of its conceptualization of feminization: making female what is male. This is not the end product—a man for a woman *per se*—but 'docile' Basarwa who become clearly in constant need of more external intervention, while they suffer the humiliation of expecting liberation from submitting to other more manly 'mortals'.

Basarwa are immediately relegated to a position of 'women,' the opposite of that which is masculine, the opposite of that which is powerful. This phenomenon I want to call *feminization*. The usage of feminization evoked here is that which refers to swapping of sexual gender roles, forcing men to swap the dominant 'male' roles for submissive 'female' ones, and tasting the humiliating experience of being the reverse of the normal superiority of maleness. I want to argue that once those with 'knowledge and power' come in, a swapping of positions takes place. Masculinity here is evoked beyond the ordinary social construction of being a man, extrapolated from biologically sexed bodies, to imply a higher level where the body need not be male for the voice to be masculine, where even biologically 'female' bodies can adopt masculine discourses.

The non Basarwa actors have successfully imaged themselves as the direct opposite of the government, as equally strong enough to save a little coy, shy maiden in distress from the bully who brings this 'small,' 'harmless' classmate to tears. The language of what Mazonde has called 'civics'⁵ means the language that the struggle takes is essentially a male one. In order to take up its mandate, the 'mediator' must believe in his 'potency.' This

for me is an image parallel to that of conservative perceptions about unmarried women. They are seen as deficient and weak, and as passive objects.⁶ The external advocate comes into this 'womanlike' existence of Basarwa as the much-needed husband, who then has a mandate to represent the woman in all public discussions. The representation itself is far more than just stating the woman's point of view to the political arena of governance. It is at once as much about being a man, doing manly duties of representation, as it is about reiterating the status of women as unable to handle the demanding spaces of men.

Men have *masculated* themselves in the very token of saving the bullied. They have muted most of the every day forms of resistance of the Basarwa by appropriating power, control, superiority, and macho-ness over them. They have decided how they want the world to hear their cry, and they have made it as high pitched and piercing as possible in order to solicit support from anyone with a heart. The little maiden is left grateful, but the price to pay is that her self-image is challenged. She remains emasculated and weak. Male Basarwa must especially suffer alienation more than the women as their manhood is rendered only marginally useful for the kind of problems facing them.

It is not clear whether this image is in line with the way an international audience would like to expend its efforts. Even scholars such as Mazonde (1997) who really want to present a progressive version of Basarwa as not being helpless victims, can only make a token statement to this effect. There is very marginal reporting on the Basarwa's own efforts. In fact Saugestad recounts her shock back in 1992 when she attended a workshop and heard for the first time a Bushman speaking on a public occasion. It was Komtsha Komtsha, who made her aware for the first time that indeed the Bushmen do speak out against the injustices they suffer⁷. As much as their abuse of alcohol and apparent 'apathy' could be due to the domineering state, it may also in part be due to the manner of representation of their issues by their equally domineering 'supporters'. According to Ditshwanelo in an Inter Press Service (IPS) report by Malema (1997):

What emerged from the comments by those who decided to move out of the Kgalagadi Game reserve is that they made a decision to move 'in their heads' and 'not in their hearts.'

What is very interesting is that even government officials cannot imagine Basarwa speaking from their 'hearts' and not their 'heads' when they say they do not want to move. Equally Survival International and Ditshwanelo would not buy into the idea of any Basarwa genuinely seeing it in their best interests to move out. Whatever Basarwa say in their own voice, unless it is what each party wants to hear, cannot be taken to be coming from Basarwa for real. The World Bank, although not necessarily the best resource on matters of disrespect of human rights, has however rightly noted the tendency for outside NGOs to control rather than facilitate the process. The World Bank itself has supported projects that have had adverse effects on the livelihoods of indigenous peoples and has been the object of a lot of criticism from activist groups, Survival International in particular. Survival International claims to have been the first organization to draw attention to the destructive effects of the World Bank's structural adjustment policies, the major cause of suffering in many poor countries.

Of mediation and feminization: outsider activism, the case of Survival International

Survival International is by far the most vocal organization of the international NGOs in terms of challenging the government of Botswana's action against Basarwa, particularly those in the CKGR. It has published especially on the web quite extensively to very wide audiences. Some of its very powerful imagery is captured in headlines such as

- “The Bushmen peoples – the hidden face of racism today”
- “Last Kalahari Bushmen tortured and facing starvation”
- “*Basarwa ba bogisediwa go tsoma dipholologo*”⁸
- “Botswana Ignores Kalahari ‘Bushman’ land ownership”
- “Botswana: last ‘Bushman’ in Kalahari Reserve resist eviction”
- “Botswana squeezes Kalahari peoples out”
- “Diamonds for land”
- “Botswana persecutes Bushmen”
- “Botswana: Bushmen persecuted to drive them off their land”

Survival International, citing the ILO Convention 169 on Tribal and Indigenous Peoples (1988) which states they ‘...shall have the right to decide their own priorities for the process of development...and to exercise control...over their own economic, social and cultural development’ contends that the government of Botswana fails to live up to its specifications, although under Section 14(3) (c) of Botswana’s Constitution, such rights as the ILO Convention espouses are guaranteed. According to Survival, although the government of Botswana has not ratified the ILO Convention 169, it is contravening its own Constitution. The mandate of Survival International, as stated in their brochure, is to work closely with the local indigenous organizations that have direct personal contact with the tribal communities, and to provide a platform for them to talk directly with those invading their land. One of the messages of Survival International is this: “Tribal peoples must be allowed to speak for themselves. Their own experience is the most persuasive testimony in their defense – that is why governments strive to deny them their voice. Survival breaks the silence by helping them take their message to the outside world.” (Survival International Brochure: 9). Survival often takes advantage of the media, saying “there is no more powerful weapon”.

The attitude of Survival International appears to be that without its ‘breaking the silence,’ about assaults on tribal peoples, their future is doomed. Not only does their future depend on Survival International, but it also depends on the outside world giving the tribal peoples a platform. The question that must be asked then is: what is the reason for this? Is it so that their voice can begin to be audible in order to shake governments, or is it to solicit sympathy from those that can shake governments? On the one hand Survival speaks progressively of the need for the voices of tribal peoples to be louder, and on the other, it immediately mutes their voice by making it singular and homogenous and by deciding which narrative should be heard. More crucially, Survival assumes the role of the loud speaker for the tribal peoples. If the oppressed can only be heard when Survival, its compatriots, and the outside world speak loudly for them, who is it that is being heard by governments and companies? Is it the peoples themselves or is it Survival, Ditshwanelo and the other NGOs? One of Survival’s methods of pressurizing governments, is by asking, not the Basarwa, but the ‘outside world’ presumably for its audible voice, to write to the relevant powers to stop the actions that may be contributing to the oppression of Basarwa. The thinking seems to be that the power to change things is less with the peoples than it is with those with much stronger voices.

Reading through all the web pages of Survival International, the sex-reversal metaphor becomes very clearly illustrated by the language used in their campaigns. What emerges from the undeniably quite important plea are several things. The first and most glaring fact is that we hear little of the voices of the Gana or the Gwi in the matter. All we are told is that their homes have been bulldozed and the people trucked to bleak resettlement camps where they cannot hunt and gather: thus making them dependent on government handouts which induce boredom, alcoholism and despair.

Basarwa are depicted as being helpless, sheepish, vulnerable human beings who have no strength to do much under the current circumstances, resorting not to James Scott's "Weapons of the Weak," but rather to self destructive alcohol abuse. That is where Survival comes in, to stand up for them against the 'bulldozer' and the bully. While government assistance is rightly labeled 'handouts', Survival does not recognize its own dominant voice in the same light as government assistance. But in the same way that government handouts make Basarwa inescapably dependent on it, as they have no sustainable income, Survival's voice makes the same Basarwa inescapably dependent on 'loud speakers,' without a sustainable voice. By portraying Basarwa as desperately in need of a 'man' to stand up to the bulldozer, Survival is justifying and legitimating itself. Speaking man to man, the government and Survival can change things.

The history of the Basarwa as narrated by Survival International is not a history of resistance or resilience. Rather it is a history of penetration, defeat, and exploitation. They are presented as on the verge of total destruction, and perhaps disappearance. They need a knight in shining armor to come to their rescue. Delicate and gentle, peaceful and graceful with nature, they cannot survive the harsh 'modern' environments into which the government wants to throw them. Ironically, although the government is supposed to be the villain, it is however the very same villain who seems to have faith in the capacity of Basarwa not to perish if they live out of the Game Reserve. Survival sees their forced relocation as tantamount to destroying them: a process Basarwa cannot survive. While I do not suggest that forced relocation cannot be anything but detrimental to the livelihoods of Basarwa, I am also not sympathetic to views that the forced relocation has the capacity to shake Basarwa's resilience.

Statements like "State intervention on their behalf is characterized by lack of consultation, inflexibility and paternalism, while officials who deal with them are commonly obstructive and patronizing, if not corrupt and exploitative" have not contributed to a moderation of the government position on the relocation. But more worrying is the fact that such statements are true not only for governments but also for those NGOs that are taking part in the struggle for tribal minorities, including Survival International. Disregarding internal processes of dialogue and pressing on with its own way of doing things, shows the extent to which Survival International can and will not be slowed down by anyone unless they share its view. At one level Survival is critical of governments, the World Bank and other oppressive agencies, but at another level, it is failing to assess its own potential for oppression. It has lost favour with many of the other 'outsider' activists.

What are the attractions of this domineering attitude for noble and worthy concerns? Why do even the most well meaning of agencies find themselves pulled into this direction? There is, I propose, a common ground for both governments and the outsider NGOs that at one level puts them at opposing ends and also brings them on the same side. And it has to do with how they both are positioned vis-à-vis Basarwa. At one level they stand at opposing ends with regard to what the future of Basarwa should be. At another level they are the powerful, the vocal, and both of them can have things their way, regardless of 'who says what'.

Of gatekeeping and feminization: the case of Ditshwanelo

Tensions between the supporters of Basarwa have now shifted the discourse from the binary oppositions, which are often drawn between government on one side as the archetypical aggressor, and Basarwa and the NGOs, donors and academics on the other side as a unified camp of supporters. Mazonde (1997) fell prey to the rigidifying of the various actors in the matter into two opposing blocks. What is beginning to become more and more apparent is the fact that, even among the 'supporters' there is controversy over

representation of Basarwa. Recently Ditshwanelo, distanced itself from the intended reporting of the Botswana government as being racist at the Durban Conference on Racism by Survival International, its long term 'comrade' in the opposition to the resettlement of Basarwa out of the CKGR. This was a very interesting case since Ditshwanelo and Survival International have to their various audiences, used the same narrative to report on the government of Botswana's human rights abuses of Basarwa.

The most significant debut of *Ditshwanelo* into the land rights and representation of Basarwa was in 1992 when its Director Alice Mogwe presented the results of a survey she had carried out on the situation of the 'San' in the Ghanzi District. This study was commissioned by the Botswana Council of Churches. Representatives of both Basarwa and the Ministry of Local Government, Lands and Housing were invited to the presentation of the results of the study. Ditshwanelo has since become very vocal about the government-sponsored resettlement exercise. They, among other things, released a comprehensive report to the media accusing the government of forcefully moving the Basarwa from the Game Reserve and pointing out the lack of proper consultation on the resettlement (Ditshwanelo, 1996).

According to a report by Malema (1997) in the Inter Press Service, Ditshwanelo believed that Basarwa could only have agreed to move because there was 'enticement' by government with promises of better facilities. This line of narrating the events at CKGR is very similar to that of Survival International. While Survival is using this masculine line from 'outside', Ditshwanelo, operates 'locally' by being Botswana based. The fact that they have a similar narrative closes the gap between the local and outside. Survival International and Ditshwanelo are simultaneously distant and very close. In fact, until very recently, there had not been any obvious opposition between them. The statements captured above could as well have been in a Survival urgent action bulletin. Lately, interestingly, there has emerged a very significant process of boundary marking, especially perpetuated by Ditshwanelo. In press releases dated 18 July and 13 August 2001, Ditshwanelo, distanced itself from the then on-going demonstrations at the Botswana Embassy in London by Survival. The first of these releases clearly spells out that as far as Ditshwanelo is concerned, the tactics used by Survival are confrontational, and hence compromise cooperative alternatives. Ditshwanelo stated that confrontation and demonstration should be a last resort because Botswana cultures respect discussion and consultation."⁹

Their fear as per the communication was that the UK based NGO's strategy could compromise the breakthrough already reached by local dialogue. This current fear of external domination on the part of local NGOs has been expressed in the local media. The *Mmegi Monitor*, 11-17 September 2001, had a caption reading, "NGO'S must strive for self rule." The article emphasizes the need for self-direction by local NGOs who are seen to be very externally controlled. Their capacity to sustain themselves effectively without donor support is challenged. They are also perceived as not to be deciding their own priorities and agendas. Phorano of the Botswana Council of Non-Governmental Organisations (BOCONGO) reportedly commended the endeavors of some NGOs to move towards income generating projects that would enhance sustainability. It is apparent that the underlying concern is not so much about resources, as it is about a much more deep-rooted concern that "NGOs from the west have dominated the African soil at the expense of indigenous ones." The use of 'African soils' and 'indigenous' is not without careful maximizing on language. The term Indigenous, used here in the sense of local, carries the connotations, of legitimacy, authenticity and possession: of being an insider, and having better 'knowing' than outsiders. The African soil is the soil where the local NGOs have a 'birth' right to define priorities and agendas.

Considering that the government has since gone on to pressurize Basarwa out of the CKGR and given the 31st of January 2002 as the deadline by which the provision of water and other facilities to the Basarwa who have remained to date in the CKGR would cease, it is not clear what, other than wanting to be a gatekeeper, led Ditshwanelo to emphasise Botswana's 'cultures of discussion and consultation'. The very same Ditshwanelo had previously accused the government for using the presence of the army to intimidate Basarwa to move. This is a sentiment they shared with Survival. What then could have shifted Ditshwanelo's cynical view of the government? I would like to argue that the issue here is about control.

The question to ask is what advances had Ditshwanelo made that could be jeopardised by how Survival executes its demonstrations? Reading through the statement that Survival International had intended to present at the Durban racism conference, one does not come across much that is different from Ditshwanelo's own message. Yet reading carefully through the press release, one is intrigued at the choice of concepts Ditshwanelo used in order to question the legitimacy of Survival's intervention. "As a locally-based NGO, we strive to work within the cultural context of Botswana."¹⁰ The use of 'locally-based' is carefully used to contrast to 'United Kingdom based' and therefore distant actors. Ditshwanelo also presents itself as more culturally and contextually relevant and informed than Survival. Being U.K based, Survival International in the Ditshwanelo narrative, should therefore only limit itself to 'supporting and providing solidarity to the Basarwa peoples, civil society and individuals working for the recognition of Basarwa.' Doing things without a green light from the 'locally-based' can have no better results than 'negative' effects on the work being done locally.

The 'local' is used in opposition to the 'external', 'outside', 'intruding', 'Western'. It is used here politically, to further Ditshwanelo's agenda—in this instance of questioning the authority and legitimacy of Survival's action. Like the concept of culture, the concept of 'local' has a double bind. Staden (1998: 15) argues that culture is a western concept with complex and often contradictory applications. At one level it provides opportunities for dismantling the discourses of colonialism, oppression, subjugation and marginalisation, and at another level it is part of the western discursive apparatus of modernity. Along parallel connotations, 'local' at one level presents an opportunity to assert indigenous discourses, but can at another level, be used to demand exclusionary rights over a discourse.

Ditshwanelo has a legitimate concern about Survival's lack of consultation with the 'internal' 'local' processes before deciding to demonstrate. However, it is clear that over and above this is an issue of Survival International not going through the 'gatekeepers', and therefore being guilty of 'insubordination.' Ditshwanelo actually goes beyond claiming better understanding of the issue of the CKGR along with the rest of the negotiating team, to a higher more global one called 'Botswana cultures'. By invoking the national boundary, Ditshwanelo is reminding Survival of its 'Westernness,' which cannot ever 'truly' help it appreciate Botswana's local cultures. Botswana is then firmly asserted as belonging to Botswana, and Ditshwanelo has "birth rights" that enables it to know better than outsiders. Ditshwanelo invokes the concept of 'culture' in opposition to 'the west,' to legitimate its having a 'higher' belonging with Basarwa than 'Westerners'. Concepts are used interchangeably for different objectives such as defining Ditshwanelo and Survival's place in the NGO landscape as speakers against the repression of minority cultures, on the one hand, but also to defend invented 'Botswana cultures' against foreign or international cultures, and therefore against cultural imperialism.

Conclusion

We need to acknowledge that knowledge may represent power for the knower but disempowerment for those who are known. This also applies to knowledge generated through advocacy. There is a shift from more manifest forms of imperialism to more latent ones, bringing with them the intended and unintended muting of voices. It is particularly the unintended muting which we have to be more careful about, lest as advocates we find ourselves inescapably fixed within the relationship of power and knowledge that in effect is marginalizing those whose suffering we know. Who then has more right to speak on the 'local' issues? When the representativeness of indigenous organizations is contested, it demonstrates that being 'local' can be contested both for purposes of exclusion and inclusion.

Notes

1. http://www.sabusinessreview.co.za/December2000/IT_special_feature/little.htm
2. Mmegi Monitor 19-25 February 2002. Vol. 3 No.6 'Government Rejects International Assistance for Basarwa.'
3. Survival for tribal and indigenous peoples – Urgent Action Bulletin on the 'Bushman' peoples. (<http://www.survival.org.uk/bushmanuab9706.htm>)
4. For a comprehensive reading of the attitude of official policy in Botswana with regards to Botswana's indigenous peoples read Saugestad, 2001: "The Inconvenient Indigenous".
5. This concept is used by Mazonde (1997) to define the whole discourse of 'politics', land rights, representation, policy, that is often used by 'experts' and governments.
6. See Romaine, S. "Communicating Gender" Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 1999, for a thorough discussion on how English as a language is made by and for men and how it places males more positively than females.
7. Saugestad (2001) recounting the variety of forums mostly in Botswana where the sensitive issue of the Basarwa began to be handled.
8. Translation: Basarwa are being tortured for hunting game.
9. Quoted from the 13 August 2001 press release.
10. Also from the 13 August 2001 press release.

References

- American Anthropological Association (AAA) (1997) Report to the Committee for Human Rights, September 1997.
- Ferguson, J (1999) *Expectations of Modernity: Myths and Meanings of Urban Life on the Zambian Copperbelt*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
<http://www.kalaharipeoples.org/documents/ghanzi.htm>.
- Good, K. (1999) The State and Extreme Poverty in Botswana: the San and Destitutes. *Journal of Modern African Studies* Vol.37 no.2 p.185-205".
- Kondo, D. K. (year of publication not available) *M. Butterfly: Orientalism, Gender, and a Critique of Essentialist Identity*'.
- Malema, P. (1997) Botswana Human Rights: Basarwa Enticed to Move From Their Home. Inter Press Service Report.
- Mazonde, I. N. (1997) Battlefield of Wits: Interface between NGOs, Government and Donors at Xade Development Site. *Pula: Botswana Journal of African Studies*, Vol 11, No. (1): 96-107.
- Mmegi Monitor*, 11-17 September 2001. Vol 2 No. 36.
- Mmegi Monitor*, 19- 25 February 2002. Vol 3 No. 6.
- Regional Conference on Development Programmes for Africa's San populations. Gaborone 11-13 October 1993.
- Romaine, S. (1999) *Communicating Gender*. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates.

- Said, E. (1995) *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London: Penguin Books.
- Saugestad, S. (1993) *Indigenous Peoples, National Models and Recent International Trends*, National Institute of Development Research and Documentation, Working Paper No.64, Gaborone.
- Saugestad, S. (2001) *The Inconvenient Indigenous: Remote Area Development in Botswana, Donor Assistance, and the First People of the Kalahari*. Uppsala: The Nordic Africa Institute.
- Scott, J. (1985) *Weapons of the Weak: Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven: Yale University Press.