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Abstract

This study draws on postcolonial and post-tourism theories to explore tourism representations of the San (commonly known outside Africa as Bushmen); predominantly those who traditionally occupied the Central Kalahari region of Botswana. This thesis deploys images, articles and captions from tourist publications, tourist 'blogs, an academic documentary, the film The Gods Must Be Crazy (1980), literary texts such as selected works of Laurens van der Post, and Alexander McCall Smith’s (1998–) No.1 Ladies' Detective Agency series as well as a series of artistic self-representations. These texts demonstrate tangible evidence of the role of representation in disenfranchisement and an increasing autonomy in the case of the San. Obviously a direct causal link between representation and disempowerment, and its opposite dynamic: self-representation and empowerment, cannot be proven (that is, measured) substantively but the two correlations are, I assert, sufficiently axiomatic.

The data qualitatively analysed in Chapters Three and Four are tourism texts comprising representations of the San, created without their authorisation. Data are accessed interpretively through public-domain representations that show the capacity of tourist texts to perpetuate or challenge the position of the Indigenous people in this context. The texts deconstructed in this thesis depict the San of the Central Kalahari region of Botswana in a variety of ways, designed either for tourist consumption specifically, with the imagery and rhetoric directly addressing them, or for commercial distribution, where tourists have been enticed to Botswana via incidental representations within such texts. Incorporated within the analysis of some texts are comments from recently posted tourist 'blogs, substantiating the fact that the rhetoric and imagery of the representations have, generally, precisely the effect upon tourists they were designed to have.
Following the analysis of non San-authorised representations, San self-representations for tourist consumption are shown (Chapter Five) as relatively recent exemplars of a burgeoning self-determination and, in fact, resistance to the Tswana hegemony operating in Botswana.

Postcolonial theory is the framework underpinning the analysis of representations of the Botswana San produced for tourist consumption. Postcolonial analysis will be informed and supported by a post-tourism paradigm, that is, a critique of cultural tourism’s traditionally exploitative and paternalistic assumptions and practices as well as the awareness of the ‘blurring between fact and fiction, reality and fantasy, education and entertainment’ that characterises the tourism domain (Sherlock, 2001: 282). This thesis analyses tourism industry representations of the San people of Botswana predominantly using David Spurr’s categories of colonial (and neo-colonial) thought and practice identified in The Rhetoric of Empire (1993).
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Glossary

Bakgalagadi – people of the Kalahari (Kgalagadi). As with the Khoi and the San, the Bakgalagadi migrated into Botswana and settled in the Kalahari Desert. All the three groups spread across the entire area of both Ghanzi and Kgalagadi Districts. This fact, to an extent, problematises the San’s First People claim to the CKGR and will be elaborated upon under the heading Indigeneity in Chapter One.

Bangwato (BamaNgwato) – one of the eight Tswana chieftaincies, of which current President Ian Khama is Paramount Chief.

Basarwa – Setswana name for the San in Botswana. The prefix ‘Ba –’ signifies respect in the Setswana tongue, while the ‘root connotation of aboriginality was neutral, or perhaps positive’ (Wilsmen, 2002: 829).

Batswana – collective term for the dominant ethnic group of Botswana.

Botswana Democratic Party (BDP) – in perpetual power since independence in 1966, and responsible for relocating the San out of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve.

Botswana National Front (BNF) – an opposition party in Botswana.

Botswana Council of Non-Governmental Organisations (BOCONGO) – a government post-compulsory institution offering short courses, certificates, diploma and degree courses.

Botswana College of Distance and Open Learning (BDOCOL) – since 1995, a national umbrella body for all non-governmental organisations in Botswana.

Bushman – original Dutch name ‘Bojesman’ bestowed on the San in the 17th century. Many San regard this as a derogatory name.

Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) – an area designated by the British in 1961 in central Botswana spanning 20,309 square miles (52,600 square kilometres). The Proclamation emphatically stated that the CKGR’s function was to ‘reserve sufficient land for traditional use by hunter-gatherer communities … whose primary subsistence was derived from wild-plants and animals’ (Good, 2002: 53).

Debswana – a joint venture (50/50 ownership) between diamond company De Beers and the government of Botswana. Debswana owns the mining rights in the Kalahari.

Ditshwanelo – The Botswana Centre for Human Rights.
D’Kar – a San village, 35 km from the regional capital of Ghanzi district, Ghanzi in north-west Botswana, originally established by the Dutch Reformed Church.

First People of the Kalahari (FPK) – the political arm of a not-for-profit human rights organisation, formed in 1992.

Ghanzi – a town outside the CKGR in northwestern Botswana.


Kgalagadi – Setswana name for Kalahari Desert

Kuru Development Trust (KDT) – an arm of KFO, which runs workshops and programs for the San.

Kuru Family of Organisations (KFO) – based in Ghanzi region of Botswana, an umbrella organisation comprising a number of smaller groups, its espoused mission to empower the San.


Khoi/e, The (more accurately, Khoekhen, according to Bennun, 2004) – descendants of semi-nomadic pastoralists whose arrival in southern Africa dates back 2000 years, while the San are believed to have been in the region for over 20 000 years. Today, the Khoi/e are more integrated into the mainstream, both economically and politically, than are the San.


Kua – a group of San people relocated to settlements outside the CKGR.

Mosarwa – Setswana name for a San individual (plural: Masarwa) is considered offensive in Botswana, ‘Ma –’ being an insulting prefix.

Mma – abbreviation of Bomma: ‘Mother’ in Setswana, a polite title for a woman (married or unmarried) in Botswana.

Motswana – an individual Batswana (or ’Tswana) person
Naro/Nharo – the San of the Ghanzi area, and the language of the same.

Open Society Initiative for Southern Africa (OSISA) – A southern African organisation that, in collaboration with other bodies, researches and advocates on behalf of education, democracy, human rights and economic development in the sub-Sahara region.

Postcolonialism – the critique of the effects, assumptions and practices of the colonial project.

Pula – the Botswana currency (meaning rain in Setswana). It is abbreviated to P ahead of the amount, eg. P250.

Remote Area Dwellers (RADs) – more than 80% of the RADs in Botswana are San, 100% San in some areas. The government of Botswana provides RAD children with the opportunity to attend government schools, at least up until Standard 4. Unfortunately, these schools, and the hostels, are generally unsympathetic places for San and other minority students.

Remote Area Dweller Program (RADP) – a Botswana government program of services, including schools and medical facilities, for landless minorities.

Reteng – The Multicultural Coalition of Botswana, established in 2002 in response to discrimination against non-Tswana minorities.

Rra – abbreviation of Borra: ‘Father’ in Setswana, a polite title for a man (married or unmarried).

San – (pronounced Saahn) the first people of southern Africa, speaking a characteristic click language.

San Research Centre (SRC) – a capacity building organisation based at the University of Botswana, (originated as a collaborative initiative of the University of Trondheim, Norway and the University of Botswana).

San Youth Capacity Building Project (SYCB) – a supplementary program of the UBTrondheim partnership.

San Youth Network – the youth arm of Khwedom Council.

Setswana – the official and dominant language (other than English) of Botswana.

Survival International (SI) – described by Kuela Kiema (2010: 95) as a “multinational pressure group” based in London, very active in the
cause of reinstituting hunting rights in the CKGR for the San, campaigning vigorously against Botswana’s diamond and tourism markets.

**South West African People’s Organization (SWAPO)** – the freedom fighters of South West Africa (now Namibia) who thousands of San were forcibly recruited to extinguish by the South African army. The governing party in Namibia since independence in 1990.

**Tc’amnqoo** – Dcuikhoi Kua name for the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (as in Kuela Kiema’s memoir *Tears for my Land* (2010)).

**‘Tswana** (or **Batswana**) – systemically, this name is afforded all citizens of Botswana, irrespective of ethnicity. Originally, Tswana is the name of the dominant Bantu majority in Botswana, sometimes called ‘the black people’ by the San, and this is the manner in which the term is deployed within this thesis.

**UBTrømso** – a collaborative program of research and capacity-building between the University of Botswana and the University of Trømso, Norway.

**Working Group for Indigenous Minorities of Southern Africa (WIMSA)** – a non-governmental network that represents the interests of San people throughout southern Africa.

* * * *

Introduction
Where I stand
I’ve always felt some discomfiture about my position in the world, believing myself undeserving of the relative privilege into which I was born. Awareness of injustice, particularly as regards representation, first occurred when in early primary school I noted Australian Aborigines described not critically, but matter-of-fact as ‘savages’ in my Social Studies book, circa 1975. But until I was training to be a teacher of English to speakers of other languages, the articulation of my own position of advantage had not really occurred to me consciously. I justified my studies and work in this area with rhetoric along the lines of increasing opportunities for those in the developing world; of the acquisition of the English tongue opening proverbial doors for those caught on the ever-recurring cycle of marginalisation. Wherever I have been in the world a sense of imbalance is confirmed and my resolve galvanised.

But resolve to do what? To be what? The position of even the most well-intentioned traveller and researcher among disenfranchised or dispossessed peoples is a complicated one, fraught with paradox and unavoidable hypocrisies. Alex Gillespie (2007) writes disparagingly about that which he labels a ‘posttraveler paradigm’, psychologically understandable in terms of self-reflection that is loaded with dilemma and contradiction, and this is a group into which, I admit, I could be classified. ‘Posttourists’ are determined not to naively conform to the tourist stereotype or, if they do, parody their own subscription to the cliché. Guide writers know this and the discourse helps to position such sojourners as ‘travelers who scorn all things ‘touristy’. Their semantics deliberately flatter the traveller as one who ruggedly sets off into ‘least visited’ and ‘isolated’ and ‘most remote regions’ (19). Based on their challenging notion of the
‘hegemony of travel’, Mowforth and Munt (2003) call up our obligation to ask ‘what vision of the world [we] are pursuing and the degree to which such visions are imposed from the First World onto the Third World’ (127).

Despite this, I am drawn to Graburn’s (1989) characterisation of tourism as a secular equivalent of the pilgrimage; a bridge to a collective consciousness, a step closer to the ideal than Arjun Appadurai’s (2006) ‘human faculty for long distance empathy’ (41). As Stronza (2001) paraphrases Graburn: ‘[t]he totems in the modern ritual of tourism appear on the pages of guidebooks, on websites and on the surfaces of our souvenirs. Through the collective reverence of these totems, tourists are able to strengthen their connection to each other as well as to a larger society’ (266). And I’m counting on Robert Dessaix to absolve me, along with many others. He claims that part of what makes us human are the preconceived notions we have about a place or a people, that we all ‘travel with baggage’ (1998: 190) and contends that Edward Said overgeneralises in his scathing assessment of travellers’ ‘projection of inauthentic images of ‘the Other’’. Dessaix interprets, for example, the desire of those in search of biblical sites as wishing ‘to have authentic images of our own roots projected onto our consciousness … our own beginnings. Knowledge of antiquity, yes, but something closer to wisdom’ (192). He forgivingly constructs travel as being, at least for some, undertaken in the spirit of a common humanity: ‘[we] travel to be hungry, not to consume … we’re resistant to the notion that ‘the Other' must always be an adversary … I recommend a little less Foucault and a little more foreign travel’ (210).
Context
The San peoples of the Central Kalahari region of Botswana are represented in my thesis in their prolonged struggle for systemic recognition, let alone autonomy. Embarrassingly, my interest was ignited by a popular film, one that remains the sole reference point for many in the developed world with regard to the San.

As a first-year teacher I took my Year Ten students from a tiny country town two hundred kilometres to the state capital to watch the film ‘The Gods Must Be Crazy’, having told them it was hilarious and wonderful. The first ten minutes of this film play like a 1960s newsreel, with a mellifluous British voice-over and ‘facts’ about the Bushmen given in neat info-bites, juxtaposed with scenes of frenetically crazy life in Johannesburg, about which the Bushmen are blissfully unaware. My recalcitrant fifteen year-olds sat there grumbling – ‘she’s brought us all this way for a documentary?’ But then, of course, the Coke bottle falls from the sky and the fun begins.

The San’s lifestyle is depicted in the film as one of Garden-of-Eden tranquility, although the landscape is somewhat more arid than the Genesis idyll. Some years after that first viewing, I saw an episode of Foreign Correspondent (Australian Broadcasting Corporation, 30/10/2002) and was shocked and mortified. The people no longer lived in desert serenity. According to the report, the San had been driven out of the Kalahari by the Botswana government in the interests of diamond mining, big-game hunting and high-end tourism. The San’s ancient skills of hunting and gathering, of finding water in an apparently waterless land had been all but lost. The family groups remaining in the remote area were, claimed the report, dependent on government handouts, many were alcoholic, apparently rudderless.
Meanwhile, tourist ephemera in-country extols the lifestyle of the Bushmen esoterically, producing imagery that suggests they are still living as they did for millennia, omitting any mention of their modern realities and perpetuating a lie about their ongoing relationship with lands to which they no longer have unfettered access.

Recently I was invited to stay in a small township created by the Botswana government outside the British-designated Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) to accommodate the evictees from the Kalahari. Such villages make up a ‘gulag of special settlements’ (Good, 2008: 183) that tourists rarely see, from which San elders are trucked to luxury safari lodges within the CKGR, made to don their traditional garb, to take tourists on survival treks, and trucked back at the end of the day, lending truth to Scott’s (1990) observation that ‘while the dominant ideology does not entirely exclude the interests of subordinate groups, it operates to conceal or misrepresent aspects of social relations that, if apprehended directly, would be damaging to the interests of dominant elites’ (71-72).

My mission with this investigation became one of exposing the mismatch between representation and reality, between myth and truth. I freely admit to the fact that while I critique unfavourably the common tourist exoticisation of certain Indigenous communities, my entire investigation into representation of the San is borne of a captivation with this group that amounts to the same sensibility. Therein lies responsibility, acknowledging that I too, am essentially a tourist and must be constantly self-reflective.
Significance of the thesis

This thesis analyses representations of the San predominantly of the Kalahari region of Botswana. My study explores the motives and techniques of the tourist industry operating in that country and the effects that depiction and rhetoric have upon tourists as well as upon the San peoples themselves. It also investigates the role of San self-representation within the quest for autonomy and recognition outside externally constructed and exploitative paradigms.

According to Nyathi (2006) the San are a people characterised by some common experiences of exclusion, including being forced to occupy a servile niche, lacking in necessities, being denied the right to recognition and partnership in the development process, subject to long-entrenched prejudice from the mainstream. But, of course, as with most colonial and neo-colonial dynamics there is whitewash and hypocrisy within the dominant discourse, as Forllore (2004) cites an historical attitude of the Bangwato, the ruling tribe of Botswana’s Central District who intermingled with the San: ‘[t]he Basarwa (San of Botswana) are Basarwa during the day but not at night’ (Mmegi, 2 July, 2004). However, there is a groundswell of San resistance to social and political exclusion and a burgeoning optimism reflected in, among other domains, self-representation, providing the impetus for this thesis.

The semantics and semiotics of the tourist industry wax poetic about the precarious existence of the modern descendants of ancient peoples, their cottage industries and quaint customs. Tourism rhetoric suggests that we are just in time to see such people in their antediluvian state before progress swallows them up, never again to be seen in their traditional dress or performing their rituals. So, unwittingly, we often become voyeurs, accessories after the fact of
ongoing systemic displacement, consoling our unease with the thought that although these people are undoubtedly disenfranchised, they have the eminently more valuable ‘social capital’ (extended family, sense of community, environmental connectedness and heightened spirituality) that we lack; they are in tune with a more profound reality, easily living without Western trappings. In short, we swallow the hyper-reality, so shrewdly constructed by government and industry that keeps us at a remove from lived realities. Artist and writer Esther Parada (1996) is, – as am I – interested in the disconnect between official narratives and hidden realities. Parada acknowledges, though, that as humans, it can take us some time to become aware, recalling her time in the Peace Corps in Bolivia in the 1960s, where she prided herself initially on her ‘egalitarian ethos and respect for indigenous (sic) cultures’:

I was stunned by the beauty of the landscape and intrigued by the folkloric dress of the Quechua Indians … [which] dominated my photography portrait. I even exhibited my prints accompanied by poignant phrases translated from Quechua poetry … I had no theoretical perspective on my own art-making impulses at that time; but it seems clear to me now that I was practicing a visual equivalent of what Professor David Spurr calls ‘the rhetoric of empire’ … It was only many years later, influenced by the writings of Roland Barthes … that I began to question the liberal humanism that had so moved me in The Family of Man¹.

Michele Fero (n.d.) also calls upon activists and researchers who represent the subaltern, those who claim to uphold the best interests of such groups, to be aware of their position of relative advantage and to use images and language responsibly in the process, preferably by way of reflexive consultation:

¹ The Family of Man photographic exhibition toured the world for 8 years from 1955 under the auspices of the Museum of Modern Art, representing many cultures and categorised into universally pertinent themes, such as family, love and death.
people have suffered the consequences of being portrayed in particular ways and Western representations (in writing and in the media) still work to maintain certain assumptions and power relationships. We need to re-examine elements from the past because they shape our present and future. We need to be more critical of the dominant discourses and practices we continue to create, in our institutions and within our discipline (6-7).

The obscenity of the ‘tourist gaze’ (Urry 2002) brings to mind the way I balked, appalled, at the favela tours organised by the backpackers’ hostel in which I once stayed in Rio de Janeiro, but this so-called ‘slum tourism’ is becoming increasingly popular and there are some valid arguments in favour of it. Writer, activist and filmmaker Susan Sontag (1977) contends that photography, (here included as a manifest extension of the tourist gaze’s inherent power imbalance) is essentially an act of theft: ‘[t]o photograph is to appropriate the thing photographed’ (4) and wryly dehumanises all photographees as ‘things’. She notes the common ignorance of our own insensitivities which naturally encompasses tourism: ‘[g]azing on other people’s reality with curiosity, with detachment, with professionalism, the ubiquitous photographer operates as if that activity transcends class interests, as if its perspective is universal’ (55).

San self-representation for tourism consumption in Botswana is incrementally offering alternatives to the deceptive iterations of representation, away from the monolithic and primeval to a more comprehensive and honest drawing of San realities that is garnering support from an increasingly aware clientele. Michael Taylor (2000) makes reference to San self-representation in some contemporary contexts which are inextricably bound with the San drawing their identity as hunter-gatherer. He believes the Kalahari Debate, which
is an anthropological issue centred around the question of the San’s custodianship of the Kalahari (whether they lived as relatively isolated, autonomous bands before contact with Europeans, or whether they had been servile to the Bantu since those groups migrated south over one thousand years ago) ‘ignores the crucial issue of how Basarwa represent themselves, which is at times, in terms of a hunting and gathering past’ (19). Taylor’s research concentrates on the San in Botswana’s Okavango Delta area, a people who benefit directly from the ethno-tourism market, so that although the category ‘hunter-gatherer’ is still legitimate in small pockets around southern Africa where land rights apply, it should not be used to define a ‘reified’ culture:

[t]he salience of hunting and gathering is more as a symbol that carries meaning to both San and their neighbours in the contemporary political economy of southern Africa, especially considering contemporary experiences of dispossession and alienation from land and wildlife ... Although thoroughly debunked in academic representations of Basarwa, primordialism thus paradoxically surfaces in the ways that Basarwa represent themselves in terms of their own past (19).

My research concentrates on the former residents of the CKGR predominantly and goes beyond such a limited drawing of the San to a broad, nuanced and integrated approach to self-representation.

In a spirit of disclosure, I admit that I had originally intended to suggest, in the form of a recommendation at the conclusion of my thesis, that the San, living as they do within geographically and culturally fragmented language groups across southern Africa, might benefit from a model of self-determination well known in the
global arena: that of the Zapatistas of south-east Mexico. The Zapatistas, named for the revolutionary hero Emiliano Zapata, comprise many language groups of Maya Indians who have seen the possibilities of autonomy from the Mexican government’s land appropriation agenda and now have a powerful international outreach and representation at The United Nations (Couch 2004: 120). Many influential individuals and organisations support the Zapatistas’ self-generated and -represented cause, making the government nervous in the process (ibid). I believed that if the San were to name themselves comparably in solidarity, so that all San groups operated under a common name unaffiliated with language or geography within Botswana but reflective of a common struggle for systemic recognition, this would be a start.

I was subsequently alerted to the inherent hubris of positioning myself to make any recommendation in such a paternalistic ‘I know what’s good for you’ vein. Michael Sacks and Marika Lindholm (2002), in a series of interviews on the subject of privilege, concluded that their respondents had (like myself) a ‘deeply-felt concern for social inequality and the plight of the oppressed but … that this reflected a philosophical stance on social problems – one not based on personal experience’ (cited in Levine-Rasky: 135). At the heart of this was a naïve belief in ‘unbridled agency’, a blithe unawareness of the social structures in place that inhibit agency. Underlying this, Sacks and Lindholm assert, is identity which, for many non-dominant groups is constructed in direct response to a lack of agency. John Gaventa’s (1980) theory of power relations holds that the dominant elite has capitalised on the historical powerlessness of subordinate groups, which naturally facilitates ‘further power to invest in the development of dominant images, legitimations or beliefs about [their] power through control, for instance, of the
media or other socialization institutions’ (22). In fact, Alice Mogwe of Distshwanelo, the Botswana Centre for Human Rights and researcher, Sidsel Saugestad have documented the negotiation of an acceptable ‘ethnic’ label engaging the San but according to Edwin Wilsmen (2002) this has been unsuccessful because, in part, ‘pronounced language differences hamper selection of an inclusively recognizable term, but also, I suspect, because local allegiances often have a greater appeal than does a pan-Sarwa image’ (837).

An extreme form of this social distancing of privilege potentially ‘allows the financially secure to blame the poor and a larger ‘culture of poverty’ ’ (Sacks and Lindholm: 136) and while I know I am categorically not guilty of this position, the potential for agency and self-mobilisation may be more difficult than I – perhaps glibly – supposed, in my suggestion that another self-determination template could be overlayed the San context, whose ‘disparate social structure has made it exceedingly difficult for them to organise pressure groups to defend their rights and land as other groups have done’ (Firestone and Karlin, eds. 2010: 64). I applied, in my guileless way, a form of cultural imperialism whereby the ‘norm’ is defined as the universal experience of the privileged; the assumption that other groups should aspire to be - and behave more like us or, I once thought, in the San’s case, like the similarly Indigenous but more politically assertive Zapatistas whose militancy I understand and applaud as a multiply privileged person with the capacity to combat oppression through available channels if needs be. Paul Gilroy (2005) alerts researchers to the challenge of producing ‘a worldly vision that is not simply one more imperialistic particularism dressed up in seductive universal garb’ (4).
Furthermore, in my naïve ideal to see the San collectivise, if only in name, some (unconscious) dismissal of pluralities was evident. Edward Said (1987) accuses Marx of such a practice, where deployment of overarching labels made it easier to illustrate a theory but at the inevitable expense of ‘existential human identities’ (155). In fact, in the case of the Botswana San, a monolithic ‘one size fits all’ approach, according to Ditshwanelo, the Botswana Centre for Human Rights, lies at the heart of the San’s distrust of government policy. Their ‘distinct varied ethno-linguistic and cultural communities … dispersed all over the national territory of Botswana’ is overlooked (Chebanne 2006: 140). Beverley, Oviedo, and Aronna (1995) celebrate the natural hybridity of societies, advocating a new social order founded on social projects, not on any postmodernist rejection of absolutism. This ideal can only occur with an acknowledgement that most depictions of the subaltern are constructions created for vested interest. Their positioning in society is equally a device, maintaining the power dynamic, a claim endorsed by Berkofer (1978) who claims that the idea and image of, for example, the American Indian is essentially a white designation and stereotype.

Foucault’s interpretation of Heidegger’s theory of language encapsulates the central enterprise of this thesis insofar as ‘[d]iscourse transmits and produces power; it reinforces it, but also undermines and exposes it, renders it fragile and makes it impossible to thwart it’ (cited in Spurr 1993: 184). The structuring of any discourse – in this case the colonial and, by extension, global/corporate – is characterised by patterns, thus by limitations and therefore, claims David Spurr ‘creates the possibility for alternative ways of speaking’ (185). Spurr chronicles resistance at various levels, some very low-level, as with ‘mimicry and mockery of authority’ (186), a privilege
of the secret understandings between members of a colonised people, and some more overt and effective, such as stealing from a government herd as the San are chronicled as having done with settler cattle in the Kalahari in the colonial era. Edward Said (1993) notes that: ‘[s]logans, pamphlets, newspapers, folktales, heroes, epic poetry, novels and drama are all means by which national cultures can be reasserted and the effects of colonization resisted’ (260). The subaltern, notes, Escobar (1995) ‘do in fact speak, even if the audibility of their voices in the circles where ‘the West’ is reflected upon and theorized is tenuous at best’ (23). With optimism and respect, this thesis celebrates the burgeoning voice and potential of the traditionally subaltern San in modern Botswana and investigates forms of self-representation beyond the traditional hunter-gatherer paradigm (such as Taylor researched) to encompass images of the San as contributing members of their twenty-first century society.

**Structure of the thesis**

Chapter One first establishes my ideological positioning within the thesis; the reasons for my interest in the San as regards the ways they are represented in tourism rhetoric and imagery. In Chapter One I also acknowledge my recognition of the somewhat precarious position of the non-Indigenous Western/Northern researcher undertaking research into Indigenous issues. It provides a background to Botswana and the San’s socio-political standing in the country pre-colonisation, during the British protectorate and since independence in 1966. As well as discussing the complex issue of nomenclature, this chapter also defines Indigeneity in terms of the First Peoples identification, and characterises self-determination as I posit its potential for the Kalahari San.
Chapter Two provides a review of the literature pertaining to the San. In anthropological and historical terms it is the case that the San have been comprehensively researched, and in more recent times, the struggle against corporate land appropriation and the San’s consequent dispossession has also been thoroughly documented. This review identifies the literature encircling my enterprise here, demonstrating the place left open for a postcolonial analysis of tourism text as a neo-colonialist construct with destructive potential where it is generated about the San without their authorisation, yet with constructive, self-determining possibilities where produced by the San themselves. Chapter Two also offers a methodology and a very brief review of generalist (that is, not pertaining to the San) colonial and postcolonial literature to further elucidate the tropes identified by David Spurr, so as to ensure they are adequately defined and illustrated ahead of their direct application to tourism texts representing the San in Chapters Three, Four and Five.

Chapters Three and Four analyse the aforementioned tourist texts: literary– and visual texts respectively against the first eleven of Spurr’s twelve tropes of colonial belief and action. Theoretical tourism literature – or post-tourism critique – is subsumed within these chapters to broaden the analysis of tourism texts. Review of some non-academic (literary) texts is included among reviews of scholarly critiques, since they, like the tourism texts that constitute the data set, are popular representations of the worldviews that for so long underscored the inequalities of colonialism and that still justify neo-colonialist dynamics, necessitating postcolonialist analysis.

In Chapter Five, Resistance, the twelfth and final trope of Spurr’s ‘continuum’ is set apart from the other eleven tropes so that efforts
at self-determination of the Kalahari San, specifically as regards self-
representation, can be analysed against elements of that category.
As with the previous chapters, various tools of semiotic analysis are
in play and I also call upon James C. Scott’s ‘arts’ of resistance
(1990) relevant to the creation of rhetoric and imagery describing
and promoting the subaltern group within a dominant socio-
political frame that seeks to undermine, deny or exploit that group.
Resistance as a trope is deployed to analyse self-representations as
exemplars of a growing spirit of San self-determination in the face of
Tswana hegemony in modern Botswana. It is important to state here
that the coverage is limited to covert forms of resistance – that
which James Scott (1990) calls the ‘hidden transcript’ – in light of
evidence cited in Chapter 1 of Botswana’s hostility towards more
confrontational resistances.

This isolating of textual examples of Resistance from the previous
eleven tropes is done in a spirit of admiration and hope for the future
implied by San self-representations which require, as Scott
eloquently describes such an enterprise, ‘an experimental spirit and
a capacity to test and exploit all the loopholes, ambiguities,
silences, and lapses available to them ... It is impossible
overestimate the subtlety of this manipulation’ (1990: 138-139).
‘Full Moon Party’: Postcard for tourists on sale in Botswana outlets, employing pun on the word ‘rocks’ (fun times/diamonds) and depicting animals in the Kalahari with, significantly, no people.

Marginalising of ethnic minorities in relation to animals within tourism is common in Botswana and other countries. As San spokesman Roy Sesana claims: ‘[i]n Botswana a Mosarwa is nothing. All Government cares for is its animals and tourists’ (October 29, 1997, The Voice: 2). It calls up Salazar’s (2009) observation that The Lion King (1994) ‘undoubtedly the most influential animation made about (East Africa), does not feature any Maasai’(57). Survival International (2005) cites ‘expert’ ecological witness for the Botswana government in the 2006 San case in the High Court against forced evictions from the CKGR as saying ‘she wants them all out of any protected area in order to favour the animal inhabitants’ (cited in Mowforth and Munt, 2009: 166).
Chapter One: ‘Sing no elegies yet’

You who having spoken for yourself before ageless
gods
Are master of all speech and rock, herb or beast
hear you
Directly in the howling wind; and having stood your
ground
In the battle of bloods in the veins of man
You will staunch still the premature flow of elegies
Commemorating your demise.

(P.W.Mwikisa, ‘Sing No Elegies Yet for the Basarwa!’)

The Botswana San is, I concede, just one Indigenous group
struggling for social and political autonomy in the wake of global
projects of appropriation and negation. As well, I acknowledge the
audacity of non-San people such as myself articulating San issues.
This second-hand research does not, as Nthomang (2006) points
out, ‘transform their marginality in society’ (104), hence my
identification of research and representation of the San by and for
the San as nothing less than a resistance imperative. This humble
recognition appears to be endorsed by University of Botswana
academic and poet P.W. Mwikisa’s acknowledgement, made
directly to the San, that ‘an ‘impetuous presumption, perhaps, bids
me speak for you’ (cited in Nthomang, 2006: 103).

Further, I fervently did not wish, in revealing the deceptive nature of
tourism industry representations of the San, to suggest that despite
the San’s marginalisation in modern Botswana they have no

2 I am intrigued as to why Mwikisa chose the nomenclature ‘Basarwa’ for his poem’s
title, since, although it is not offensive per se, this is the Setswana name for the San;
one not generally endorsed by the San themselves in Botswana. In light of Mwikisa’s
body of work on San issues, I can only assume he is using the term pointedly, as an
indictment of the fact that the San are defined socially, politically, geographically and
representationally by the hegemonic Tswana majority.
capacity for self-determination. Agency is growing, increasingly from within San communities, and outside the auspices and agendas (admittedly, often well-meaning) of NGOs and other non-San capacity-building organisations. San self-representation for tourism consumption plays a significant role in this enterprise.

The San’s social and economic position in modern Botswana
The Republic of Botswana has a justified international reputation as the most peaceful nation in Africa; once dubbed the ‘African miracle’ (Samatar, 1999: 217) for its exemplary economic growth in an era of ‘Afro-pessimism’ (Mogalakwe, 2003: 85). But a deliberately designed nationalist image, with its inclusive rhetoric has, to an extent, contributed to the disadvantage of minority groups through its assimilationist model, typical of the colonial project and its legacy in post-colonial systems. The Batswana (or ‘Tswana), the dominant ethnic group of Botswana, have a prominent place in society, minority languages like those of the San are subject to language genocide in favour of the principal tongue, Setswana (Kiema, 2010).

The President’s pronouncement: ‘all Batswana are indigenous (sic) to the country’ (cited in Good, 2008: 109) supporting this stance is articulated in his assimilationist public statements dismissing the uniqueness of minorities: ‘[t]he government’s development programmes and assistance schemes do not draw any distinctions among the country’s citizens’ (cited in Saugestad, 2001: 52). Edwin Wilsmen (2002) asserts that this has rendered many ‘partitiive ethnicity-based development efforts’ in Botswana ineffectual since genuine democratic ideology enshrined in the constitution and strengthened by the shadow of apartheid militates against special ‘culturally exclusive’ solutions to social problems such as rural poverty but also, significantly for San, because an
attitude persists that these people retain atavistic traits from the distant past (839).

Khama’s ‘official transcript’ (Scott, 1990) epitomises Joe Galbo’s observation that ‘[m]inorities quickly become a problem in a modern global context because they challenge national narratives of social cohesion and homogeneity’ (2006:1). Substituting ‘naturalism’ here for Botswana’s official transcript of nationalism, Paul Willis’ assertion that ‘one of the most important general functions of ideology is the way in which it turns uncertain and fragile cultural resolutions and outcomes into a pervasive naturalism’ (162) is pertinent to Botswana, as is Frantz Fanon’s (1968) observation about a national bourgeoisie which ‘turns its back more and more on the interior and on the real fact of its undeveloped country, and tends to look toward the former mother country and the foreign capitalists (Belgium, China and Australia, among others) who count on its obliging compliance’ (cited in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995: 157).

As such, as Abdi Ismail Samatar points out, Botswana’s postcolonial economic development is really a class project’ (1999: 5), with the state (characterised by the dominant Batswana) ‘relatively independent from civil society as its institutions are insulated from the ‘undesirable’ societal influences’ (Mogalakwe: 87). Zibeni Maudeni (2004) asserts that the San, constituting four percent of the population ‘are the most ethnically discriminated’ of Botswana’s poor who fall under the Poverty Datum Line. They are effectively, according to Good (2008) ‘a landless, cattleless proletariat’ (107). At present, those San who are not employed by the tourist industry are to be found manning the cattle posts of affluent Batswana. Kenneth Good (2008) asserts that this dynamic of San dependence upon owners of ranches and cattle-posts was a form of ‘voluntary
slavery’ where the San were ‘forced into a new serfdom’ (107). As Kiema (2010) endorses: ‘[t]hey looked after cattle for little or no pay. They worked under appalling conditions. No one cared how much they were paid. There were no labour laws to protect the interests of people who were now working on what was once their tribal territories’ (79). This is endorsed by tourism researchers in Indigenous contexts such as Heather Zeppel (2006) who notes traditional San culture as being, after wildlife, strongly promoted for tourism in Botswana while the population of between 47,000 and 48,000 San ‘lived in poverty with limited economic opportunities’ from the impact on their communities of tourism (172).

**History as it affects the present for the Botswana San**

The San were predominantly hunter-gatherers, although to limit them to this pursuit alone is erroneous: ‘the San are described in popular and academic literature as ‘nomadic’ and this has led to the same kind of justification for appropriation of Aboriginal land practised in colonial Australia (Gaita, 1999: 76). However, San oral testimonies … revealed that they … lived in well-defined territories belonging to different bands and clans who guarded and protected their natural resources’ (Le Roux & White, 2004: 16) Le Roux and White go on to acknowledge that ‘[i]n the traditional territory system, San bands knew the landmarks of their areas and respected those of their neighbours, and would not dream of entering others’ lands for hunting and gathering without consulting the owner first’ (168). The San being completely nomadic is a flawed concept, as Kuela Kiema, (2010) a (Kua) San author and scholar asserts:

> [a]ccording to which clan we came from, we lived in different places within our tribal boundaries [within Tc’amnqoo, or the CKGR in the dominant discourse]. We
hunted here and gathered fruit from trees and shrubs. One clan had to ask for permission from another in order to gather food from outside its own land… Migrations of Kua people would take place only within their territories. If a Bantu of a white man walks around his field, no one called him a nomadic person’. Yet we moved within our lands, within our marked tribal territories, and they called us nomads. This concept of nomadic has been used to deprive us of our territories that duly belong to us (23-24).

The notion of Bushmen as possessions is entrenched in the ‘Tswana mindset. Sandy Gall (2001) recounts the story of the delegation sent to Bechuanaland by the London Missionary Society in 1935 to investigate reports of Bushman enslavement by the Bamangwato, the most prominent of the eight ‘Tswana tribes. The chief, Tshekedi Khama, assured the missionaries that Bushmen would receive the same rights and freedoms as the Bamangwato, including a voice in the body politic and some land ownership. Yet Seretse Khama, heir to Tshekedi and father of the current President, owned Bushman slaves at least until his accession to the Presidency of Botswana at Independence in 1966. John Hardbattle, founder of the First People of the Kalahari (FPK), endorses Ketsitlile’s observations about San identity, asserting that ‘many among the elite today still consider [the San] no more than serfs since they “inherited” them from their forebears’ (cited in Gall, 2001: 188). At the state level this is difficult to overturn since, as Mogalakwe (2003) points out, ‘the Botswana Democratic Party class project took off relatively easily because of the absence of organised or mobilised social groups whose interests contradicted those of the dominant class’ (86). The story of ‘El Negro’ is a case in point of government whitewashing of San realities.

Stolen from the grave soon after death, a San man’s body was embalmed and exhibited in the Banyoles Museum in Spain in 1916,
referred to in that context as ‘El Negro’. Caitlin Davies (2003) writes of this man, also known as Africa’s ‘unknown soldier’ who died circa 1830 and had been, according to his large commemorative plaque ‘carried to Europe in Death’. In the 1990s it was agreed that the body be repatriated to southern Africa and in 2000 the man’s remains received a state burial in Gaborone, with the hope of luring tourists to Botswana. Leslie Nthoi (2001, cited in Good 2002) asserts that the fact that no San representatives were present at the re-burial was a travesty and a violation of even Tswana burial practices. Davies is concerned that the man’s burial site has become a ‘sort of sideshow’, simply another feature on tourists’ itineraries, as well as an object of academic interest. But Kenneth Good (2002) sees the broader, more insidious nature of the event, asserting the ‘glaring contrast between the furore over the repatriation of El Negro with the continuing neglect and subordination of some 100,000 of his San and other Remote descendents’ (52).

Good is convinced that the exhibition that is ‘El Negro’s’ resting place constitutes propaganda, designed to serve as a convenient distraction of international attention away from the resettlements out of the CKGR; a public relations opportunity for the government to feign respect for the San in response to negative reports to the contrary. More specifically, Good aligns the ‘El Negro’ revelry and associated publicity with the threat to Debswana of Botswana diamonds being internationally classified ‘conflict diamonds’ due to the eviction of over 4000 San. Good does acknowledge the possibility, however, that at least for some people, ‘one Unknown Bushman, like an Unknown Soldier, [might highlight] the plight of all the rest’ (54).
The reputation of Botswana internationally has effectively whitewashed the marginalisation of the San and other minorities over decades, but their removal from the CKGR for commercial purposes and to deny them rights to land and resources has not gone unnoticed. These actions have certainly tarnished the national brand, although not to the extent that the decision to evict has been overturned or a proportion of land/mineral rights offered. London’s *Sunday Telegraph* of 11 August, 2002, accuses the Botswana administration, of ‘ethnically cleansing [the San] in ways that would cause outrage if Botswana were not so prosperous, stable and pro-Western’ (cited in Taylor, 2003: 277). Stephen Corry of Survival International, apparently with great faith in human integrity, believes that the eviction and associated policies will inevitably affect Botswana economically to the point where the government will have no alternative but to capitulate to the demands of San activists and those advocating on their behalf:

The truth is that Botswana’s government wants it both ways. It wants foreigners to visit as tourists, it wants them to buy its beef and its diamonds, and it wants them to finance its wildlife and AIDS programmes. But it does not want to know what foreigners think of its appalling treatment of Basarwa, and it seems it has yet to realize that what those foreigners think will eventually affect what they buy and where they choose to take their holidays. The government may be able to order the Basarwa to be evicted but it cannot order Americans to buy its diamonds (cited in *Mmegi/The Reporter, (Gaborone) 21-27 June, 2001*).

The High Court hearings of the San case against the Government of Botswana were described by Survival International as surreal (2005, cited in Mowforth and Munt, 2009).
High Court ruling and its aftermath

Although the San won a celebrated high court battle to win back traditional hunting rights in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) in 2006 (Saugestad, 2010: 2) cattle owners and large-scale farmers often ignore this and brutally threaten the San who exercise this right. An evaluation of the diamond deposit in Gope was completed in 1996 and the following year ‘[a]pparently coincidentally, the first enforced evictions started in May the following year. One Bushman community, Xade … which was already equipped with a school, clinic, airstrip and borehole for water, was completely removed (Survival International 2006:2). This was justified by the Minister of Local Government, Lands and Housing in The Botswana Gazette 20 December 1995 with the explanation that that essential services for the San could only be provided outside the CKGR since such facilities would ‘not be compatible with maintaining the pristine environment of the game reserve’. Another minister added that tourism could become the biggest contributor to the nation’s economy if game reserves were more attractive to tourists and wildlife was conserved (cited in Good 2002: 53). This suggests that the tangible realities of the San’s lives, as well as their ancestral ties to the land are, respectively, an embarrassment to the perceived aesthetic and credulous sensitivities of tourists which must be accommodated by that industry, and a potential threat to the development agendas of government and corporations. There are well-documented cases within Botswana itself that wells have been filled with sand or concreted over so that the San cannot access water if they return to the CKGR for hunting purposes (Survival International, 2001: 2). John Hardbattle of the FPK was outspoken at the 52nd session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights about the relocation of the San.
Sandy Gall (2001) cites Hardbattle as saying: ‘[t]housands ... have been herded into settlements to make room for a thriving cattle industry [rendering us] beggars in our own country ... Why is it today that the lion is to be given rights and we the San are not given any?’ (194). Samora Gaborone (1998) draws a correlation between John Hardbattle’s sudden death and the speeding up of the resettlement campaign. ³ Former employee of the Botswana government, American ecologist Kathleen Alexander ‘said that [the San] had to evolve, claiming that ‘culture’ had nothing to do with ancestral land and they could practice it anywhere’ (Survival International, 2005, cited in Mowforth and Munt, 2009: 166).

In 2011 the San won the right to access water in the CKGR when hunting but a press release in 2012 quotes a San man as saying the government has ‘sent in armed forces to intimidate us ... We depend on the natural resources of the CKGR for our food. How are we expected to survive if we cannot hunt?’. Good (2002) cites reports from San woman, Andrea, widow of John Hardbattle, of raids and beatings carried out by officials trying to re-evict the few hundred San steadfastly remaining in the CKGR (despite having no access to water, nor permits for hunting) having moved back with their belongings on their backs, effectively making a nonsense of the government’s assertion that the San moved out of the reserve voluntarily.

³ Samora Gaborone was an advisor to the residents of the CKGR and FPK. He presented a statement at the University of Botswana in 1998, directed to then Vice President Ian Khama.
Christian Erni notes that ‘the unyielding determination of the government to push the resettlement programme in the CKGR through is ultimately motivated by the aim to establish a fait accompli before the Khwe ... and Bakgalagadi communities have become better organized ... and seek to prevent or at least demand compensations for commercial activities and resource exploitation by outsiders on their land’ (IWGA 1997).

San man Kgeikani Kweni (2010) makes this plea to the world in a web statement:

The government has forced us off our ancestral land, and now we live in resettlement camps. Since being relocated we have problems we never knew before: drinking, violence, HIV/AIDS. Many of us are dying in the camps. When we try to hunt or gather we are arrested and sometimes tortured. In December 2006 we had a historic victory in the Botswana courts. The judges ruled that our forced relocation from our beloved land was unlawful, and that we have the right to go back and hunt there as we have always done. However, despite the judgment, the government won’t let us hunt and is stopping us using the water borehole on our land. It has also refused to help us with transport home. Because of this, most of us have not yet been able to return.

Human rights website, NationbyNation (2010), relates that the High Court ruling was insidiously interpreted to allow only the applicants and their families to return to the CKGR rather than all San affected by the relocation in the policy of Villagisation. Liz Wily (1980), coordinator from 1974-1977 of the (now defunct) Bushman Development Programme, notes the San’s legal rights to land and hunting as having been dismissed in the office of the attorney-general in 1978, from which time the nomadic life was actively discouraged officially. Government policy dictated that the San ‘should be made to settle in a village so that they may be
developed’ (98). The court did not recognise any obligation for the government to provide services to the CKGR such as the maintenance of wells which, in fact, the government denied existed in the first place.

Indeed, in December, 2006, a press statement for the CKGR NGO coalition cited the High Court ruling in favour of the government that effectively evicted the San from the CKGR by ruling it ‘neither unlawful nor unconstitutional’ for termination of basic and essential services (health, food and water) to occur, even though the Court also ruled that ‘the residents had lawfully occupied the land and were unlawfully deprived of it [from 2002 onwards] it was [also] unlawful and unconstitutional to deny residents entry into the CKGR’ (1).

Despite the initial dismissal of the San’s application, Morula notes that ‘the judgement has received wide publicity in and outside the country, with some papers running the story just hours after the judgement’ (ibid). An appeal in this case has since been successful, in January 2011. This case is still open to interpretation by the government in the same way that the court case to return to the CKGR was; that is, theoretically successful, but in reality only the appellants whose names appeared on court documents and their families were permitted to return. Commercial reasons for government obstructionism, beyond diamond-mining, tourism and cattle agistment, are becoming evident.

A recent documentary entitled The High Cost of Cheap Gas (2013) reveals the exploration concessions granted to Australia’s Tlou Energy Company and the African Gas and Coal Corporation allowing fracking to proceed across half the area of the CKGR, with
Tlou already having drilled exploratory wells for coal-bed methane. Maps indicating the fracking sites in the CKGR and other areas of Botswana are now accessible online. The documentary asserts the lowering of the water table and water toxicity that are natural outcomes of this process.

The film-makers are concerned about the effect this will have upon the San’s efforts to return to the CKGR and if they are successful, the effects the fracking process will have upon the environment upon which the San rely. The owner of the Elephant Sands Guest Lodge in the area where test drills were carried out explains in the documentary that elephants are suffering from lack of water and his business is smarting from the necessity to truck or pipe in fresh water that is now not readily available on site. No mention whatsoever is made by this lodge owner of the effect of fracking and drilling as it would affect the San or of the fact that such a practice may be in violation of San rights to resources and ancestral homelands.

In terms of population, the San’s numbers are dwindling as they become more alcohol-dependent and affected by HIV. The official San population is unknown however, since according to Kenneth Good (2011) minority census data are deliberately not collected on an ethnic basis as the government refuses to acknowledge ethnicity. The San’s relative lack of self-determination could possibly be seen as a natural passivity, yet there are historical accounts of bloody battles over land between the San and the colonial Dutch and British (van der Post, 1958: 32). The despondency is demonstrably a more recent phenomenon, brought about by years of neglect, prejudice and dispossession.
Mogalakwe (2003) who notes the schism between state and civil society, cynically identifies as the exception those ‘segments of civil society whose active involvement in the economy is necessary for transformation’ (87) which includes the place of the San in the tourism paradigm, wherein their position as ethnically unique is systemically denied except within representation for tourist consumption. As Zibani Maundeni (2004) asserts, Botswana’s status as the leading example of democracy and human rights protection in Africa and of a burgeoning middle class, meant that international donors moved funding, resources and personnel to countries deemed more deserving with more high profile human rights violations and economic problems. Maundeni claims, however: ‘there are not many more serious human rights violations than to the San. Thus international donors and local businesses such as the Debswana mining company have not been forthcoming in funding human rights’ (65). New developments also implicate Debswana and the Government of Botswana in the form of the High Court dismissing on a technicality the San’s attempt in 2013 to gain free access to hunting rights in the Kalahari, denied them since. Although the 2006 High Court case conceded the rights of the San to hunt and gather in the CKGR, it was only by way of successful application for permits. To date, no permits have been issued and San men Nkemetse Motsoko and Kebonyeng Kepese were violently arrested for killing an eland in the CKGR and fined a prohibitive $190 each for hunting without permits (Survival International Press Release 13/12/2012).

Tourism boycott campaign
A solution to this impasse is proposed by Survival International in the form of tourism boycotts to Botswana until such time as free access
to hunting is reinstated for the Botswana San, a spokesperson noting the irony of the fact that

on its official tourism website the government uses images of Bushmen wearing animal skins and hunting, and at the same time it’s not allowing them to do that. The only Bushmen that tourists can visit are the ones outside the CKGR, who are of course not living day to day in the way they’re showing tourists that they are because the government doesn’t allow it. None of the Bushmen that actually live in the CKGR are involved in tourism because they’ve been excluded by the government from anything that will allow them to have their own economy in any way. It’s important that tourists are aware of this, and to know that any tour operator claiming that a San bushwalk shows how they live today and how well they’ve adapted is completely false (www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 12/1/2014).

To date, in response to the campaign two travel companies have cancelled existing bookings and refuse to take new ones. SI’s director, Stephen Corry, penned a letter to all tourism operators in Botswana explaining and defending his organisation’s international boycott to Botswana, offering the sweetener, “[w]e will be happy to publicize the news of any companies who stop offering tours to Botswana, or any travel advice websites that provide a link to our boycott campaign’ (www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 24/9/2013). In response to such a proposal, Richard Madden, a journalist sponsored by Wilderness Safaris (which has entered into a lease agreement with the government) upholds government policy that claims “[t]here is no longer any community in our country which survives solely on subsistence hunting and gathering’ (Daily Telegraph 1/11/2013). A recent blogger ‘Pazmino’ responds to this article on a Survival International site asking ‘[w]hy is someone who’s written promotional articles for Wilderness Safaris – who would be one of the main companies affected by a tourism boycott of
Botswana – writing an "objective" article? He ought to declare an interest’ (www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 1/1/2014). An article in Botswana daily newspaper Mmegi by Séverin Amougou (1/1/2014) also exposes the partiality of Madden’s treatise:

I think it’s important to get every side of the story, but this article is not balanced.

(1) The Bushmen’s right to hunt in the CKGR was recognised by the Botswana High Court in 2006, yet the government has not issued a single permit. Surely this is what is at stake here - will Botswana’s government respect the rulings of its own High Court?

(2) During the court case no evidence was produced that showed that the Bushmen’s hunting techniques or livestock rearing had a negative impact on wildlife. To my mind this makes sense - what can less than a thousand people do in an area twice the size of Rwanda, where there is next to no commercial demand for bushmeat? But what we need, Mr. Madden, are the facts.

(3) How can the government claim to be acting in the interests of conservation at the same time as it is allowing a diamond mine to run in the CKGR? Will that not have a negative impact on the wildlife there?

SI has many supporters internationally, including the San’s British lawyer, Gordon Bennett, who is currently prevented from entering Botswana by way of a ‘visa list’ prior to the High Court hearing whereat he intended to defend the San’s right of free access to the CKGR. But SI encounters resistance also, some objections lodged with regard to SI’s methods, some based on their entire worldview on Indigenous rights. Blogger John Grobler (www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 1/1/2014) expresses the former category of qualm:
Dear SI

I do not want to get into a slugging fest here. But I ... get to deal with San people regularly. Now, the San of course do not use guns in CKGR because that would get them arrested immediately. Problem is that if you allow one group a special class of privileges, pretty soon everyone else will demanding same ... once you open the door to hunting in CKGR (we’ll leave the mining debate aside for now), other people living in areas adjoining the CKGR will also want to do the same. That thin edge of the wedge could kill off Botswana's tourism industry, its biggest employer, in due course. We are not rich in Africa. Most are poor. And to target the entire tourism industry is not fair to those people who depend on that income to keep their families fed and kids at school - San included. There has to be a better way to address their plight.

Even San man, Job Morris of D'Kar, while supporting SI’s philosophy, has reservations about the organisation’s methods as his response to a 'blog from a staunch SI detractor reveals:

San ... have from first encounter with whites and blacks been under extreme pressure of losing their lives, serfs in all black and white household, loss of land and its resources, etc. ... Dxana and Dcui, with sometimes Naro and !Xung, benefited by hunting in the area ... from time immemorial, has the animals been exhausted? ... the group of people whom you wildly speak of, as if you have spent a lifetime with, do not reject development. It is not about buying a nice pair of jeans, rather it is about the attachment to the environment that they have grown up from. It is about their physical and spiritual disconnections that they worry about if displaced. Monthly government food rations further contribute to their loss of will to be empowered. This rations (sic) do not solve the problem of poverty but contribute to it further. If you show him how to do it, it will not materialize but if you involve him in how to do it, he will know how to do it and do it even when you are not there; this are development and empowerment philosophies that needs to be lectured to Botswana government but not 'one size fits all' approach. I’m not against the mandate of SI but im (sic) strongly against their approach to advocacy which to me are radical (www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 2/1/2014).
A posting epitomising an attitude of undisguised antagonism to SI and similar organisations’ approach to the Botswana San appears from blogger ‘Chris’, responding to SI’s claim that the San’s rights have been decimated in the same manner as those of North American and Australian Indigenous people:

What a load of bs! (sic) Botswana is not Australia or North America! In Botswana any national treasure of economic importance is exploited for the benefit of all in the country! Are you saying prospecting should not take place here? Pathetic! Mines in remote areas have build (sic) roads, hospitals, schools and created jobs in all corners of the country. Don’t stick your nose in affairs of a country that truly knows how to help its people ... Get the hell out and see this country help its own people! You are nothing but a sick organisation as far as I can see (‘Chris’, www.survivalinternational.org, accessed 1/1/2014).

An anonymous blogger on the tripadvisor website also draws a comparison with other postcolonial contexts, calling the proposed tourism boycott ‘[u]nfair ... unless you agree it would be fair to boycott America because of how the Native Americans are treated in the Dakotas (even now)? I think if more people see for themselves ... the better’ (www.tripadvisor.com.au, accessed 4/1/2014).

To supply one exemplar of tourism company responses to the SI campaign, the Responsible Travel company is less belligerent than most. It claims to support Survival International’s campaign in principle but considers its tourism practices to be sufficiently ethical and has consequently not joined the boycott since its client-base includes those who wish to experience the Other without making an exploitative or unwittingly insensitive footprint. But in an apparent contradiction, the following entries credulously whitewash the San’s socio-political reality, in the company’s advice to tourists within a framework of acceptance of the status quo:
Make sure your tour operator has experienced the San tour they are selling – it’s the only way they will know how ethical the tour is. Ask them if the tour is genuine, is it sensitive to the San culture and do the San themselves benefit from the tourists? ... Many San complain about the way they are treated by tourists and guides ... taking photographs without permission. Be sure to treat them as respectfully as you would any other host, and refuse to participate in any tour where the San are visibly uncomfortable with your presence (Responsible Travel, www.responsibletravel.com accessed 12/1/2014).

There is apparently unquestioning acceptance of the essentialist notion that there is but one ‘San culture’ and that it is as it traditionally was. No definition of the verb ‘benefit’ is offered nor suggestion as to what might be a fair and reasonable remuneration for the San guides. The overlay of Western interpretation of manifestations of San comfort or discomfort appears naïve, as well as the assumption that tour operators will naturally have an ethical agenda. This company’s advice to tourists trivialises the San’s situation as it dismissively – and with no detail about the ‘serious issues’ it alludes to – moves on to generalise about the benefits of safari tours to the locals:

Despite the serious issues with the San, the Botswana Tourism Organisation generally has a good relationship with community-based organisations and tribal authorities. Most land used for tourism in Botswana is leased – either in a national park or in reserves or from local communities. Safari companies ... must demonstrate the financial and environmental benefits they will provide during their lease (Responsible Travel, www.responsibletravel.com, accessed 12/1/2014).

Any mention of San eviction or dispossession, of lack of royalties from mining or Indigenous botanical knowledge, and the evident acceptance of government rhetoric that celebrates a myth of
ethnic homogeneity is omitted from this company’s promotional material. The rhetoric is also credulously embraced by some tourists, one testimony advising fellow tourists to ‘eat locally, shop locally and do little things like taking your washing to the local ladies … it can be tempting to just eat group meals but the local food is wicked and definitely worth a try’ (ibid). The observation was made by Hitchcock and Brandenburg in 1990 that the San are often ‘requested to do disagreeable chores for tourists such as washing their clothes or cleaning up their campsites’ (n.p) and the previous blog suggests this expectation is still in play.

Indeed, the eponymously ‘responsible’ facet of the company’s position appears to be directed at animal conservation rather than human rights in its (albeit admirable per se) anti trophy-hunting agenda. With, again, little understanding of the San’s realities in the settlements, Responsible Travel seeks to enhance its ethical credibility by quoting experts such as a team of National Geographic wildlife photographers who contend that ‘the conversion from hunting to photographic safaris … alleviates poaching pressure, as only those on the breadline need to resort to poaching’ (ibid). No identification is made as to who is ‘on the breadline’ and, whoever it is is apparently dismissible.

**Education and the San**

To an extent, naturally, disempowerment is the result of education, or lack thereof. Although official policy in Botswana dictates that all children have the right to go to school, the infrastructure of the education system and the nature of the San’s lives mean that they rarely see this become reality. There is also no follow-up for school inattendance. The Remote Area Development Program (RADP) has established hostels for children (predominantly San) who live long
distances from schools, but there are many documented cases of San children being harassed, even brutalised by hostel staff, so that they eventually run away. An added impediment is that minority children are instructed in Setswana until Level 2, and subsequently in English rather than having the benefit of a systemically endorsed mother-tongue transition program (Mokibelo, 2012). As a result, the number of San children attending school is diminishing each year. Thus, in the context of this modern manifestation of marginalisation, the San are generally living at the mercy of aid organisations, the meagre offerings of the tourist industry and Tswana cattle owners.

Indigenous Knowledge Systems are undermined by the transference of children to mainstream, formal settings where the transmission is alien to them because traditional knowledge includes ‘observational and participatory (as opposed to instructional) learning styles’ … In contrast, formal education systems tend to emphasise indigenous (sic) students’ incompetencies, rather than the areas in which they are already competent’ (Hays 2007: 198-199). San spokesmen James Morris and Aron Johannes of Botswana’s Ghanzi district (cited in Stewart and Hays, eds. 2010) endorse this sentiment with regard to the education San children receive in RADP schools:

Not only are we denying them our own education, but we deprive them of our social roots. Soon, when we are all gone, they will become confused and their children will have no history. They will only read about it in the books in little details and forget about it because they are not taught it at home. This is dangerous education (3).

Morris and Johannes uphold the necessity for mother-tongue education which encompasses culture, only operating where (usually church-affiliated) NGOs establish this, not in government
operated RADP schools. Jennifer Hays (2009) notes that ‘[n]o languages other than Setswana are recognized as ‘mother tongues’ for Botswana’s population ... despite the lip service of public officials to the benefits of mother-tongue education and of cultural and linguistic diversity, language policy in Botswana remains unchanged’ (403).

Mokibelo and Moumakwa (2006) identify impediments outside the language issue that have impacts upon the San’s participation in formal education, including excessive use of corporal punishment at RADP schools; family and community expectation for early marriage; sexual abuse at hostels, and bullying by Setswana-speaking children at school. Polelo (2003) asserts that school drop-out is motivated by a ‘counter-hegemonic strategy of resistance’ but becomes in effect a self-sabotage ‘in which pupils themselves lose out in attaining educational credentials that socially elevate their position’ (3). The Botswana College of Distance and Open Learning’s (BOCODOL) ‘one size fits all’ approach and supporting materials, while well-intentioned and founded firmly in Botswana’s Vision 2016 and the Botswana Millennium Goals (2004) does not account for cultural nuances and is unfamiliar with San knowledge systems (Mokibelo, 2012). Jennifer Hays (2007) posits that: ‘[t]he most serious problems that the San experience with education transcend linguistic groups and national borders ... [studies provide] strong justification for a targeted approach to San communities, and for regional collaboration on certain issues’ (137).

The complexity of the education issue is evident when it becomes obvious that education provides a ‘window to self-development [since, due to the San’s disadvantaged position] ... not many have used education for self-development’ (Nyathi, 2006: 190) and this
begs the question of what self-development means for the San; whether it is to be defined in the terms of the dominant discourse. Baba Gobabis Festus (2004), a San man, observes that:

the more education some San acquired the more they were exposed to the wider world, the more they exchanged views with other San, the more they came into contact with people who informed them about their rights ... the more they asked what benefit their community or they themselves would derive from the research, books, music tapes, films, postcards and their performance (60).

The Western researcher investigating Indigenous contexts

The onus upon all researchers within an Indigenous (indeed, any human) domain is to at the outset situate themselves ideologically in relation to those under their gaze. The necessity for this is exemplified by American writer Henry James who described tourists as ‘vulgar, vulgar, vulgar’ (cited in Edwards, 1997: 1), suggesting an incapacity of tourists for introspection. James often assumed the identity of the tourist while simultaneously attempting to set himself above and apart from his fellow sojourners. But James’s ‘touristic denial’ employs the discourses of the American tourist industry, thereby illustrating his participation in (and contribution to) the very industry that he claims to despise. Thus, the inherent contradictions of the thinking traveller’s forays into Indigenous space must be acknowledged and dealt with sensitively. Paul Gilroy’s concept of ‘vulgar cosmopolitanism’ (2005); those finding virtue simply in their ‘exposure to otherness’ (67) also exhorts tourists and researchers to be acutely aware of their motives and actions.

Social distance of privilege

While the social construction of whiteness and the critical paradigm of whiteness theory help to expose the link between oppression and privilege, I want to broaden this definition, acknowledging that
privilege is more than simply an outcome of whiteness. I accept Sacks and Lindholm’s (2002) assertion that ‘privilege is maintained by the social structure that protects dominant groups from the experience of oppression’ (129). They use the term ‘social distance of privilege’ and identify class and gender alongside race as the dimensions in which this is evident. Certainly this wider drawing of the whiteness concept is more apt for Botswana, independent from the British since 1966 and with a postcolonial ‘right to rule’ assumed by the dominant Tswana, in particular the Khama family, chiefs of a ruling clan in the region since pre-colonial times. As such, race, class and gender as sites of privilege can, I propose, be extended to encompass tribal hegemony in this context. So, the re-inscribing of whiteness as ‘social distance of privilege’ is appropriate since it is not, in fact, white people who create the imbalance of power within postcolonial Botswana, nor is it solely white researchers who undertake research into San issues.

**The tourist gaze**
The ‘tourist gaze’, a term coined by John Urry (1990) has psycho-political connotations, and makes a natural corollary with the social distance of privilege. The gaze concept is inscribed by David Spurr (1993) in colonial terms as Insubstantialization, a ‘phenomenology of consciousness’ (142) drawn as fantastical representations of the ‘Other’ by the West and as Dean McCannell’s concept of ‘reconstructing ethnicity’ (1984). At its heart it implies an imbalance of power and dovetails also with Spurr’s trope of Surveillance, namely the point at which colonised people are first observed by the colonising power: ‘[g]azed upon, they are denied the power of the gaze; spoken to, they are denied the power to speak freely’ (13) and recalls Mary Louise Pratt’s ‘monarch of all I survey’ trope (1990) that underscores the colonial project and the neo-colonialist dynamic of supremacy and
subjugation at work in most capitalist arenas. Pratt’s analogy is that of the panoramic shot commonly used by Victorian explorers to help the audience at home ‘see’ what the explorer had witnessed/discovered. Pratt observes that this monarch-of-all-I-survey scene involves ‘explicit interaction between aesthetics and ideology’ to produce a colonial mentality (205).

The tourist gaze is often an example of colonialist and gendered hegemony in the vein of David Spurr’s colonialist mindset of Eroticization. Magazines and brochures designed for tourist enticement, argue Pritchard and Morgan (2007), feature models who ‘rarely return the viewer’s gaze – a convention which confirms the viewer’s right to look and appraise – whilst their downcast eyes also serve to offer the female face for the viewer’s uninterrupted surveillance’ (174). As Charles Sugnet (1991) has it, though travelers are, in modern times, not literally in an imperialist position over those under their gaze, and may well be offended by the suggestion of any such complicity, ‘he (sic) still arrogates to himself the rights to representation, judgement and mobility that were the effects of empire’ (85).

However, as Stronza (2001) argues, this wielding of power by tourists in the way they look at locals, need not always have negative outcomes; that locals can often play a role in encounters with tourists by ‘turning back the gaze’ (272) and using initiative and creativity: ‘[i]f the tourist gaze does indeed have power to act as a mirror and, ultimately, transform the identity of the people gazed on … tourism has as much potential to revive old values as it does to destroy them … Tourism then can become an empowering vehicle of self-representation’ (271). This concept of the gaze returned is recognised by Maureen Moynah (2008) as a phenomenon that does not ‘deny that experiences of travel are shaped by
established social structures and ways of seeing, but it is to acknowledge that not only tourists see and that bodies travel too’ (40). The notion of the ‘tourist imaginary’ is conceptually related to the gaze in its various interpretations of otherness; commonly ‘products of images of difference … (re)constructed over centuries of cross-cultural contact’. These ‘representational assemblages’ are ‘meaning making and world-shaping devices’ (Salazar and Graburn, 2014: 1); interpretations borne of myriad preconceptions, often imbued with mystic wish-fulfilment as demonstrated further into this thesis with regard to specific texts. The ways in which the tourist gaze and imaginary is being redirected, realising its potential among the Botswana San is demonstrated in Chapter Five of this thesis. Both these cognitive and emotional investments of tourists feed into a mandate of authenticity in their experience.

**The myth of authenticity**

The tourist demand for - (and supply of) authenticity often, according to Carmen M. White (2007) *in itself* ‘privileg[es] processes of othering’ [whereby] ‘host societies [are] made to embody an authenticity or ‘realness’ that jaded western ‘middle-class’ tourists have lost’ … reinforc[ing] binary oppositions between ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’ (26). The notion of the authenticity of the tourist experience is explored by Dean MacCannell (1973) who coined the term ‘staged authenticity’ (92) to describe the way tourist expectations and preconceptions are not disappointed due to constructed realities borne of a perception of ‘the shallowness of their lives’ in relation to ‘the sacred in primitive society’ (1973: 589-590).

Tourist gullibility is a vital element of this dynamic; host societies relying on either utter credulity of the ‘pseudo events’ offered or at
least a temporary suspension of disbelief because, as Boorstin (1964) asserts: ‘the tourist seldom likes the authentic ... product of the foreign culture; he prefers his (sic) own provincial expectations’ (106). Ning Wang (1999) identifies three forms of ‘authenticity’ in the tourist experience: the objective, constructive and existential. All are demonstrably at work in the Botswana context with relation to the San.

Briefly, ‘objective authenticity’ refers to original objects alongside tourist cognition of these objects as originals (or primary) artefacts, such as those found in museums and denounced by Boorstin as being (usually) ‘the well-contrived imitation, outshin[ing] the original’ (353). A revisionist extension of the objective definition is ‘constructive authenticity’ which is more nuanced; symbolic in nature, referring to projections of tourists’ expectations, preferences and beliefs (and tourist providers’ satisfying of same) upon ‘toured objects’, where reality is interpreted and constructed by those consuming the experiences and the objects, present in its extreme form as hyper-reality, evident in many tourist texts featured in Chapters Three and Four. Globalisation, claims Wang, is accelerating at such a rate that ‘it is increasingly difficult for the authenticity of the original such as the marginal ethnic culture to remain immutable’ (358), paving the way for a more existential tourist engagement as alternative experience.

‘Existential authenticity’ is ontological; ‘a state of Being’ (Wang, 1999: 352) effected by activities undertaken or performance witnessed by tourists (note Wang’s capitalisation of ‘Being’, suggestive of the existential philosophers, heralding a heightened state of awareness). This perception of authenticity is not grounded in temporality or spatial domains, but in an anxiety about human
existence. Manifestations of this will become evident in the
discussion of tourist responses to the San ‘trance dance’ in Chapter
Four of this thesis. In all cases, the common element is something
other than the tourist; something external.

While White (2007) challenges us to ‘disengag[e] authenticity from
othering tendencies’ (27) she does concede that MacCannell, in his
categorising of authentic experiences by their ‘natural’ intimacy
and closeness in terms of the sacred, or the pilgrimage, accurately
interprets tourists’ motivations generally and this awareness
necessarily extends to academic scrutiny of tourists and tourism
practices.

**Dilemmas**

A further consideration for First World researchers is articulated by
anthropologist Jennifer Hays (2007) who conducts empirical,
community-based research with the San. She concedes that
researchers engaging in interchanges with Indigenous communities
in a ‘host-guest paradigm’ - which Aramberri (2001) sees as illusory,
and Sherlock (2001) considers a simplistic binary - are inherently part
of the accelerating process of change which inevitably includes
‘incorporation into the cash economy, urbanization, and a shift to a
status as subservient peoples at the very bottom of a social hierarchy,
as opposed to independent, self-sustaining hunters and gatherers
with an egalitarian social structure’ (6). This is certainly the case for
the San in Botswana today, having been forcibly relocated from the
Central Kalahari Game Reserve and even after a 2006 High Court
ruling that the eviction was unlawful, are unable to return, often in
fear of their lives. Aware that researchers cannot claim to be neutral
onlookers in this process, Hays acknowledges the dilemma that
‘having inherited this academic legacy, we have a responsibility to
give something back. However, ‘giving back’ can be a problematic issue, for who is going to define what this reciprocity entails?’ (ibid: 6,7). This calls up Susan Sontag’s recognition of a dilemma of representing the marginalised: ‘[p]erhaps the only people with the right to look at images of suffering ... are those who could do something to alleviate it’ (39) and recalls Aramberri’s aforementioned cynicism with regard to the ‘host-guest’ relationship in tourism and research (both domains, he argues, an exchange of commodities) since it is often based on the misconception that ‘just denouncing what is done will make it disappear’ (747). Also, as Aramberri challenges, the interactions between peoples of vastly different social circumstances having a ‘shared covenant of nonmonetary reciprocities ... is preposterous’ (745) since, as Kirsty Sherlock notes, ‘the myth-making quality of tourism is interwoven with socio-economic power relations between the core and the periphery’ (2001: 283). This is endorsed by Van Beek and Schmidt (2012) who cynically dub the infrastructure created to host the visitor the ‘tourist bubble’ (10) and call for more research into the effects of tourism upon ‘host’ communities. Based on her observations in Pacific contexts, Carmen M. White (2007) is equally sceptical, noting that ‘juxtaposed to ‘friendliness’ in the language of Fiji tourism, ‘hospitality’ also connotes familiarity and social proximity, even as it bespeaks asymmetrical relations between tourists and hosts’ (45). In any case, Aramberri contends, ‘communities do not speak with one single voice and are ridden with many conflicts of interest’ (750).

The assumption of ‘one single voice’ via representational essentialising is another paradox of conducting research and its inscription. Political theories of recognition such as Charles Taylor’s (1994) are problematic when the legitimacy of collective rights is set against individualism, begging the question as to the ontology of
the collective: is it an entity qua a group that transcends the individuals that constitute it? The universalism of Taylor’s ideal holds that rights and entitlements should be equalised in a spirit of dignity and respect. This is achieved by way of the ‘politics of difference’ whereby an individual or group is not required to relinquish their uniqueness. But as Maureen Moynah (2008) notes, there is a potential contradiction inherent to addressing ‘mutual interests, commonality and plural loyalties – without erasing difference’ (5), an issue which Hays (2000) recognises as being embedded in her depiction of the San in Ghanzi whom she has ‘defined according to an essential set of characteristics’ (38). The impossibility of circumventing this relational inequality is something researchers must acknowledge and to which they must be sensitive. I justify this in the vein of Les Field’s (1999) assertion that while essentialism, in its insidious manifestations which result in a group’s systemic dismissal, is ardently to be avoided, overarching categories can have a place in empowering a people whose voice, effectively silenced in fragmented groups, would be more likely heard when emanating from a larger network. Those who, like the many capacity-building organisations, academics and, to a meagre extent, like myself, with the impetus of humanitarian concern, seek to expose the position of the San in modern Botswana, are on the horns of a dilemma in terms of representation, since that same concern necessitates a level of essentialising and objectification of the San in abstract terms, or, expresses P.W Mwikisa (2006) ‘as signifiers in constructions of narratives in which their images are aesthetically exploited in ways that do not necessarily undermine the language of prejudice against them’ (101). This sits conceptually alongside Taylor’s observation that ‘dominant groups tend to entrench their hegemony by inculcating an image of inferiority in the subjugated’ (1994: 66). Along with Taylor and others I argue for the place of social
and political recognition, despite its practical shortcomings, as a vital element of self-realisation.

This leads me necessarily to the acknowledgement that the very practice of applying theory to representations of Indigenous peoples implies a power imbalance. As Raewynn Connell (2007) suggests, to hold and expound theories is, in essence, a dominant, or ‘majority world’ practice; a privileged position of relative power, whereby colonies (or *periphery*) have been the sites of ‘data gathering and application … while theorising happens in the metropole’ (ix). In other words, the ‘truth’ (or interpretation arising from the data collected) is for those in dominant positions to access and to apply. The terms ‘majority’ and ‘periphery’ are deployed by Connell in the sense of possessing the *means* by which knowledge is produced and then perpetuated as universal. Such means, obviously, are still largely unavailable to the ‘periphery world’, making the creation of knowledge on the fringe largely non-viable. This is also conceded by Chris Dunton (2015) who notes that those in the centre derive ‘power both in the sense of status (endowed by class position, gender, race) and in the sense of access to resources’ (35). Karin Barber (1984, cited in Spurr, 1998) acknowledges that deconstruction is the product of a Western literary and philosophical tradition … and that its strategy of reading appears more suited to exposing the overwhelming power of Western metaphysics than to identifying the exercises of power inherent in concrete human activity, especially in non-Western settings (199).

In the context of ethnicity, Stuart Hall (1989) commends the challenge leveled at the ‘discourses of the West’; the undermining of centred narratives’ ‘transcendental claim to speak for everyone’
(n.p). Thus, it is incumbent upon the researcher to keep this awareness at the forefront of their investigations.

I encountered one such dilemma in Ghanzi, Botswana, when photographing a San woman making eggshell necklaces for tourists frequenting the craft shop nearby. I made hand gestures and smiled, by way of asking her permission to photograph her, and read her nod as acquiescence. While there was no conscious set-up to the photograph (indeed, having gained what I interpreted to be the woman’s permission to photograph her, I wished to impose on her for as brief a time as possible) it was nevertheless unsettling for me, as it was perhaps for the woman.

There is no doubt that the I (my eye), unlike the impartial lens of the camera, responded with subjectivity to this woman, to our common humanity, to the arbitrariness of life that means one of us can afford the eggshell necklaces, while the other could never do so.

The experience of taking this photograph is also redolent of Gillespie’s ‘reverse gaze’ (2006) which, he posits, causes embarrassment and discomfort for the tourist’ (343). It is the punctum – or subjective, emotional response which Barthes (1979) characterises as a ‘wound’:

this mark made by a pointed instrument: the word suits me all the better in that it also refers to the notion of punctuation, and because the photographs I am speaking of are in effect punctuated, sometimes even speckled with these sensitive points; precisely these marks, these wounds are so many points ... punctum is also: sting, speck, cut, little hole - and also a cast of the dice. A

4 This photograph, along with further analysis, is located in Chapter Four (Figure 5).
photograph’s punctum is that accident which pricks me (but also bruises me, is poignant to me). (46-7).

Moynah (2008) qualifies Urry’s (1990) positioning of photography within the paradigm of European industrial capitalism in a way that, I believe, aptly describes the dynamic operating when I took the San woman’s photograph:

A given tourist may, by virtue of her gender or her political identifications, insert herself only partially or reluctantly into established ways of seeing; may encounter in her travels political, material and physical impediments to the task of representation; may find herself disconcertingly transformed into the object of a gaze that refuses assimilation (39).

In his seminal work Orientalism (1978) Edward Said asserts that the European is a ‘secret writer’ in an ‘us and them’ exchange; the ‘Oriental’ behaving and the Orientalist (the term Orientalist deployed for my purposes in this thesis as synonymous with a generalist colonial worldview), recording the behaviour for dissemination and interpretation in European institutions. Said appears to be suggesting that such ‘secret knowledge’ converts easily into domination and exploitation, that the depictions of the Orient (the ‘Orient’ defined herein as any colonised context) and its people will necessarily employ the detached discourse of ‘scientific’ observation to disguise the motives of vested interest. But Said believes that this does not occur in the reverse, that ‘the Orientalist can imitate the Orient without the opposite being true’ (160). Benjamin Graves (1998b) paraphrases Gayatari Spivak’s (1988) warning to researchers who altruistically seek to grant collective voice to the subaltern, yet in doing so risk making: ‘a logocentric assumption of cultural solidarity among a heterogeneous people, and ... [affirming] a dependence on western intellectuals to ‘speak
for’ the subaltern condition rather than allowing them to speak for themselves’ (1). Spivak appears to be encouraging reflexivity and issuing a warning to postcolonialists against exactly the essentialising and condescending practice they critique and purport to avoid.

Chapter Five of this thesis notes and celebrates the burgeoning voice and agency of the decidedly subaltern San in modern Botswana, but accepts that Spivak’s sentiments reflect a long-entrenched reality. Those commentators, suggests Mogalakwe (2003) who accept the orthodoxy within Botswana that the class project is a ‘national project in the national interest’, rather than recognising it as a palpable case of class (specifically Tswana) hegemony, are effectively complicit in perpetuating the ‘myth of the Botswana miracle’ (88) and, by extension, the practices of marginalisation necessitated by the project. In a similar vein, Michel Foucault (1969) suggests that discourses (and within these I include visual representations) are subject to exclusion practices which determine who can say what, when – and since discourses produce knowledge, knowledge itself must be seen as a construct within paradigms of power.

Articulating a more moderate approach, Robert Dessaix (1998) posits that both Said and Foucault are overly concerned with exposing domination and exploitation agendas and should be more celebratory of the social dynamic created by the mix of cultures, since it epitomises the nature of society ‘to remark on what happens when two ways of being in the world intersect’ (197). Dessaix acknowledges the language (and other artistic imaging) of eroticisation/oppression/stereotyping in Orientalist discourse but asserts that Said’s epistemology does not leave scope for wisdom, which ‘implies a much wider and more complex relationship
between the knower and the known than Said’s … European notion of knowledge’ (185). It is essentially this potential for awareness, wisdom and nuance, thereby overturning the effects of representational domination, that my thesis exposes and celebrates in relation to the San of postcolonial Botswana. One step towards this endeavour may be naming from within. Naming lies at the heart of social and political self-determination, and this may one day be adopted by San groups across southern Africa.

Nomenclature
Kenneth Good (1999) submits that the names by which the San are called by others are all ‘to varying degrees terms of abuse. Basarwa is the official designation of Bushmen/San people in Botswana and its usage cannot be avoided for that reason. The impoverishment of the people has not only been material but also cultural and political, in their loss of a history and the lack of a self-given name’ (201).

Having long been aware of the sensitivity surrounding the name Bushman which was originally conferred by the Dutch, this name only appears where I quote others referring to the San of the Kalahari using this term. I initially employed the ubiquitous name ‘San’, under the misconception that this was the most acceptable term to encompass the many southern African language groups with the linguistic distinction of click phonology. Although this term is adopted by several capacity-building organisations with great respect for the San, such as The Centre for San Studies (University of Botswana) and is defined innocuously by Le Roux and White (2004) as meaning ‘those who forage’ (4) the authors concede that, while they used the term San in their work they acknowledge the variety of ‘terms used by individuals and groups to refer to themselves and their communities … though the term San might be regarded as the
least degrading, it still perpetuates … the misrepresentation of peoples and their history’ (6). Neil Bennun (2004) concurs: ‘[n]either San nor Bushman was a positive term. San – ‘cattleless’ – was a denigrating word used by a people for whom cattle were everything, the Khoekhoen, for others who had none’ (381). Tlou and Campbell (1984, cited in Kiema, 2010: 68) have it that the very term Bushman means those people who occupy an unoccupied land. This begs the obvious question for Kiema, a (Kua) San man: ‘[s]o the presence of people in a piece of land is not perceived as an occupation of that land by those people and the land is then perceived to be occupied only if tribes rather than the ‘Bushmen’ are in that land. What a convenient definition!’ (68).

While the above is a fairly mild assessment of the San nomenclature, I find it difficult to justify its use in the light of its derogatory definition in San author Kuela Kiema’s memoir Tears for my Land (2010) which elucidates that:

in a strict sense, Sääb (sic) is a noun referring to a man who picks food from dustbins or the ground because of poverty. Although it describes the socio-economic situation of our people, there are many people who pick up food from the ground, dustbins and other filthy places for their survival and all these poorest of the poor are not called Sään … the name has gained popularity with those involved in ‘improving’ our conditions, but due to the ignorance of some academics and agencies, many people understand the term San to be the most neutral and unifying name of all the first in habitants of southern Africa, excluding the Khoekhoe. In a perverse response, the huge sums of donor money attached to the term San have compelled many to strive to promote, develop and legitimise it (70).

The Khoekhoen or Khoisan, according to Smith, et al (2000) is a general term for speakers of click languages of southern Africa and
‘which physical anthropologists use as a biological term to distinguish the aboriginal people of southern Africa from their black farming neighbours’ (2). The term Khoi, according to Sylvain (2005) is ‘often used to refer to Nama-speaking peoples, who are linguistically and culturally similar to San’ (367). San researchers, however, avoid this term since it does not sufficiently distinguish between the cattle-owning Khoi people and (traditionally) hunter-gatherer San people.

Basarwa, the collective name for the San common within Botswana is a Setswana (dominant language) general name for the people to whom I refer. Ian Taylor and Gladys Mokhawa (2003) assert that it is ‘supposed to come from the Setswana phrase bao-ba-ba-sa—ruing dikgomo (those who do not rear cattle), which establishes the norm by which the San are judged in negative terms' (261). San man Kuela Kiema extends the attribution to ‘those with nothing: no tribal territory, no livestock, no culture, no property, no rights, no language, no ethnic identity, no human dignity, even no chief’ (Kiema, 2010: 39). As such the term Basarwa (Mosarwa for individuals) will only occur where I am quoting others. The country’s name, too ‘is an arbitrary name and represents Tswana tribal hegemony over the many non-Tswana peoples who reside in the country’ (Solway, 2010:1). ‘The First People of the Kalahari’, a name often deployed by anthropologists, is of the colonial language, which fact in itself could render it offensive; it could be confused with the advocacy group, The First People of the Kalahari (FPK), and in any case, this title encompasses several completely diverse ethnic groups. Nthomang (2006), supporting Kiema’s statements, acknowledges that ‘[the San] prefer to use their own titles that connect them to Earth and to deeply significant spiritual relationships with land as a source of livelihood … they prefer to call
themselves N/oakwe or Kwe, that is, the ‘red people’ because of their skin colour and association with the desert in which they live’ (103).

It must be acknowledged that some essentialising of a people is unavoidable when one ‘umbrella’ term is employed to define a large ethnic group with distinctive cultural and linguistic variations within it. Yet despite the derogatory etymology of the term San, researchers nonetheless employ it. The scope of this study in terms of the representations it analyses goes beyond one particular clan, so a name with broader coverage is necessary. The complexities of the naming of the people of this study are legion and perhaps can never be fully understood by outsiders. This, I posit, continues to fragment the people such that their resistance is still relatively ineffectual, although the situation is gradually improving as will be demonstrated in the chapter identifying self-representation as resistance (Chapter Five). The San’s representation as First Peoples from both within and without the San community, has certainly engendered much international interest, commercially, academically and altruistically, and an official acceptance of this status has the potential to help or hinder the process of self-determination.

**Indigeneity**

Indigeneity is a contentious concept and must be defined for the purpose of study, especially in light of the San’s claims to ethnic uniqueness. The San’s assertion of Indigeneity is based on their ‘First People’ status, the fact that they were the original occupiers of the land which comprises (predominantly) modern-day Botswana. This is endorsed by many in the international community (Cook and Sarkin, 2009: 121). The Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating
Committee (IPACC) adds the dimension of disputed ideological and political terrain to their definition of Indigeneity, referring to those who ‘occupied a territory before other peoples and suffer current marginalisation [5 October, 2004, my italics]. The first part of this definition is fraught with complication in the context of the Kalahari region, since the Bakgalagadi claim to the area is possibly more robust than the San, who originally spanned most of southern Africa. The remote aridity of the Kalahari region provided security from later groups dominating the San, most recently white settlers expanding their territory. Also many San assimilated with later arrivals, as evident in the characteristic click sounds present in some Bantu dialects. But Alan Barnard (2007) identifies the fact that Indigenous people ‘do not seek to dominate or oppress; they only seek to be regarded as different, albeit with special rights … (e.g. to land under traditional arrangements)’ (6). Sidsel Saugestad, a scholar involved in the San court case of 2006, identifies the following definitions of Indigenous:

- first arrival: people who are descendants of those inhabiting an area at the time of the arrival of other groups,

- non-dominance: people who are placed under a state structure with social and cultural characteristics alien to theirs, do not control the national government and constitute a numerical minority,

- cultural distinctiveness: people who have, or have had, a traditional adaptation system using resources and territories in a way that differs from the social and economic adaptation of the present majority,

- self-definition: people who identify themselves as indigenous people and who see themselves—and are seen by others—as different from the ‘incoming’ peoples (1997: 294).

Barnard (2006), also recognising that ‘definitions must at best be polythetic’, asserts that the second and fourth criteria identified by
Saugestad – non-dominance and self-ascription – are the most significant. However, Adam Kuper (2003) raises concerns about the concept of Indigeneity, arguing that, despite the undoubtedly generous motivation of most Indigenous people’s movements, they form the basis of land claims that ‘rely on obsolete anthropological notions and on a romantic and false ethnographic vision. Fostering essentialist ideologies of culture and identity, they may have dangerous political consequences’ (395). This of course begs the question as to Kuper’s definition of both ‘dangerous’ and ‘consequences’, so that his skepticism about claims to Indigeneity can be subject to a justified scrutiny of his own political motives.

But there is some sympathy for Kuper’s position, in the vein of Renee Sylvain’s (2005) recognition that the ‘international indigenous (sic) people’s movement, as a form of “globalization from below”’, adds another layer of essentialism to the idea of culture by using it to provide a crucial part of the contrast between Indigenous peoples and impoverished “ordinary folk” (366). Jen Couch (2004:154) notes Indigenous people being represented as inherently democratic; as noble (virtually nonviolent) warriors, and as passive victims who have been grossly neglected and abused by their government. This type of romanticisation or stereotyping of the other is understood by many to be simply another form of colonisation. Fanon calls it the ‘final liquidation…the digestion of natives’ (1963); Albert Memmi calls it ‘identity appropriation’ or the repackaging and promotion of native perspectives to facilitate their incorporation into the dominant culture (2000).

Such positive stereotyping leading to essentialism is as potentially insidious as its negative counterpart. This thesis attempts to draw upon an objective, non-idealised foundation for its definition. Roxanne Dunbar Ortiz (1984: 82) defines Indigenous peoples in the manner of the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
(IWGIA) as those ‘descended from a country’s aboriginal population and, who today are completely or partly deprived of the right to their own territories and its riches. The peoples of the 4th world have only limited influence or none at all in the national states to which they belong’.5

Challenging Kuper’s ongoing mission (1988, 2003) to discredit all definitions of Indigeneity on the grounds of ethnographic fallacy supporting vested interests, Barnard (2006) points out that simply because a community may be a recent manifestation does not render it inauthentic: ‘[r]eal ‘traditions’ can be invented, just as ‘imagined communities’ can be real communities – assuming we recognise social reality as a social construct [just as] the notion of ‘indigeneity’ (sic) is itself a western construct, and claims to it follow a western social construction of ‘indigenous’ authenticity’ (10).

Barnard concedes that definitions of Indigenous peoples are problematic in a purely anthropological sense and broadens the classification to legal and political criteria, including ‘being affected by civil war, nation-building by centralized states and inappropriate economic projects’ (ibid). Even this extension Barnard deems inadequate, acknowledging an intangible, almost mystical element to the definition of Indigeneity which adds to the conceptual complexity and has an impact upon the construction of representation, demonstrably in the modern tourism paradigm. Stuart Hall (1989) problematises the concept of the parallel concept of ethnicity, noting the necessity to decouple ethnicity, as it functions in the dominant discourse, from its equivalence with nationalism.

5 Fourth World theory is a critique of development agencies’ general failure to acknowledge that decolonisation has simply delegated power to a postcolonial regime that continues to marginalise and, in effect, internally colonise certain groups (Sylvain 2005).
imperialism, racism and the state, which are the points of attachment around which a distinctive ... English ethnicity have been constructed (n.p).

Such an observation as Hall’s could have been made of the Botswana context. The nation is party to certain international agreements to protect Indigenous rights, including the African Charter, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR); the International Convention in the Elimination of all Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD); The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD) General Recommendation 23 on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. However, by way of its Remote Area Development Program (RADP), the Government of Botswana categorises the San and other non-Setswana speaking peoples by their ‘absence of valued Tswana qualities’ (Cook and Sarkin: 120). Despite the ethnic groups being so labelled, no obligation is felt by the government to uphold these international obligations and Botswana’s status as a dualist state means that it is not obliged to write such treaties into law. Indeed, as Cook and Sarkin (2009) note, the Government of Botswana’s support for the San has been limited. Not one state report has been submitted since ratifying the Charter on July 17, 1986, as specified under Article 62 of the Charter. They claim that unless the government recognises the San as Indigenous, the situation will remain stagnant.

Teedzani Thapelo (2002) notes the insistence by government of the ‘insignificant’ number of San, citing a fixed population in Botswana of 30,000 or less than two per cent of Botswana’s population. This was refuted by the Christian Michelsen Institute (CMI) which, in 1996 calculated the number of San to be possibly over 100,000, constituting ten percent of the population. The subordination of this
proportion of a nation’s people, suggests Kenneth Good ‘reflects seriously on Botswana’s democracy’ (109). Barnard (1998) cites threats by the Botswana government to change the country’s constitution if those claiming to be Indigenous [read: the San] succeeded in their land rights case as epitomising the ‘relation of dominance of one group over another, and especially the relation of different groups to the state, where the state is perceived as protecting the values of non-indigenous over indigenous peoples’ (72).

This thesis is founded upon an acceptance of the definitions of Indigeneity articulated by the Danish IWGIA, Sidsel Saugestad and Alan Barnard, also acknowledging the point made by Andy Chebanne (2006) that it is ‘not so much whether [the San] are indigenous (sic) or the minority, but whether they have or do not have ethnic rights (linguistic, cultural) and territorial rights (customary land rights) recognized by the state ... It is not how to access development, but who you are in development’ (144).

**Self-determination**

The right to self-determination is recognised under international law in Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The shape and scope of self-determination as it applies to Indigenous people is open to interpretation, however, and as such, holds a capacity for positive and negative manifestations.

I am indebted to the work of Aaron Bobrow-Strain (2007) who eschews the temptation to simplistically draw corporations and landowners who have uprooted Indigenous people from their ancestral lands as the ‘bad guys’ by asking ‘how would it change understandings of how positions of privilege and domination are
created in general? And, most important, how would it change understandings of the politics of challenging those positions?’ (18).

In the light of this, I attempt to define self-determination in the Kalahari San context in a positive, proactive and not overly dichotomous manner, working towards a ‘horizontal political culture’ characterised by ‘dialogue, respect for difference and autonomous organization’ (Dellacioppa, 2009: 22). Several Indigenous movements and organisations identify themselves as nations and in their proposals seek the constitution of multinational states … they no longer accept ‘ethnic’ or ‘peasant’ categorisation which they consider reductive to economic or ethnographic categories made by Western anthropologists which takes away their identity as a people.

Australian Aboriginal lawyer Larissa Behrendt (2002) posits that a broad and multi-faceted rights-based vision of Indigenous self-determination is necessary for any long-term outcomes to be effected. This must go beyond mere policy to embrace economic and property rights as these allow ‘income generation, enterprise and self-sufficiency’ (n.p). Behrendt claims that policy has been characterised in the Australian context (applicable also to the Botswana San) as imposing ‘programs or structures onto Indigenous people without thought of cultural conflict or impact on social, cultural and kin relationships’. Self-determination, she argues, should not be defined by government policy but by ‘Indigenous political vision’ and advocates community-level initiatives, rather than ‘imposing concepts as they have been developed in international forums on to Indigenous communities. It is a bottom-up, rather than top-down approach’ (ibid).
I concede that the development of self-representation within a tourism framework is but one element of a multi-faceted approach to self-determination but I assert that systemic and institutional change that recognises Indigenous rights will only occur as a result of such grass-roots initiatives generated by the people themselves, since as Moynah (2008) recognises, traditionally, tourism has been ‘a more adequate structure than language or nation for accounting for the uneven processes of modernization around the world’ (9).

This first chapter introduces historical and social contextualisation to the position of the San in postcolonial Botswana. Herein, I also locate myself within various paradigms of analysis, including the theoretical and ethical foundations of my interpretation of concepts such as self-determination, nomenclature and Indigeneity. The position of my role relative to those I am researching is acknowledged; the dilemmas researchers encounter, such as the unavoidability of a certain degree of essentialism, and the reflective honesty with which we must undertake our endeavours.

The following chapter reveals the place left open in research of the San to investigate a link between disempowerment, empowerment and tourism by way of a representation paradigm. Chapter Two also demonstrates the way manifestations of this link are to be deconstructed, both technically and theoretically.
Chapter Two
Literature, Theory and Method

The previous chapter provides necessary contextual background by situating the Botswana San in the historical, social and political landscape. This goes some way towards explaining their modern predicament as a people whose image, cultural history and labour are still often appropriated and exploited. This chapter looks more widely at representations of the San through three discrete sections: (a) a review of literature pertaining to the San and their representation today and throughout history; (b) the theoretical underpinnings of the analysis of tourism text in the following chapters, and (c) my methodology, encompassing textual sampling, critical technique and the application of theory.

Jennifer Hays (2007) asserts that the Ju ‘hoansi San of Namibia, along with the Dobe San in Botswana, are ‘among the most researched people on the planet’ (4) and although these communities constitute but two language groups, Hays’ observation can be extrapolated to encompass the entire assembly within an overarching San identity across southern Africa. In anthropological and historical terms it is the case that the San have been comprehensively researched, and in more recent times, the struggle against corporate land appropriation and the San’s consequent dispossession has also been thoroughly documented. Some San groups have resented the intrusive curiosity of researchers, journalists, filmmakers and tourists (WIMSA 2002). Varied research foci, especially that emanating from a collaborative San research program of the University of Botswana and the University of Trømso, Norway which began in 1996 and recently became the sole responsibility of UB, include ‘land rights, power relations, culture and identity, the meaning of development, democracy and human
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rights as well as the underlying social conflicts and contradictions in
government policies (Selolwane and Saugestad 2002: 73-74). Necessarily, portrayals of the San produced by government and industry make expedient reference to anthropological and historical text to underscore the central mythology of the tourism industry pertaining to the San.

Though it is a corporate/government deception and one especially galling in a country with systemic projects of eviction from traditional lands and forced minority assimilation into dominant Tswana frameworks alongside rapid modernisation, the persuasive tourism rendering is that the San are unique, autonomous and relatively untouched by the modern world. Mary Louise Pratt (1986) identifies the ‘blazing contradiction between a tendency ... to historicize the [San] as survivor-victims of European imperialism, and a tendency ... to naturalize and objectify them as primal beings virtually untouched by history’ (1986, in Barnard 2007: 132). This review, then, identifies the literature encircling my enterprise here, demonstrating the place left open for a postcolonial analysis of tourism text as a neo-colonialist construct with destructive potential where it is generated about the San without their authorisation, yet with constructive, self-determining possibilities where produced by the San themselves. The situating of my research into tourism representations of the San within the body of existing work on San issues is further distinctive in its theoretical approach.

The discussion of theory is an amalgamation of postcolonialist and tourism critique. Such a blending within this study seems only natural because colonialisht assumptions, to which postcolonial critique necessarily responds, originally emanated from travel and its resultant experiences of the ‘other’. Still today, many of the same
colonialist premises exist to the advantage of those in power, and by extension, to the disadvantage of any others, effecting a neo-colonialist power-dynamic. Obviously this study incorporates contexts outside the ‘Oriental’ exemplars in Said’s *Orientalism* (1978) but an extrapolation for this purpose is the substitution of the tourist industry (cited in some cases supported by government) for European imperialism, the San for Said’s ‘Orient’ and colonialist/capitalist discourse for ‘Orientalism’. Calás & Smircich (1999) claim that to undermine the hegemony of a dominant centre theorising about the cultural periphery ‘we need to ask the following questions. What other theories are there, or should there be? Which groups of people are written out of current theories and what are the consequences of such marginalization?’ (cited in Prasad 2003: 138). The physical and embodied texts subject to postcolonial and post-tourism critique are sampled, categorised and analysed according to methodology that is as philosophically faithful to the purposes of this research as possible.

Methodologically, the analysis of text in this thesis is a deliberate divergence from any poststructuralist/postmodernist tendency to view negative experiences more as ‘representational issues than as acts of extreme violence and destruction’ (Baudrillard, 1995, in Prasad, 2003: 54). In this vein, Terry Goldie (1989) acknowledges that: ‘the shape of the signifying process as it applies to indigenous peoples is formed by a certain semiotic field, a field that provides the boundaries within which the images of the indigene function’ (cited in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995). But he goes a step further, using the metaphor of the chess board to illustrate relative power, recognising the political agenda and human impact: ‘The indigene is a semiotic pawn on a chess board under the control of the white signmaker ... [who] can move the pawns only within certain
prescribed areas ... a replica of the black and white squares, with clearly limited oppositional moves' (232-233). This would certainly be endorsed by Edward Said (1978) who suggests that this is a relational typical of power imbalances in colonial contexts: ‘[m]any of the earliest oriental amateurs began by welcoming the Orient as a salutary derangement of their European habits of mind ... Yet ... such over-esteem was followed by a counter-response: The Orient suddenly appeared ... backward, barbaric’ (150).

(a) Review of Literature

In the following coverage, themes are categorised by way of critical literature’s critique of the San’s representations as children, hyper-real/commodities, victims, ‘less than’, a doomed race, and agitators for change. In most case, these themes are inter-related and overlap, but a flexible organisational structure is overlayed for clarity.

The San as children

Hays (2007) notes the infantilisation of the San within common representations and metaphors that endorse this relational dynamic, even from quarters it is least expected:

[While it may not be particularly surprising to encounter such paternalistic attitudes among Afrikaner farmers towards their Bushman workers, it surprised me at first to encounter it so ubiquitously among development workers and others that I worked with during my periods of employment with local organizations (315).]

This is exacerbated in many instances by the self-esteem of the San themselves in relation to others, an issue oft-noted throughout this thesis. Chebanne (2006) attributes this sense of inferiority to the San being ‘under the generalizing effects of the majority ... [finding] their
identity diminished and their participation in socio-cultural activities devalorized’ (144). Hays provides a poignant anecdote of an incident while on a field trip with some San women who considered her superior and more deserving of respect than they because she drove a car, as though this were a marker of maturity and sophistication. Hays responded that were she to be stranded in the Kalahari she would not be able to survive without the women’s knowledge and skills, yet “development workers, missionaries, teachers, and anthropologists have in varying ways assumed the role of “parents,” working to ensure that their “adopted children” are able to access adequate resources’ (315). Nyathi (2006) cites Hakansson’s (2001) description of the San’s place in Namibia and asserts that this observation is also true of the San in Botswana as ‘widely regarded to be … incapable of making adult decisions on their own … government extension workers and officials working with [the San] have … been unable to move beyond ethnocentric interpretation of [San] behaviour (195).

The San as victims
San’s Lament: San school children made an anguished cry for respect at a meeting held to let them voice their grievances (Tebogo Mogale).

The above headline appeared in The Botswana Gazette, December 16, 1998. The implication of victimhood and a lack of agency is embedded in the words ‘lament’ and ‘anguished’, as Hays notes in her (2000) discourse analysis of this article. Botswana newspaper headlines since have commonly drawn the San as victims using emotive language, to wit: ‘Voice of the Refugees at Home’ (The Voice, March 30, 2001) and ‘Home is in Old Xade, Where our Hearts are!’ (The Voice, March 23, 2001). Over a decade
after the Gazette article’s publication, San self-determination is suggested to be an elusive ideal, for example, ‘Basarwa say they are discriminated against’ heads an article in the Botswana daily, Mmegi (19th August, 2011) and ‘100 pupils drop out of New Xade primary’ (The Midweek Sun, 14 September, 2011). Hays, however, acknowledges the limitations of both journalistic discourse and a purely semantic analysis of it, stressing that what ‘the San themselves are saying … and the ways that they are also, through discourse, both affirming and contesting the existing hegemony’ (37) are important issues to address. More objective and rigorous academic papers often draw the San as victims also, tacitly perpetuating their historical positioning through a tone of futility in the face of government and corporate interests.

Mmila and Janie (2006) refer to the fact that the majority of the Naro (San of the Ghanzi area, Botswana) residing in what became the Ghanzi farm block relinquished their land to white farmers and the only condition under which they could stay on was as labourers on the farms. As Kiema confirms: ‘we watched the land our people had lived on for centuries become commercial farm land [for] the British and Boers … we were used as ‘human fences’ to look after cattle, day and night’ (88). This has had ramifications upon lifestyle and inevitably upon self-perception: ‘like all San communities of Botswana, the Naro face an unrelenting encroachment of modernism and this often brings about social changes that the communities are not capable of managing or channeling to better preserve their indigenous knowledge systems’ (8). Again Kiema endorses this: ‘once well-off people with high self-respect began to see themselves as others considered them, as livestock thieves’ (88-89). Such debasement of the San by white farmers, perpetuated by the Tswana in postcolonial Botswana, and the San’s subsequent,
inevitable loss of self-esteem (documented comprehensively throughout this thesis) sets up the ideal conditions for appropriation to be sustained.

NGOs and other capacity-building organisations, both in-country and international, support San causes, some to the good, others not. Sethunya Tshepo Mphinyane (2006) endorses this lack of respect for the capacity of the Botswana San in a graphic account of the de-validation of their knowledge systems by both government and NGOs claiming to represent the San. She posits that many NGOs do not recognise the San as being capable of determining things for themselves. Mphinyane cites the example of San spokesman Komtsha Komstsha who made Sidsel Saugestad aware in 1992 that the apparent ‘apathy’ of the San is as much due to the domineering nature of supporter representation as to the state; that Survival International and Ditshwanelo, two of the San’s most outspoken advocate bodies, often refuse to accept that some San might be ‘genuinely seeking it in their best interests to move out [of the CKGR]. 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’ (79). The narratives of NGOs and a burgeoning voice of the San do not, however, discount the fact of hundreds of years of debasement, the legacies of which can only be overcome given time, education and increased agency.

The depiction of the San as victims can, however, take an apparently contradictory turn in popular opinion in Botswana. Hays (2000) notes with cynicism the fact that although the San ‘are rendered passive in their representation and in their development processes, they are not excused from being responsible for the multiple social problems of their communities’ (31), drawing the
people as dominated but simultaneously ‘less than’ by way of their own lifestyle choices’, and thereby undeserving. Hays (2007) posits that the discourse of the San as child-like and living in the moment are in part new ‘variations of a discourse that depicts San as less fully developed than other human populations’ (112).

The San as ‘less than’

‘Sometimes I equate [the Bushman issue] to the elephants. We once had the same problem when we wanted to cull the elephants and people said no’. (Margaret Nasha, 2002, minister in the office of the President and responsible for public service, cited in Survival International Press Release, 10/11/2010).

The category Sarwa, notes Edwin Wilsmen (2002), while not etymologically negative, came to denote an all-encompassing San identity. This, he claims, ‘became reciprocally marked in symbolic ordering, with Basarwa bushmen’, increasingly consigned to a peripheral, wild, uncontrolled nature in Tswana ideology, while in much ... San ideology Batswana took on the central attributes of overlordship’ (829). This schism is still evident in the official rhetoric.

In a 2010 interview with the BBC, Kitso Mokaila, Botswana’s minister of environment, wildlife and tourism said: ‘I don’t believe you would want to see your own kind living in the dark ages in the middle of nowhere as a choice, when you know that the world has moved forward and has become so technological’. President Ian Khama described the Bushmen’s lifestyle as ‘an archaic fantasy’ in 2008, and in 2010 a South African woman was arrested at the border post in Botswana for remarking, on seeing Khama’s ubiquitous framed photograph, that he looked ‘like a Bushman’ (Palapye.com news blog, 11/11/2012). Such attitudes of Debasement towards the San
are entrenched in history, evident long before the colonial era in southern Africa.

The colonial era saw the white farmers of, for example, the Ghanzi area exploit the ready availability of San labour. San serfs were effectively owned by their masters and considered items of inheritance, which, as Wilsmen observes, supported the ‘symbiotic’ relationship of the British with mining interests and which resulted in ‘partitive ideologies [creating] the class structure with its ethnic divisions found in Botswana today’ (829). Gadibolae (1985) notes that British official policy ‘announced that if Basarwa were allowed to leave their masters they should do so only in a recognised and controlled manner’ (28). W.G. Morapedi (2006) asserts that this was exacerbated by the fact that even in communal areas, the ‘relatively defenseless San were no better treated by their Bantu overlords and could not claim land’ (123). When San tried to quit, devastating consequences ensued and many incidents of severe brutality were and are undocumented in the colonial and postcolonial periods. Gasebalwe Seretse’s (2008) novella is dedicated to ‘the San of the Kalahari ... Although these people are hardly ever acknowledged they are among the foremost builders of Botswana’ (iii). Here Seretse’s protagonist Xhai, a young San man in Botswana pre-independence, is representative of his people in his position as servant to the dominant Bangwato, who, as Wilsmen (2002) notes, imposed greater and greater levies on ‘ground rent (in the form of tusks, feathers, hides, livestock and labour) from increasingly dispossessed non-Tswana (828).

At the denouement of the novella, the kgotla, or Bangwato council of chiefs, recalls Khama III’s visit to Queen Victoria in 1885 to
safeguard Botswana from German expansionism and speaks of the San’s historical position:

[a] long time ago when our people had little contact with the white man, we had our own laws that governed us. We had long conceded that men were not equal. There were those who were born to be masters and those who were born to be servants … The white man … told us when he saw us and the Masarwa he saw no difference – we were like brothers. We silently protested and continued to rule the Masarwa with an iron fist because we believed they belong to a lower class (79).

Seretse’s novella appears to uphold the myth that the San’s relative position in modern Botswana has improved. The perpetual power of the Khama family has simply transferred from the pre-colonial and colonial times to its postcolonial manifestation in the BDP, currently led by President Ian Khama. In a broader southern African San context, Bennun (2004) recounts historical examples of the dismissal of San in the European negation of Bushman cave paintings. This is redolent of the attitude towards the imposing fortress of Old Zimbabwe which Western scholars believed could not have been constructed by the Indigenous people of the area but must rather be the work of lighter-skinned (read: superior) visitors from the north. In this instance, the painting known as the White Lady of Brandberg (Namibia’s highest mountain) was discovered by chance by a cartographer who immediately assumed the work of being in the Egyptian-Mediterranean style. A French priest specialising in the rock paintings of Paleolithic Europe was called in to verify this and confirmed that:

of course this beautiful painting could not possibly have been made by the Stone Age hunting and gathering people of Southern Africa. It was painted by the survivors of a party of shipwrecked
Mediterraneans who trekked eastwards ... They painted those short, yellow-skinned people bowing in deference and offering up their children ... Colonel Hoogenhout, the administrator of south west Africa [also declared] ‘This is no Bushman painting ... This is Great Art’ (330-331).

The ‘of course’, uttered so emphatically, simultaneously affirms the superior knowledge and capacities of the European and negates the San’s abilities, debasing them through the assumption of their deference and offerings to Europeans. The priest calls upon, by way of endorsement, a representative of the colonial authority; Colonel Hoogenhout’s administrative role apparently establishing him as an art critic. Dorothea Bleek, considered, in the early twentieth century to be, along with her father and aunt, the world’s pre-eminent European expert on the languages and culture of the San, expressed the opposite view: ‘it is a Bushman painting with face and limbs smeared by pink clay’ (cited in Bennun: 331).

Ethnographic deconstruction and academic/commercial reproduction of San rock art in the modern era is reductionist and generalist and this practice in itself serves as a metaphor for the essentialising (thus limiting) of the San:

The approach is partly a product of and strongly dependent upon its own method for recording the paintings – the simple technology of the acetate tracing. Tracing replaces the originals with linear, stylistically arbitrary, monochrome copies, and has absolved the researcher of the need to address the iconographic diversity and stylistic variety that exists in the paintings by effectively eliminating them. The pervasive thin black line has rendered all paintings equal, stylistically similar, visually bland (Skotnes, in Deacon and Dowson eds. 1996: 236).
Robert Gordon (1992) is scathing about representations of negation and debasement of the the San in both historical and modern contexts, labeling the San an 'underclass' in his treatise *The Bushman Myth*: ‘[w]hether we portray them as living in ‘primitive affluence’ or ‘struggling to survive’ [the pervasive subtext is that] ‘they are different from us in terms of physiognomy, social organization, values and personality’ (217). Gordon notes the a dehistoricisation process emanating from the ‘centre’ whereby a succession of dominant regimes over centuries has refused to acknowledge San marginalisation, the current regime conveniently absolving itself of responsibility for accurate historical representation in the modern context.

Today the undermining of the San is politically and commercially driven, channeling, in both overt and covert ways, the entrenched prejudices of history and making expedient use of hypocrisy and omission. George Monbiot (2006) cites a member of the UK’s House of Lords berating the Kalahari San as ‘holding the government of Botswana to ransom’ by resisting eviction and ‘wanting to stay in the Stone Age’ with ‘primitive’ technology. Conveniently omitted from this member’s speech to the House was the fact that the guides on her half-day mission to the resettlement camps outside the CKGR were government officials, and the delegation had enjoyed first-class air travel to Botswana funded by Debswana. Monbiot cites Survival International’s 2006 campaign to discourage the international community from characterising Indigenous peoples as ‘primitive’, based on their observation that ‘Stone Age and primitive are what you call people when you want their land’ (16).

In early colonial times, the click sounds that characterise Khoi and San languages were held up by some as proof of the people’s ‘less
than' status on the evolutionary scale: ‘a chattering rather than a language’ (1614); ‘an inarticulate noise ... like the clucking of hens, or gabbling of turkeys’ (1777) (cited in Chidester 1996: 24). Chidester notes that this apparent absence of language ‘represented a rupture of human unity even more serious than the disaster of Babel’ (ibid) and later in the colonial era, one Robert Moffat’s 1842 description: ‘[h]ard is the Bushman’s lot, friendless, forsaken, an outcast from the world, greatly preferring the company of beasts of prey to that of civilized man ... We can scarcely conceive of human beings descending lower in the scale of ignorance and vice’ (cited in Dowson 1995). Such a classification served to justify the continuous dispossessions, exploitations – and worse – of the San throughout southern Africa. Hays (2007) asserts that while ‘expression of this perspective is generally not tolerated today in either academic or popular writings, one hears echoes of its refrains in current discourses about the San’ (112).

The San as doomed race

An annotated compilation of the archived Bleek/Lloyd family ‘Bushmen Work’ project is authored by Neil Bennun (2004) who, as his book’s subtitle suggests with no irony, endorses the belief that the San across southern Africa are an ‘extinct people’: [t]he people who made this picture are dead and there is no one alive today who can explain it to us with first-hand experience of making rock art or the husbandry of rain creatures. The Stone Age culture that produced these artists, the language they spoke and the eland they painted are all extinct here’ (5). South African artist Pippa Skotnes (1996) cites the advertising of a 1853 exhibition showcasing the San, or ‘Earthmen’ which invites viewers to come see the ‘only specimens ever seen in Europe of a race rapidly becoming extinct’ (4). The depiction of the San as people of the past is implicit in many
representations. While Anthony Sillery (1974) does concede there are San living today, he posits that, 'above all they have produced a remarkable form of art, the rock paintings ... The art has now quite died out, and many of the paintings we see today are quite old' (10) thereby proposing that their most noteworthy attribute – along with hunting and gathering skills – is now redundant. As Hays (2007) explains, this led to the kind of ‘salvage ethnography’; a desperate intellectual scramble to document as much as possible before cultural termination:

Bennun quotes from one of Dorothea Bleek’s notebooks of observations as she traversed the region between 1910 and the late 1920s:

Fifty years ago, every adult Bushman knew all his people’s lore. A tale begun by a person from one place could be finished by someone from another place at a later date. In 1910 ... [n]ot one of them knew a single story. On my reading some of the old texts a couple of old men recognised a few customs and said ‘I once heard my people tell that.’ But the folklore was dead, killed by a life of service among strangers and the breaking up of families’ (378).

Doomed, of course, can mean physical extinction or social and political exclusion. Cook and Sarkin (2009) endorse the fact that Botswana’s first president, Sir Seretse Khama’s legacy of national
pride and unity meant that Tswana hegemony was assumed as the natural successor to the colonial authority, so that nationalism inevitably became defined in Tswana terms. As a direct result, the San and other minorities in the country were further marginalised, a relational codified ‘through such laws as the Tribal Territories Act of 1933 and the Chieftainship Act of 1966’ (117-8). According to the Tribal Land Act (no. 54 of 1968, amended in 1973) entitlement to land allocation required a person to be a tribesman. Historian Teedzani Thapelo (2002) cites the Act whereby the term ‘tribesman’ is defined as ‘any citizen of Botswana who is a member of the Tribe occupying the tribal area’. According to this semantic technicality and owing to historical displacement, the San were not considered tribesmen. Thapelo cites a report from the Attorney-General’s office: ‘Masarwa (sic) have always been true nomads, owing no allegiance to any chief or tribe … it appears to me that true nomad Masarwa can have no rights of any kind except rights to hunting’ (140) and goes on to note that San ‘displacement and haphazard resettlement’ (141) gained momentum due to the government’s recognition of tourism’s economic potential, necessitating conservation legislation and the transplantation of San from within the CKGR to without.

In the case of representation in textbooks, perpetuating the idea of the San as an historical people only, Kuela Kiema (2010) cites Sidsel Saugestad (2001) as observing that the San are still presented in many texts as people of the past. Kiema himself substantiates that ‘we are still shown between the Stone Age and the Iron Age chapters’ (76):

- [w]e do not feature in pre-colonial history of Botswana except as the first in habitants of southern Africa;
• We do not feature in Botswana’s colonial history except as expert hunters;
• We do not feature in the struggle for Botswana’s independence; and
• We do not feature in the history of contemporary Botswana as we are still portrayed as a ‘stone-age’ people (75-76).

To paraphrase Paulo Freire (1970), oppressed people are so enmeshed and have such a sense of powerlessness within the dominant society that they cannot perceive of the oppressor as being ‘outside themselves’, consequently rendering them ‘fearful of freedom’ and unlikely to ‘seek their own liberation’ (128). As an elderly man said to Kuela Kiema: ‘[y]our repression has been so systematic that you are now participating in your own repression’ (2010: 19). Kiema, among a group travelling by car, admitted to the man that he and some others had written to the District Commissioner in Ghanzi asking to be relocated from the CKGR due to the pressure the San were under, upon which the man called Kiema ‘Judas’: ‘[w]e all laughed at the statement, even though my voice was hoarse from secret weeping’ (20). As a result of this long-entrenched disenfranchisement, asserts Hays, ‘very few San individuals have been able to enter into the discourse of national and international politics as equals’ (2002: 29). Indeed, Kenneth Good (2003) asserts that under the definition of ‘tribe’ in the Chieftancy Act the San are not recognised in the list of Botswana tribes (22). Kiema (2010) relates: ‘at school we learned about Setswana chiefs and their taboos and totems … No one from our tribe was in the House of Chiefs to advise parliament on matters affecting our traditions’ (19). Today, as Cook and Sarkin (2009) assert, Botswana’s Constitution officially recognises only eight ethnic groups, while twenty-six other ethnolinguistic groups, including the San are not recognised and ‘the government refuses even to maintain official data on San populations … [who] have largely
been denied the fruits of Botswana’s rapid economic growth and social development, suffering from chronic unemployment and poverty ... frequently depending on government beneficence for survival’ (118-9).

Ironically, in the light of rhetorical imagery and sentiments of a harmonious relationship between the people and their land in tourism ephemera, Nthomang (2006) writes of the government of Botswana having appointed a fact-finding mission in 1985 to ‘facilitate decision-making on environmental protection and wildlife conservation.’ Kiema (2010) labels it a ‘fault-finding mission ... determined to show we shouldn’t live on our land’ (83). The government, Nthomang asserts, ‘adopted a position that the emerging lifestyle was not compatible with the promotion of wildlife conservation’ (53). Consequently, between 1996 and 1997 all communities within the CKGR were forced to relocate to places outside the reserve. This was effected by way of a systematic termination of social services (water, closing down of the school and health facilities) inside the reserve and the establishment of similar services in the settlements of New Xade and Kaudwane. Following this, the Department of Wildlife and National Parks (DWNP) immediately began ‘to exploit the reserve’s tourism potential’ (ibid: 126).

The San as agitators for change

Resistance ensued among some San groups who moved back into the CKGR after relocation, despite the withdrawal of facilities rendering them officially destitute. Justice Unity Dow cites the case of Amogelang Segootsane, appellant in the High Court case with ancestral ties to the CKGR, who, opposed to relocation, became associated with the FPK as he believed the organisation would
represent his interests. Prior to relocation, Segootsane hunted, maintained huts, cultivated crops, kept donkeys, goats and gathered veld foods regularly and had ‘no intention to relocate from the reserve’ (2005: 163).

Morula Morula writes in the Botswana Sunday Standard (August 1-7, 2010) of the recent High Court dismissal of a San claim for the right to drill their own borehole in the CKGR. The claim will now be heard in the Court of Appeal. Again, though, external agency is being solicited in the form of the San’s London-based advocate, Gordon Bennett, who claims that ‘by denying Basarwa access to the borehole [High Court judge Walia] was exposing them to inhuman treatment, contrary to the constitution’. Morula cites Walia: ‘Basarwa who choose CKGR must live with the difficulties that their choices present. [They] … have chosen to settle in areas far from facilities provided for by the government and have become victims of their own decision to settle inconveniently long distances from services and facilities’ (4). The ubiquitously endorsed national philosophy of ‘Botho’ meaning (cited in Setswana) respect and equality is clearly undermined by these tourism ventures since the management is predominantly non-San. Nthomeng (2004) comments on the fact that ‘Botho’ is inscribed within Botswana’s national Vision 2016, and that ‘in the true spirit of ‘Botho’ … government, NGOs community and other stakeholders should all feel bound to contribute effectively to reducing Basarwa dependency by promoting self-reliance … cooperation, compassion and the spirit of sharing’ (24). Nthomeng sees this as an ideal which is theoretically achievable and San voices are beginning to be heard, as Chapter Five demonstrates and which is succinctly expressed by a San activist:
It is not that we are a dull community. We are just like everybody else but it is ... our government’s notion that we were created to be underdogs and to be exploited. Basarwa in this country are ill-treated and looked down upon. We want the world to know that. (Keiphile Steven, Botswana Guardian, 26 April, 2002).

The San as hyper-real/commodity

Although the aestheticised rendering of the San that has developed in the past half century is undoubtedly preferable to the overtly prejudicial representations of the past, it is not without its problems, as it is one of the central purposes of this thesis to demonstrate.

While several writers including Laurens van der Post whose romantic representations of the San are further analysed in Chapter Three and the film The Gods Must be Crazy (1980) examined in Chapter Four, and even some anthropologists have glowingly described the San as happy, sweet and peace-loving, more responsible and multi-layered discourse resists the promulgation of this simplistic image, making a case for the complexity of San lifestyles and socio-political realities. Yet such an idealisation of the noble savage is attractive to the First World imagination and tourists continue to visit the Kalahari in search of a gentler humanity personified: ‘[t]he demand for images of people who live a good, simple life close to nature is an exploitable market, a fact not lost on tourist operations, who use the image of the Bushmen to sell their travel packages (Buntman 1996: personal field notes). As will be demonstrated in Chapters Three and Four, although some San individuals and communities benefit indirectly from the marketing of this image and have come to depend on it for their livelihood, especially since their eviction from the CKGR, there are many who are left bereft due to an incapacity to appear authentic.
Hays (2007) asserts that the two opposing approaches at loggerheads as regards appropriate development strategies for the San – indeed, for all Indigenous peoples – are assimilation and preservation. Paradoxically, assimilation of all ethnic minorities into the dominant social discourses is the official line of the ruling BDP and, while it appears to be at odds with the preservation agenda, careful marketing has facilitated the accommodation of both. This is effected by way of tourism packaging manipulated to disseminate the romanticised ideal of the primordial San, with a few more ‘authentic’ looking San who have the requisite skills brought in to the CKGR safari lodges for survival demonstrations, thus perpetuating the preservation myth via assimilation. At the same time, most San must assimilate into (the periphery of) other corporate agendas, usually by way of supplying art and craft to outlets, rather than claim ethnic uniqueness, thereby limiting their capacity to demand land and resource dividends. Both agendas, in fact, hinder the choices of San to either return to a traditional way of life or to pursue an assimilated life with the same options available to the dominant group.

Legitimising that which is (and who is) authentically San feeds into the tourism imaginary as well as to perceptions of entitlement. Robins (2001) cites the example of the San land claims in South Africa in 1999, and notes the marked change of media representation prior to and immediately following the success of the claims in 1999, a shift from ‘stereotypical images of primordialist San ‘tribes’ reclaiming their ancestral land’ to (subsequent to the resolution of the claim) ‘reports of conflict, homicide, suicide, alcohol abuse, AIDS, and social fragmentation’ (834). Robins shows how the preoccupation with, and problematising of classifications
tied in historically – and still does – with the authenticity fallacy, and thus to questions of legitimacy:

...the problem of classifying ‘bushmen’ created considerable anxiety amongst European travelers, scholars and administrators. Attempts to resolve this problem generally took the form of scientific enquiry into whether these people were ‘pure products’, ‘fakes’ or hybrids. Language, genealogies, bodily features and livelihood strategies have gone into such classificatory exercises, [posing] enormous problems for those seeking neat and unambiguous classifications (839).

Such conflicts are also evident amongst members of subaltern groups, or ‘articulated from below’ (Robins: 839); a form of autosubalternality whereby some members assert greater legitimacy within their heritage (for example those living a more traditionalist lifestyle versus those who have embraced first world culture) in order to have the lion’s share of land claims and access to resources. Robins begs the question whether external agencies create such artificial dichotomies, perhaps deliberately manipulating internal conflict to their own ends, or perhaps simply through ignorance:

...despite these local constructions of a ‘Great Divide’ between ‘traditionalists’ and ‘western bushmen’, none of the Kalahari San fitted the mould of indigenous (sic) people untouched by modernity, neither were they modern citizens completely moulded by discourses of western democracy and liberal individualism. Instead, San identities, local knowledge and everyday practices were composed of hybrid discourses ... Could these donor double visions of the San – as both ‘First Peoples’ and citizens-in-the-making – be a catalyst for these intra-community divisions? (834-835).
Such classifications, Robins argues, can be harmful and are ‘deployed as strategies for exclusion’ by traditionalist San seeking to ‘stabilise bushman identity through recourse to notions of a ‘detribalised Other’, the western bushmen living in their midst’ (835). Liesbeth Groenewald (2008) notes the revival of ‘Bushman handicrafts’ that the modern tourism industry has engineered and the consequent change in the San’s attitude to material goods. She argues that this has brought about a diminishing of the traditional egalitarianism of San societies which is replaced by communities beginning to be aware of their market potential, leading inevitably to their seeking ‘cultural and political autonomy, arguing that they have a basic right of self-determination’ (27).

Belinda Jeursen (1995) is disparaging about the affirmative stereotyping of the San as a hyper-reality that tourists are frequently duped by, noting that although there are positive outcomes to this phenomenon in terms of the conservation of historical assets, to replace a negative (slave, possession) stereotype of the San with an affirmative (‘first people’ of southern Africa) is equally unacceptable. As Le Roux and White (2004) assert, the imperialist agenda pertaining to the San in Botswana did not cease once their hunting rights and access to the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (CKGR) was denied them. A more insidious form of imperialism took its place, ‘from which they have still not escaped’ (54). In the same sense that Nadia Lie (69) proposes that idealisation of specific groups occurs when they do not pose a threat to the dominant agenda, so the San continue to be idealised in a process that Le Roux and White pointedly label ‘invasion’ (54). They note that this form of imperialism is carried out in the name of preservation, citing the ‘scientific’ collection and dissection of the San for display in European museums, followed by, in a more ‘enlightened’ age,
romanticisation, calling up a connection to a bygone era: ‘[t]his reaction … created for the San an unrealistic … image that has ultimately served to disempower them. These approaches are not distinct, but overlap in time and play off each other’ (54-56).

Edward Said’s (1978) notion of ‘standard commodities’ (190) is convincing, however, and is revisited within several tropes in this thesis. In appropriation terms, commodity could be seen as, among other things, the prehistoric. As Terry Goldie (1989) extrapolates: ‘[t]he historicity of text, in which action makes a statement, whether overt or covert, on the chronology of the culture, shapes the indigene (sic) into an historical artefact, a remnant of a golden age that seems to have little connection to anything akin to contemporary life’ (cited in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1995: 236).

The theoretical position operating in Botswana underlying the relational between agro-pastoral and foraging groups is articulated by Thapelo who notes that the romantic ‘isolationist-evolutionist’ (137) mythology that positions the San as primordially autarkic also conveniently legitimises their lack of property and socio-political standing. The emphasis on their aboriginality is a lucrative and convincing aesthetic for tourists. Yet, paradoxically, the assimilationist agenda denies that same ethnicity in order to undermine claims to land, royalties, and San-specific representation in government.

The San settlements established by the Botswana government on the fringes of the CKGR are not open to the tourist gaze at all. Lekoa (2007) notes that the San are effectively corralled in the sense that they do not own the land on which they live and have limited mobility. She recounts her horror at the living conditions she saw.
Size, the tour guide she accompanied with a group of tourists at the lodge near Kaudwane, was picked up by the lodge managers in the morning and delivered back at night, so that tourists were unaware of his real life, in makeshift housing with insufficient food, and no facilities. On her visits, Lekoa took food to Size and his extended family as well as bundles of second-hand clothes. Size mentioned to Lekoa that since those San originally from the CKGR had no official papers such as birth certificates they were not entitled to the old age pension, despite government policy explicitly extending it to all citizens of Botswana. Chebanne (2006) notes that the resettlement from the CKGR was a natural segue from the earlier displacement of San for ranching developments, through the auspices of the RADP in the Ghanzi district. Chebanne sees the policy as a clash of ideologies in that the San view of land, existence and identity is at odds with the government’s inscribing of the same in terms of ‘cattle culture in a cash economy and urban land values’. The threat to the San’s life source and the vulnerability it effects are, according to Chebanne’s interpretation, ‘not bearable, humanly speaking’ (142). Morapedi (2006) claims that some relief from the brutality of farm employers in the Ghanzi area and Bantu tribal leaders in communal areas was realised by way of the villagisation project but that this does not compensate for systemic denial of access to the CKGR.

A press release in 2010 from the London-based Survival International draws attention to the fact that Ian Khama, a board member of Conservation International, has:

banned the Bushmen from accessing a well which they rely on for water on their lands. At the same time, his administration has drilled new wells for wildlife only, and allowed Wilderness Safaris to erect a luxury tourist lodge on Bushman land. In addition, the government is currently in negotiations with
Survival International’s director, Stephen Corry, in calling for a boycott on Botswana tourism and diamonds, comments that such remarks as Nasha’s comparison of the outcry over San evictions with opposition to elephant culling, ‘smack of the colonial past and show that the government still holds the same racist attitudes it held back in 2002 when it forced the Bushmen off their lands. The Bushmen deserve respect for their way of life, the same as everyone else. If anyone is ‘living in the dark ages’, it’s the Botswana government’ (Survival International Press Release, 10/11/2010). The Government of Botswana, in turn, ‘accuses Survival (sic) of peddling to gullible foreigners a romantic, or even racist, image of the Bushmen as anthropological relics untouched by the modern age’ (Financial Times, June 20, 2006: 3).

Dithunya Lekoa’s (2007) documentary, a text which provides an empirical precursor to some of the text analysis of this thesis, shows first-hand that tourists in Botswana are ‘educated’ into the assimilationist rhetoric of the dominant culture, which also positions the San as inevitably dying out, except for contrived and packaged exoticisation for tourist consumption or the ostensibly well-meaning appropriation underpinning academic research:

Tourist Guide (to tourists): They have a rich culture which is now dwindling as their youngsters have to go to school so you find out that they don’t have much time to learn, the culture is now slowly slowly vanishing.

Tourist: Why is the government encouraging that?

Tourist Guide (to tourists): Actually the government is not prohibiting them to live their traditional way. What
the government is trying to do is to pick them at the same level like other groups in the country ... there are some people who are coming up and study their culture so that it is documented in books.

In her dissertation *Culture on Sale* (2007) Lekoa describes her visit to the home of San tour guide, Size, and of her dispiritedness on seeing the conditions in which he and his family live, especially in the light of the opulence of the safari lodge for which he works. Such stark contrast is condemned by journalist Nathan Reneilwe (2009) who questions the ethics of opening up the CKGR to tourism, citing the director of Survival International: ‘visitors will be sipping cocktails in the bar while the Bushmen living nearby are forced to travel hundreds of kilometres to access water’ (*Sunday Standard*, November 1-7, 2009). This is upheld by the *British Observer*, cited in the same article, that ‘one safari lodge will have a water hole less than a mile from the Bushmen, who will be made to walk hundreds of miles to collect water’ (8). The same article reviews a book by Survival International *We are One* (2009) wherein a spokesperson for the watchdog organisation Tourism Concern explains that ‘tourists are becoming often unwilling collaborators in the exploitation of others ... Tourism is land hungry. It depends on unspoilt landscapes. Time and again the indigenous (sic) peoples have their land grabbed. They just don’t come into the equation’ (ibid).

The book cited in this article suggests that the San are not necessarily averse to tourism and would welcome it on their own terms. The reality the article asserts, however, is that, ‘the government – which blocked the Basarwa’s main borehole in the centre of the [CKGR] – claimed that it could not guarantee their welfare ... But after an exploration deal was signed with diamond mining firm De Beers, rumours spread that the government wanted to clear the park to allow for diamond extraction’ (ibid).
Interestingly, in an edition of Discover Botswana (2009) President Ian Khama is referred to in an article header as ‘Botswana’s No.1 Conservationist’. With no irony, the author states: ‘we have in our midst a global leader ... an example to all leaders in Africa who will come to understand that today, you cannot lead a nation, without stepping forward and playing a major role in the conservation of this planet’ (42). Sidsel Saugestad (2011) notes a classic tourism appropriation within the reserve: ‘central in [SI’s] campaign is the denial of access to water, and the quite absurd situation created by the government giving concession to an international company, Wilderness Safari, to establish a lodge inside the reserve, sporting a bar with swimming pool for tourists’ (5). Taylor (2003) also notes the convenient dovetailing of the ‘oft-stated wish of the Botswana government to persuade the San to move out of the CKGR as part of its policy to develop tourism – and possibly diamonds – in the area (276) much like the ultimata issued by successive governments to the Maasai to vacate first the Serengeti, then the Ngorongongo areas from 1959 onwards ‘because their presence was believed to be detrimental to wildlife and landscape’ (Salazar, 2009: 60). However, it is important not to essentialise the San’s relationships with tourism operators and tourists as the dynamics are diverse.

Robert Hitchcock and Rodney Brandenburgh (1990) note that San groups are divided in their opinions about tourism. One misconception of some tourists, especially those not part of organised tours, is that they enter San communities expecting to obtain resources from the San and therefore deprive the San of their meagre rations. In the northeastern Kweneng District and Central Kalahari Game Reserve regions of Botswana, Hitchcock and Brandenburgh assert that tourism can ‘affect the degree of social harmony in local communities’ by skewing the remuneration in favour of males more familiar with outsiders by way of their role as
tour guides. Interactions can be disrespectful, a common complaint being that tourists ask the San to remove their clothes to don more traditional garb for photographic purposes. Ostentatious displays of wealth by tourists insensitive to their relative position of advantage are also known to offend, along with invasions of privacy. Hitchcock and Brandenburgh note that a common sight is San ‘flocking toward tourist vehicles with handicrafts in tow. In the town of Ghanzi ... some poverty-stricken Basarwa beg tourists for food, which leaves the visitors feeling uncomfortable’. They cite an RAD officer’s observation that the San of the region ‘have become so tourist oriented that they literally begin dancing in place and removing their clothes whenever they spot a tourist vehicle in the distance’. (n.p).

According to ethnologist Lekoa (2007) little of significance has changed in two decades, in terms of San dependence and lack of agency. She quotes an observer of life in a resettlement village of 300 San: ‘the water from the borehole causes diarrhea. So we have those tanks. A truck must come from Ghanzi to fill them ... Most of [the villagers] have TB ... A doctor comes every two or three months ... The government trucks in food once a month’ (90). And as the attitude of debasement expressed by a lodge staff member Lekoa interviewed in 2007 attests: ‘[f]or each [San survival] walk [the guide] gets P60, we give him P3 ... because otherwise he drinks all of it, as we speak now we have fenced yard ... Alcoholism is a big problem’ (39). Effective incarceration in specially administered settlements is undoubtedly anathema to the San’s lifestyle. Justice Unity Dow, one of the judges ruling in favour of the San’s right to remain in the CKGR, acknowledges the San as being traditionally a ‘highly mobile people’, travelling long distances inside and out the CKGR, their movements dependent on the ‘availability of drinking water’ (2005: 157). Monaka (2006) cites spokespeople for relocated San reporting
alcohol abuse with its associated problems and a general breakdown of social relationships, while FPK reports (2005, 2006) and SI press releases (2005, 2006) describe the amenities in the new settlements as unsuitable for the pursuit of livelihood, education and culture.

Lekoa’s (2007) documentary features the manager of the ‘Edu’ lodge in the D’Kar area of Botswana. Lekoa asks him if he thinks culture plays a role in tourism:

[The tours we offer] basically follow up the culture of San people. The edible plants, the insects and things like that. And to learn how the people existed and this is something that is coming important in tourism. It’s not only animals any more, people want to see more of people and how they live and how they lived in the past and how they manage to exist in an area that has no surface water. As you know, this area has boreholes, before people existed here where there was no water. So it’s a learning process for our clients and they are really enjoying it … I only started this year and we are now in August (2006) I have got 30% [more] in my first year of operations in this area.

This quotation demonstrates the lucrative nature of the constructed San as commodity.

As this review illustrates, the San have been broadly represented in research domains across a range of issues, including their positioning as commodities within a tourism paradigm. The particular research opening identified and, I hope, done justice by this thesis, is for analysis of the rhetorical and visual devices produced for tourist consumption by non-San which perpetuate San disenfranchisement. In a spirit of optimism, an investigation is made into an increasing San self-representation for tourists and the potential of this enterprise for their empowerment.
I move on now to an overview of the theoretical underpinnings of the thesis, both broad (postcolonial and post-tourism theories) and specific (the colonial tropes identified by David Spurr in *The Rhetoric of Empire*, 1993).

**b) Theoretical framework**

At this point I outline the two theoretical persuasions to be fused for the purpose of this analysis: Postcolonial theory and post-tourism critique

*Postcolonial theory*

As John MacLeod (2007) has it, postcolonialism ‘does not glibly mean ‘after colonialism’ as implied by the misleading axis of the hyphen in ‘post-colonial’. Rather, it is a term which describes, evaluates and helps to configure a relationship: between reality and its representation’ (9). Accepting this reasoning, the term ‘postcolonial’ is consciously unhyphenated in this thesis.

Vijay Mishra and Bob Hodge (2005) assert that it is important for postcolonialism to be aware that bourgeois anticolonial nationalism is merely another form of colonialism, manifesting, as they cite Fanon (1990), ‘neocolonial class consolidation [which does not bring about] fundamental transformation [but rather] a mere restructuring of the social order’ (384). This is demonstrably the case in postcolonial Botswana, where the social order was simply realigned once the British relinquished control, to place the dominant Tswana at the top of the social stratum, marginalising other tribal groups. Ali Abdi (2006) asserts that the case in many African countries, certainly evident in post-1966 Botswana: ‘postindependence Africa emulated ... the colonial legacy ... a black African elite replacing the colonial elite’ (19). Frantz Fanon (1968) draws a cynical description of such elites, which aptly describe
those of Botswana establishment: 6 ‘[A]s soon as independence is declared, far from embodying in concrete form the needs of the people …the leader will … become the general president of that company of profiteers … which constitutes the national bourgeoisie’ (cited in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995: 157).

Samatar argues that while colonial rule brought all Batswana together under one authority, ‘it also maintained and petrified the divisions amongst them’ (cited in Mogalakwe: 92). Following independence, the colonial administrators’ party of choice (the Botswana Democratic Party) ‘became the ruling party without ever having fought an election or waged a nationalist struggle’ (Gossett 1986: 248). Legal academic B.D.D.M. Radipati (2006) defines decolonisation in terms of the San in postcolonial Botswana in the same vein, noting that decolonisation simply affirmed ‘the self-determination of those dominant ‘native’ communities at the expense of indigenous (sic) people’. Radipati asserts that San self-determination on decolonisation was not a natural outcome since San communities were already dispossessed of their ancestral lands and ‘progressively weakened by the confluence of conquest, colonization and independence movements’ (165).

Post-tourism critique

You needn’t let that slightly funny feeling you have from time to time about exploitation, oppression, domination develop into full-fledged unease … you could ruin your holiday’ (Jamaica Kincaid 1988: 10).

As far as tourism is concerned, a premise in this thesis is that although the principles and practice of tourism are becoming more enlightened insofar as at least acknowledging cultural integrity, there are still many examples of operators who exploit a ‘noble savage’ ideal, keeping the
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6 Sheila Khama, currently the Director of Africa Natural Resource Centre of the African Development Bank was formerly Managing Director of Debswana.
cultural static within a representation paradigm in order to sustain a lucrative tourist commodity, prompting Sherlock (2001) to define tourism as ‘one form of creative destruction’ (287). The romanticised aesthetic of there being an ancient people still living as they have done for millennia, in harmony with the land, is limiting and potentially condescending and cultural tourism theory does acknowledge this, in a critique known as ‘post-tourism’, which ‘transforms these processes by which the tourist gaze is produced and consumed’ (Urry 1990, in Hutnyk 1996: 206) towards an awareness of the ‘links between the tourist experience and the everyday aestheticized consumption practices that pattern life (Sherlock, 2001: 271). Trevor Sofield, in his longitudinal study of the impact of tourism on development in the Pacific region refers to the relational dynamic between inside knowledge of a culture and externally constructed interpretation of it. He cites Moscovici (1984) as acknowledging the ‘interaction between the consensual universe (everyday knowledge) and the reified (technical, scientific) universe’ (Sofield, 2003:3).

A critical approach to tourism practice and its philosophical underpinnings, especially in the developing world, is advocated by Pushkala Prasad (2003) who uses Zantop’s term ‘latent colonialism’ (1997) to describe an insidious by-product of tourism in such places, since: ‘[a]s tourism discursively constitutes native cultures as sources of exotic pleasures and adventurous thrills, it still continues to reproduce former colonial relationships of Western dominance in different ways’ (cited in Prasad, A., ed. 2003: 162). She adds that such representations take effect in wider domains of development and international relations, which inevitably inform policy and planning. The colonial project is echoed in a neo-colonialist tourism framework in which the land is appropriated as a playground where travellers can live out adolescent adventure fantasies, to which the native inhabitants are merely adjuncts, suggests
Prasad (2003): ‘[t]oday’s natives bear a strong resemblance to anthropology’s ‘informants’ – trusted subordinates who translated a number of cultural practices and helped ethnographers gather information about native ways of being’ (ibid: 161). So, the notion of authenticity extended to tourism is shown to be fraught with blurred identities necessitating robust critique which, Julio Aramberri asserts, draws the ‘difference between that form which endeavors to discover the genuine, and other commercialized or alienated versions of it’ (2001: 740) although, he concedes, the distinction is largely ‘what academics and other social scientists define as such’ (ibid.).

Smith and Robinson (2006) also ponder the nature of this dialectic, recognising a necessity for a balance between essentialism (of the iconic) and relativism (of the intimate experience). They ask how it is possible to privilege both tourists and hosts in terms of representation, how we can ‘celebrate cultural difference and diversity in ways that retain meaning for tourists and visited communities’ (7). The authors also identify a dilemma at the heart of the postmodern tourist enterprise: the escape from the ‘existential burden of history and contemporary reconciliation … freedom and hedonistic expression … mobility and playfulnesss’ (ibid.) that it should and does afford. But with this comes responsibility, the way ‘the experience touches upon the deepest and most persistent of struggles’ (ibid.) since ‘cultures and societies are not passive recipients of tourism, they are also sites of contestation and resistance’ (8). This is post-tourism, the critique of our motives, interpretation of experiences and assumptions, constructed, asserts Urry (2002) through signs, ‘and tourism involves the collection of these signs’ (3). Smith and Robinson assert that there is definitely a trend towards ‘authentic’ tourism on the part of tourists themselves, which sees them opt for less elite experiences reflecting a generational move towards egalitarianism; away from the more formalised settings, such as galleries,
in favour of the ‘culture of the ordinary’ (9). Lekoa’s 2007 documentary speaks to the well-meaning tourists who genuinely wish to engage with what they perceive San culture to be but who are so screened off by the industry from the San’s modern realities, that essentially nothing changes, either for the San themselves or for the tourists’ understanding. A strictly postcolonial projection of tourism imaginaries is too limiting a definition of the relationship, however.

Salazar and Graburn (2014) extend the paradigm to include the often overlooked ‘host’ in the tourism dynamic, whose realities are directly affected, even transformed by tourism. In their dealings with tourists, local peoples develop revised self-identifications by way of imaginaries that ‘drive tourists, host societies and tourism service providers alike’ (ibid.: 2). The simplistic binary assumed in the conceptualisation of host and guest is also noted by Kirsty Sherlock (2001) who shows that both groups have shared fantasies in the practice of consumption. Such reflexive encounters can of course, have positive and negative ramifications.

Through the analysis of tourism texts, this thesis demonstrates the binary nature of tourism, with its inherent capacity for good and for ill. Tourism is usually situated within a capitalist paradigm: ‘Both tourists and resident consumers are motivated by collective and self-identity, dreams and desires, as much as rational material needs’ (Sherlock, 2001: 280) and often seen as an opportunity to disseminate capitalism to the developing world, thus perpetuating a culture of dependency. Mowforth and Munt (2003) see tourism as a form of ‘hegemony in practice’ (48), whereby political, cultural and moral values eventually permeate the consciousness and values of subordinate groups, thus enculturating them in capitalist principles or towards the same human rights and/or environmental issues that concern the West. John Urry (2002) maintains that new or alternative tourism practices are simply a postmodernist
response, naturally amalgamating tourism with other practices, such as education.

This correlation is endorsed by Mowforth and Munt (2003) who identify: ‘differentiation of tourism as it becomes associated with other activities [and] increasing interest in other cultures, environments and their association with the emergence of new social movements’ (116) as components of postmodern tourism. Urry’s descriptions of volunteers in Calcutta, while certainly not skirting around the hegemonic assumptions underlying much tourism practice, nonetheless acknowledge some hope in the enterprise, especially within such programs as the Mother Teresa Trust which, although characterised by ideologically naïve participation and by ‘the tourist gaze’ (2002), nevertheless sees volunteers eventually analysing their own motives and, over time, their cultural understandings becoming more profound, rendering them useful (1996: 44). Fiona Allon (2002) asserts that guidebooks in the travel-writing genre give ‘new purchase to Heidegger’s concept of the ‘world picture’ ... [in a] project of ‘planetary consciousness’, of knowing and describing the constituent ‘units’ of the world in a seemingly unmediated manner ... apprehended by language, and translated into representation’ (86,87). Whether the tourist enterprise benefits or exploits those gazed upon, the relationship of power exists and must never be underestimated.

**Applying the theory**

Having identified the broader theoretical framework of this thesis as an amalgam of postcolonial and post-tourism critique, I now isolate the more particular model underpinning the scrutiny of textual material, that of the twelve tropes operating within a colonial worldview identified by David Spurr in his seminal work *The Rhetoric of Empire* (1993).
Working from the selected tourism texts outwards, rather than applying Spurr’s framework as a template over texts selected for any convenient exemplification of theory provides a more valid approach, since it does not unquestioningly assume the legitimacy of the framework, as though anything that falls out of the theoretical confines is to be ignored or rejected. To select tourism texts (or artefacts) based on an inquiry selection process suggests that the theory is simply a tool that comes into play at the point of analysis. Purposeful sampling does not mean texts have been selected to conveniently fit the postcolonial framework. In this way, ‘variations in the concept [are] sampled to rigorously compare and contrast those variations’ (Patton: 239).

Recommending methodological symmetry or a ‘principle of free association’, Callon (1986, cited in Law, 2004) appears to concur: ‘Instead of imposing a pre-established grid of analysis upon [the entities] … the observer follows the actors in order to identify the manner in which these define and associate the different elements by which they build and explain their world, whether it be social or natural’ (102).

**Justification for use of central analytical text**

The Postcolonial theoretical framework taken from David Spurr’s influential text offers a useful model for categorising evidences of the (still pervasive) worldview that assumes certain cultures are naturally predestined to lead, others to follow. Spurr’s classifications are used as confirmation of the selected tourism texts’ capacity to (dis)empower Indigenous groups. Spurr’s categories are deployed as facets of the colonialist mindset, arguing that they are still evident in a neo-colonialist, globalised world.

Spurr’s categorisation of imperialist rhetoric identifies distinct facets of a worldview which informed cultural power relations during the major
period of colonial influence in the world beyond Europe. Spurr believes that such mindsets are still prevalent in many postcolonial contexts.

Spurr has been challenged for ‘politically charged criticism’ in attributing a rather limited ‘master-of-all-I-survey’ school of travel writing (Garrett 1997: 70-79). Another critic accuses Spurr of ‘disciplinary narrowness’ in that he ‘deliberately eschews working in historically specific contexts’ and in doing so ignores the ‘complex cultural poetics of … particular instances of colonialism’ (Dixon, 2001: 3).

By way of positive critique, Spurr’s *The Rhetoric of Empire* is oft-cited as a seminal work in the field by academics including Holland and Huggan (2000) who consider the ‘patriarchal and imperialist undertones of travel writing [to be] expertly analyzed by … Spurr [who] suggest[s] that an uncritical view of travel writing as a celebration of human freedom needs to be adjusted to the modern realities of class, race, and gender privilege’ (4). Refuting Dixon’s claim (as do I) that Spurr avoids ‘historically specific contexts’, Holland and Huggan consider Spurr’s work to be replete with historical examples but still to have relevance for today’s world: ‘[a]ware of the perils of the prefix ‘post’, Spurr wisely resists the temptation to speak of a period ‘after’ colonialism – as if colonialism, in a variety of new and virulent forms, were not still very much with us today’ (47).

Spurr’s identification of various rhetorical modes in a kind of taxonomy provides a very useful model for analysis of the case study investigated in this thesis. Spurr’s is a study ‘devoted to re-examining the history, politics psychology and language of colonization’ (1) - a new trope of the late 20th century. Until the second half of the twentieth century these colonial texts had been largely accepted at face value. His work casts a more universal net than Edward Said’s in that its scope encompasses the
Americas, the Pacific region and all of Africa. With the crumbling of old European empires, the rhetoric of imperialism was open to critical scrutiny.

Spurr’s particular focus is analysing colonial discourse in journalistic writing by addressing the questions: ‘How does the Western writer construct a coherent representation out of the strange and ... often incomprehensible realities confronted in the non-Western world? What are the cultural, ideological, or literary presuppositions upon which such a construct is based?’ (3). Spurr points out that the discourses he articulates here are not exclusive to journalism but inform art, philosophy, religiosity and educational tropes, among others, and are evident in myriad manifestations.

My reasons for using Spurr’s categories as an organisational tool for analysing tourism texts in this thesis are threefold. First, while accepting that Spurr’s work has limitations, I nevertheless deem it robust and more comprehensive than other postcolonialist critiques specifically in its identification and detailed analysis of the modes of colonialist assumptions and practices. Also, those very structures along the spectrum of colonialist rhetoric identified by Spurr naturally overlap and this serves as an metaphor for the inherent heterogeneity of cultures, often dismissed in a colonialist mindset in favour of convenient, essentialising, monolithic generalisations. Expressing the same ideals, Arjun Appaduari (1994) writes of ‘fractal’ boundaries and a dialectic ‘polythetic’ overlapping of cultures. Spurr has constructed his argument around the concept of a natural continuum of the colonial (and neo-colonial) experience; resistance being the proverbial ‘last straw’ when subjugated peoples have had enough, eventually realising and challenging the extent of their oppressed state. The ‘continuum’ is not slavishly sequential, however. While in most colonialist and neo-
colonialist contexts, Surveillance will naturally occur first, followed by Appropriation, with Resistance as an eventual response to the colonial project, the nine tropes between these three are often evident in a range of combinations simultaneously and this natural interchangeability will be demonstrated throughout the thesis.

Secondly, Spurr’s work reads as a more objective, less politically biased critique than Said’s most famous treatise which is described by Robert Irwin as a work of ‘malignant charlatanry’ (2006) and by Ibn Warraq (2007) as a concocted Foucaultian narrative fuelling Said’s thinly veiled anti-Israeli agenda. Dennis Kwek (2003) acknowledges The Rhetoric of Empire’s pertinence to the structures of a new globalised world by quoting Spurr thus: ‘[t]he first step towards an alternative to colonial discourse … has to be a critical understanding of its structures; and this understanding would be an insider’s because we read the discourse from a position already contained by it’ (cited in Prasad, 2003: 142).

Thirdly, Spurr also undertakes a similar enterprise methodologically to that of this thesis in that he works ‘upwards from detailed evidence rather than downwards from theoretical models [placing] literary or visual texts in as richly contextualised settings as possible in order to understand their relation to other texts, to their consumers, and to related domains of practice, such as colonial governance’ (Patton, 2002: 3).

Defining Spurr’s tropes

Representations specifically of the Botswana San in Chapters Three, Four and Five are explored via thematic distinctions drawn from David Spurr’s The Rhetoric of Empire (1993). This thesis demonstrates, with the Kalahari
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7 Spurr’s tropes of colonialist rhetoric are capitalised and italicised from this point so as to distinguish their contextual usage from more general interpretations of the terms. Also, please note the use of British English throughout the thesis except when employing Spurr’s tropes or quoting other texts using U.S English.
San as case in point, that these particular strands (or tropes) can be transcribed as neo-colonialist (often in a range of combinations) and are ubiquitously in operation within the tourism industry, perpetuating disempowerment in some cases and acting as a catalyst for self-empowerment in others. Spurr’s categories naturally inter-relate, some more seamlessly than others, and are briefly defined and illustrated as follows:

(i) Surveillance is the point at which colonised people are first observed by the colonizing power: ‘Gazed upon, they are denied the power of the gaze; spoken to, they are denied the power to speak freely’ (13). Michele Fero (n.d) echoes Spurr, citing Mary Louise Pratt’s analysis of European travel writing, the infamous ‘Monarch of All I Survey’ mentality, and the writing that presents this as self-evident, creating, Fero posits, ‘a dominant and harmful discourse about non-Europeans, especially those with darker skin’ (2).

(ii) Appropriation, in the old colonialism, is concerned with the acquisition of land and labour and resources for Empire, while in neo-colonialism, Appropriation is specifically manifest in the form of cheap labour and commercial imperialism. Regarding the Appropriation of an image (a practice prevalent in the representations of the San of Botswana, as will be demonstrated in Chapter Four of this thesis) New Age movements of recent times, asserts Robert F. Berkhofer (1978) exploit Native Americans in a countercultural use of constructed imagery.

Berkhofer points to the ‘real and imitation Indian jewelry festoon[ing] the arms and necks of White American men and women [and] bedspreads, towels and tablecloths decorated with supposed
Indian motifs adorn[ing] their homes’, reflecting, ‘some Whites’ disquietude with their own society [indicating] that even today’s sympathetic artists chiefly understand Native Americans according to their own artistic needs and moral values rather than in terms of the outlook and desires of the people they profess to know and depict’ (103).

However, such ‘indelible engravement’ on White minds can be the stuff of positive change, suggests Berkhofer, when ‘[h]umanness not race’ becomes the ‘essential criterion’ (106) of [Indigenous] depictions in artistic texts. This extension of the concept is explored in the chronicle of San Resistance (Chapter Five) in this thesis.

(iii) Aestheticization sees a ‘narrative approach to reality’ which sets the real world and its people at a remove from the observer. The distance, both geographical and cultural, of the Third World from the First, asserts Spurr, is that which facilitates the use of ‘the restraining constructs of advanced civilization’ (46).

(iv) Classification is a necessity to a dominant worldview: ‘Within the realm of discourse, Classification performs this policing function, assigning positions, regulating groups, and enforcing boundaries’ (63). Spurr cites Darwin, whose descriptions of Indigenous people could offend enlightened understandings. Darwin ranks the ‘primitive’ peoples he encounters in hierarchical order, largely according to their perceived level of technological advancement and societal structuring: ‘If the state in which the Fuegans live should be fixed at zero in the scale of government … New Zealand would rank but a few degrees higher, while Tahiti, even when first discovered would have occupied a respectable position’ (64).
(v) Debasement in colonial discourse is about the production of rhetoric and imagery that actively sets out to defile and vilify a certain race or group often in a psycho-semantic exercise. Spurr cites Julia Kristeva who notes the abjection of the object by the subject, thus creating a convenient Other and in the process maintaining the established power dynamic. The ‘scapegoat’ for the apparent shortcomings of society is susceptible to any negative labeling and defined as being fundamentally flawed.

(vi) Negation is a case of ‘persona nullius’; the effective dismissal of a race and its culture by way of deliberate omission or subtle undermining; a concept philosopher Raimond Gaita (1999) asserts as being a prevalent European-Australian attitude towards Aboriginal people still today: ‘We love but they ‘love’; we grieve but they ‘grieve’ and, of course, we may be dispossessed but they are ‘dispossessed’ (78). According to Spurr, non-Western language too, is subject to Negation, still evident in supposedly enlightened societies. As is evident further in this thesis, San languages are actively negated in modern Botswana official policy and the education system: ‘Although there are efforts towards introducing mother-tongue languages in the school curriculum, the education system is still plagued with many challenges in realising these aspirations’ (Rebecca Lekoko, presentation to the OSISA conference, Gaborone, 2011).

(vii) Affirmation occurs whereby idealised values of a dominant culture, such as science and progress are endorsed, the affirmation of moral and cultural – and holistically human – superiority: ‘it calls attention to itself as a declaration, thus ennobling its rhetorical posture. It makes the obligatory distinction between civilized and barbarian’ (111). Such positioning, of course, must come at some
price: Spurr cites writers who have described their dominant situation as a ‘responsibility’ and a ‘burden’, enhancing rhetorical motifs of ‘chivalry, heraldry and ancient nobility’ (115). In terms of representation, Affirmation of the new establishment is necessary to maintain that authority, so the representations are continuous and constantly updated in order for an established system to be self-evidently in authority.

(viii) Idealization sets up the ‘use’ of colonised peoples in a largely symbolic manner by Europeans and Americans for their own political purposes. Spurr cites Montaigne’s references to the ‘Edenic’ cannibals of Brazil who were shown to be shocked at the class schism and ludicrous manifestation of monarchy they encountered in France in 1562. Thus, these Brazilian Indians became simply a tool for Montaigne’s satirical expose of sixteenth century France. They are constructs for political propaganda, for righting the wrongs of Europe through comparison with its perceived antithesis.

Glowing rhetoric about the subaltern is and was often sincere, albeit ignorant, showing a genuine regard for the subjects of the imperialist project. The project still has, at its core, however, the ultimate agenda of changing the native, retaining those virtuous qualities innate to their antediluvian state and discarding the more crude (or resistant) in favour of Christian values. McAllister (2010) shows the disparity between reality and rhetoric with his employment of the term ‘pastoral’ to describe representations extolling the virtues of the ‘simple, harmonious, rural life’, cynically noting its place in exoticising discourse since ‘it lost its ancient contact with ‘the real social conditions of country life’ (5).
Insubstantialization is a ‘phenomenology of consciousness’ (Spurr, 142) in the Western world, drawn as specific fantastical representations of the ‘Other’ by the West; Westerners’ experiences in the non-Western world are thus essentially inner journeys, or soul experiences. The material, then, becomes the immaterial. The objective (scientific) and the subjective (poetic) converge with the effect that the Orient is confirmed as the Other.

Postcolonial theory (or Orientalism’s foil) is also, according to Abigail Ward (cited in MacLeod, 2007) subject to ‘psychological formulations’. Ward cites Sam Durrant (2004) as claiming an inextricable correlation between psychoanalysis and postcolonialism: ‘Postcolonial narrative … is caught between these two commitments: its transformation of the past into a narrative is simultaneously an attempt to summon the dead and lay them to rest’ (190).

Naturalization in essence, assumes that natural laws determine the natural superiority of the coloniser over primitive peoples because the former is ‘civilised’ and the latter lives in a state of nature, the antithesis of civilisation. Certainly it is not in the coloniser’s (or, in a neo-colonialist schema, globalised/corporate) interests to be aware of such an inconsistency. This is a phenomenon ‘joining scientific theory, moral philosophy, and political ideology’ (Spurr: 163). Perhaps by extension, the correlation is drawn between physical differences such as ethnicity, lifestyle and moral divides. The natural state necessarily equates with immorality/amorality, while civilisation is synonymous with the observance of moral code. This schism was also connected, in the European narrative, in terms of tropical heat and northern cold respectively.
(xi) Eroticization involves the use of ‘metaphors, seductive fantasies expressions of sexual anxiety – in which the traditions of colonialist and phallocentric discourses coincide’ (170). Of course, this is not simply in the realm of rhetoric. Colonised and developing countries have been, and in some cases still are, playgrounds of sexual imperialism.

And finally, (xii) Resistance involves the ‘colonial enterprise’ from the opposing perspective, manifest in myriad forms, some combative, some passive, some imaginative, subtle, clever. James Scott (1990) goes so far as to suggest Resistance can be considered a strategic art form in many cases. Paulo Freire also elucidates this concept, describing critical performance as that which should empower the disempowered to ‘unveil the world of oppression and through praxis commit themselves to its transformation’ (Freire 1970, in Denzin and Lincoln: 688).

It does not necessarily follow that open self-representation, while almost always hard-won, is an impossibility: ‘self-definition proceeds through opposition, making the asymmetrical relationships to power all too apparent ... the need to know ourselves all the more by defining who is and who is not our permissible neighbour, our competitor, our guide’ (Hutnyk 1996: 209). Graves (1998b) acknowledges however, that there may be limitations with this, since almost invariably the subaltern’s discourse of Resistance occurs within the language of the dominant. This is the case with the Botswana San who must mount any challenges to Tswana hegemony in the English language, or at the very least, Setswana.

Resistance, then, need not be oppositional or negational towards the dominant discourse. Anna Carr (cited in Timothy, 2007) posits
that tangible, inclusive, yet inoffensive and undisruptive measures, such as the acknowledging of Maori place names in New Zealand, is much more significant in promoting cross-cultural understanding than more adversarial methods (77). Several of these non-confrontational modes are shown to be at work in San resistance via self-representation for tourist consumption, elaborated upon in Chapter Five.

(c) Methodology

Representations are not a reflection of ‘reality’ but constitutive of it. There is no materiality that is not mediated by discourse, as there is no discourse that is unrelated to materialities (Escobar 1995: 130).

Limitations to (traditional) empirical research

My natural inclination is towards the inherent inclusiveness of participatory action research in the light of (among others) Paulo Freire’s endorsement of this orientation; the belief that ‘people have a universal right to participate in the production of knowledge which is a disciplined process of personal and social transformation’ (1982:30) and in its commitment to acknowledging the ‘political nature of knowledge’ and upholding ‘a premium on self-emancipation’ (Esposito and Murphy 2000: 180). However, my reasons for not undertaking a traditional ‘empirical’ study where members of San communities, as well as tourist operators, are interviewed and their responses interpreted, are significant and presented below.

First is the undeniable fact that research into the San, indeed any ethnic minority, in Botswana is forbidden, although this is not articulated in law. Anthropologist Jennifer Hays, who was obliged to shift her research to Namibia where it was welcomed rather than
viewed with suspicion, as in Botswana, articulates this limitation with regard to her research:

"Although I had initially proposed to conduct my dissertation research in Ngamiland, Botswana, and had received funding to do so ... the government of Botswana had issued a moratorium on research investigating the Basarwa (as the San are called in that country). The government perceived researchers ... as working against the interests of national unity under one ethnic identity. Research about ethnic minorities — particularly the San — was seen as divisive (2007: 10-11).

Official hostility to academic scrutiny of the situation of ethnic minorities is exemplified in the treatment of Professor Kenneth Good who was evicted from Botswana in 2005 for his outspokenness on San issues generally; the eviction from the CKGR and their marginalisation in modern Botswana, including their lack of representation in government. Although the African Union ruled in favour of reinstating Professor Good’s right to re-enter the country (and in fact, to be compensated for his original loss of employment and court costs) the Government of Botswana has ignored this and Good is still a Prohibited Immigrant.

Far from being a reason to go outside Botswana for my own research, such obstructionism suggests the government has something to hide and makes the rhetoric of texts produced by government tourism agencies all the more interesting in their duplicity. It must be said, though, that while at the time I was undertaking this research, permits were usually denied by the Government of Botswana, this is less the case, now (Mwikisa, 2015), although obtaining them is a long process."
Secondly, the language is a hindrance in both contexts, so that even with the aid of an interpreter it would be impossible to tell the extent to which certain nuances of meaning are lost in translation, or whether or not there were elements of fear and/or coercion in the answers given. This involves ‘sensitive research’, a practice articulated by Wellings et al (2000, in Liamputtong 2007: 194) as that which ‘might result in offence or lead to social censure or disapproval … [and which] potentially poses a substantial threat to those who are or have been involved in it’.

In this, suggests O’Neill (1996, in Liamputtong 2007: 26) researchers, morally speaking, are like pimps: ‘[c]oming into the field to take, then returning to the campus, institution or suburb where they write up the data, publish and build careers – on the backs of those they took data from’. Such a consideration is in keeping with the definition of ‘vulnerable people’ as ‘individuals who are marginalised and discriminised (sic) in society due to their social positions based on class, ethnicity … Often they are difficult to reach … to access’ (Liamputtong 2007: 194). From afar, with only very limited time in-country, scope for the establishment of trust necessary for any meaningful interchange to occur is unavailable.

Thirdly, as Jennifer Hays (2007) submits, there are times when the very people in whom researchers are interested become fatigued with Western intrusions into their space, perceiving (sometimes correctly) that here is yet another ‘do-gooder’ whose research will probably have negligible positive impact upon their lives, ‘[t]here was the feeling that researchers keep coming to ask them questions … but that nothing ever changes … [people] expect more than just immediate material gains from their interactions with researchers’ (6-7).
As a result of such considerations, this thesis offers an analysis of public domain texts for tourist consumption, for which official clearance is not necessary. Postcolonial theory deconstructs the inherent exploitative features of these texts, supported by semiotic tools of analysis.

Kellehear recognises that it is possible to be an ‘unobtrusive researcher’, not directly interacting with the human subjects of interest but rather remaining a ‘detached onlooker … [forcing] familiarity with the subject, allowing previously unnoticed or ignored aspects to be seen [since] people’s actions are … more telling than their verbal accounts’ (115-116). He does, however, concede potential disadvantages with this method, including the fact that our own subjectivity as researchers can hinder our understandings, in that whatever is familiar to us can be overlooked, accepted per se, while the unusual can be interpreted in ‘loaded or ethnocentric ways’, or subsumed into that which makes sense to us. This is ‘observer bias’ (126), a phenomenon which also encompasses fatigue due to the time involved and often unmanageable amounts of data which is difficult to prioritise. For this reason, Kellehear suggests that observation should not be the only method, and as such will play only a supplementary role in this thesis.

Kellehear acknowledges Webb et al (1966) and Denzin (1970) for this list of observation types: exterior physical signs (including graffiti, street signs, menus, tattoos, church services, commercial products); expressive movement (body language, gesture, facial expression); physical location (human use of setting and study of personal space); language behaviour (repetition of topic, stuttering, volume of speech, eye contact while speaking, etc), and time duration
Kellehear stresses that all interactions, activities and objects occur within a socio-political and physical landscape. Whatever the central focus of the observations (space, behaviour, product, etc) the notes ‘should exist around the other areas to contextualise the subjects and the observations themselves’ (130). The inclusion of some tourist blogs to ascertain tourists’ understandings of the Indigenous people in context they visit, and the extent to which tourism texts influenced their decisions and perceptions, helps to endorse the status of the texts as inherently powerful in their representations.

**Target audience: defining cultural tourists**

Within my semiotic analysis is an assumption regarding the type of tourist that the selected texts are designed to attract. Tourist typologies are complex, perhaps impossible to categorise cleanly; Eade (1992) calls for a nonessentialist analysis of tourism that deconstructs superficial, dichotomous notions of hedonist versus pilgrim. Noel B. Salazar (2014) points out, though, that hitherto, tourism as a study is not comprehensive or universal since the conceptual discussion around tourism’s motives, types, trends and dilemmas has occurred within a Western framework ('the metropole'). For the purpose of this thesis, however, I make some broad classifications.

*Alternative - or justice tourists* include activists, freelance writers and researchers. This group lies outside the parameters of Chapters Three and Four. *Cultural tourists* encompass those who have an aesthetic and/or anthropological – in short, a non-activist – interest
in an Indigenous group. Spiritual tourists seek out certain
cultural/ethnic groups for enlightenment and/or healing. This thesis
concentrates on texts designed for cultural and spiritual tourists. This
(admittedly generalised) demographic is largely responding to the
'postmodern rhetoric of exhaustion ... [eschewing] a world at mortal
risk' in a desire for 'global consciousness' (Holland and Huggan,
2000: 178). The authors note that nature writing, the literary by-
product of ecotourism, commercialises 'narratives of
disappearance ('vanishing worlds, endangered species,' and so
forth) and the incorporation of these narratives into a redemptive
allegory that combines (collective environmental consciousness
with (personal) spiritual quest' (179).

The response of tourists to the Kalahari regarding their encounters
with the San is, for the most part, demonstrably ingenuous.
Unwittingly accepting the ‘co-optation of primitivist aesthetics’,
they epitomise the ‘consumer-driven fascination with scarcity’,
apparently unaware of the ‘marketing of New Age myths of spiritual
regeneration or awakening' (ibid: 179). Robyn Davidson’s 1996
chronicle of her time in Gujarat, India can be briefly shown here as
an example of a desire for otherness in the implicit comparison
Davidson draws between her own native England (which she sees
as overly individualistic and ahistorical) and the visited culture
(which she obviously regards favourably in its timeless communality):

How comforting it must be to pass through life’s
storms always with the support of the group [with]
one voice extending from the time of one’s
ancestors down through the generations, saying,
'it’s all right. We are all here. There is no such thing
as alone (cited in Fullagar 2007: 8).

Liesbeth Groenewald (2008) posits that the co-mingling of the
traditional and the contemporary in the San context is a
strong cultural motivator [involving] a degree of fantasy. This serves a psychological need in the tourist [entailing] a meeting by the ‘tourist’ with a hunter-gatherer society of the past that is even today managing to live comfortably and in harmony with nature (27).

Motives of escape, freedom from obligation and time constraints can be as powerful as the drive of quest, according to Turner and Turner (1978) who see tourists ushered into ‘a state of liminality or unstructured ‘time out of time’; the ‘antistructure’ of life’ (cited in Stronza 2001: 266). Noel B. Salazar (2009) notes the mythologised tourism imaginaries of (largely) Western visions of “otherness” that emanate from popular culture and several scholarly discourses. He cites Galaty’s 2002 notion of the ‘pictorial frame’ of the exoticised indigene which ‘bears considerable political cost’ (ibid.: 52). Whether the tourist is consciously aware or not, ‘blogs cited in Chapter Three of this thesis attest to such incentives as these.

The phenomenon of modern ‘third world tourism’ as a form of Appropriation is highlighted with the recognition of

the market potential of [the longing for ‘authentic’ experiences with ‘natives’ ... as [is] the tourism industry, which is systematically engaged in producing images of ... difference in order to promote different native worlds as desirable travel destinations (Britton 1979; Enloe, 1989, in Prasad 2003: 161).

But Frommer (2009) believes that ‘unless tourists make an effort to visit all parts ... their understanding is badly incomplete; they cannot use such visits to inform their political thinking, because they have seen only one, limited aspect of a particular society’ (1). Stasja Koot (2012) notes a paradox Namibia whereby the Hei/ /om Bushmen
whose hunting rights, revoked on ancestral lands have been revived for the purpose of assisting trophy-hunting tourists so that the San are able to live their traditional way only within the confines of the ‘tourist bubble’ (Van Beek and Schmidt, 2012: 10). Joseph Mboiwa (2012) observes tourists seeking out San in the Okavango region as effectively chasing myths in the belief that developing countries such as Botswana are timeless.

In Chapter Five of the thesis, Alternative - or justice tourists feature more prominently, those possessed of that which Maureen Moynah (2008) calls an ‘ethical form of worldliness’ (6). Such tourists are characterised in this context by their recognition that the official rhetoric in Botswana does not reflect the San’s socio-political reality. Artistic and literary texts depicting the San produced for the tourist industry by the San themselves are shown to be eagerly supported and promoted by such tourists and the hope that provides the impetus for this thesis is that the Cultural tourists who constitute the majority of visitors to Botswana will grow in awareness as the San’s self-representation becomes more pervasive.

**Tourism texts**

Texts deconstructed in this thesis are not only those commercially purpose-produced for tourist consumption, although there are certainly several of these described and analysed. Texts were also selected that have been produced as artistic pieces, such as a fiction series, memoirs and a popular film, or informal texts such as tourist blogs and political communiqués that have, perhaps inadvertently, generated a wave of tourist interest in the Botswana San context.

Semiotics, argues Daniel Chandler (2007) seeks to ‘study meaning-making and representation in cultural artifacts and practices … While semiotic analysis has been widely applied to the literary, artistic and musical canon, it has also been applied to a wide variety of popular cultural phenomena. It has thus helped to stimulate the serious study of popular culture’ (223).

Semiotics is essentially an arts-based inquiry which, according to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), ‘has emerged in postcolonial, postmodern contexts, woven from complex threads of social, political and philosophical shifts in perspectives and practices across multiple discourse communities … [and which] features a developing activist dynamic’ (682). Ironically, in terms of the focus of this thesis, semiotics has been ‘criticized as imperialistic’ by virtue of its ‘invading the ‘territory of different academic disciplines’ (Chandler 2007: 223). Among other noble intentions, this type of research critiques ‘the everyday signifiers of power and practices of concealment that typically prevent self-knowledge and by discouraging naming the tensions and contradictions wrought by capitalist colonialist practices’ (688).

Ulmer (1994) coins the term ‘guerilla semiotics’ to describe that project of ‘changing the circumstances by virtue of which the receivers choose their own codes of reading … This pragmatic energy of semiotic consciousness shows how a descriptive discipline can also be an active project’ (Ulmer 1994 in Denzin and Lincoln 2005: 689). This is the politics that Law (2004) identifies (along with truth and aesthetics) as one of the ‘goods’ that assemblages potentially generate, ‘[i]f politics is about better social … arrangements, and about the struggles to achieve these, then
method assemblage and its products can also be judged politically ... it is not innocent’ (149).

A lack of innocence also informs Norman Fairclough’s discourse analysis, which naturally integrates with semiotic analysis, as he sees everyday use of language as integral to hegemonic struggle (1995), arguing that language is in essence a social practice, and by way of interdiscursive (or intertextual) analysis it is possible to determine the relationship between texts and their social contexts through their selection, determining ‘which discursive practices are being drawn upon and in what combinations’ (189).

Underpinning this method, though, is my inclination towards post-structuralist anti-method, founded in humility. Law (2004) expresses this succinctly: ‘[W]e need to unmake many of our methodological habits, including the desire for certainty; the expectation that we can usually arrive at more or less stable conclusions about the way things really are’ (9). He cites Derrida’s postmodernist rejection of the foundational and the fixed, ‘[n]othing is self-sealing, complete ... What is being made present always depends on what is also being made absent ... Materials – and so realities – are treated as relational products. They do not exist in and of themselves’ (83).

Law goes on to discuss the concepts of ‘presence, manifest absence and Otherness’ (84) which is helpful in the mechanics of text deconstruction. This relational dynamic is summarised as follows:

[p]resence is, obviously, what is made present ... ‘condensed ‘in-here’... Some are representations while others are objects or processes. Presence ... is any kind of ‘in-here’ enactment. Manifest absence [correlates with presence] since presence
incomplete and depends on absence. To make present is also to make absent … Otherness, or absence that is not made manifest, [is also] necessary to presence. But it disappears … Perhaps … because what is being brought to presence and manifest absence cannot be sustained unless it is Othered … method assemblage is … about the crafting and enacting of boundaries between presence, manifest absence and Otherness (85).

In accord with this, Allan Kellehear argues that semiotic analysis goes beyond the thematic and the hermeneutic in that it deems that which is ‘omitted or repressed and/or overlayed by other themes’ as equally significant to that which is present. He paraphrases Deeley’s assessment that ‘[s]emiotic analysis really involves following on realization about hidden meanings and codes to its fullest unfolded implications’ (1993:43). Interpretations, of course, often occur within a theoretical framework. Such assumptions of what specific signifiers mean are, of course, culturally determined, but this thesis conducts such interpretations within a predominantly Postcolonial (read: Western meta-analysis) paradigm. Theories of visual literacy are consulted to give the analysis of visual representations further profundity.

Selection of texts for analysis.
The sampling of texts within this thesis is purposeful sampling, in that tourism texts available are simply too numerous for one researcher to accommodate, necessitating considered selection: ‘[t]he logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in electing information-rich cases … from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the inquiry … Purposeful sampling is sometimes called purposive or judgement sampling (Patton: 230).
The rationale for text selection is that which Michael Quinn Patton (2002) identifies as ‘perspective/worldview’ based, wherein people ‘share a culture [and/or] … a common experience or perspective’ (231). This is both people focused and structure (context) focused. Patton classifies several strategies for selecting ‘information-rich cases’ (230). Purposeful Sampling encompasses seminal elements of (a) critical case sampling, (b) theoretical sampling and (c) opportunistic (or emergent) sampling, so these are paraphrased as follows:

(a) Critical case sampling acknowledges that although this research centres around representations of a specific indigenous group, the findings and conclusions can be universally extrapolated. Patton writes, ‘[c]ritical cases are those that can make a point quite dramatically or are … particularly important in the scheme of things ‘if it happens here it will happen anywhere’, or vice versa … logical generalizations can often be made from the weight of evidence produced in studying a single, critical case’ (236-237).

(b) Theoretical sampling is relevant in this study as the text artefacts chosen will be deconstructed against a theoretical framework, or the traditionally labeled comparative method, ‘connecting design and analysis’ (239). Postcolonial theory, supplemented with elements of tourism theory is the theoretical construct, so that artefacts are selected on the basis of the ‘emerging concepts with the aim being to explore the dimensional range or varied conditions along which the properties of concepts vary’ (Strauss and Corbin 1998, in Patton: 239).
(c) Opportunistic sampling speaks to the fact that researchers seeking text artefacts usually do not know what they will encounter before they set out. As previously mentioned, for political and other reasons, the traditional empirical approach is inaccessible in the Botswana context, so the research focuses instead on that which is readily available in the public domain.

In terms of verbal texts, semiotic analysis and discourse analysis interrelate insofar as both reflect and represent social realities and inform the construction (and de-construction) of the dominant social order. Fairclough (1992) makes the point that discourse can be used to refer to extended samples of spoken dialogue, spoken or written language with the emphasis on interaction between speaker and listener and to identify different types of language employed in a variety of social situations.

A cross-section of textual genres is provided within the sample in order to explore the validity of my central claim: that texts for tourist consumption are sufficiently powerful and influential as to have an effect upon the level of dis/empowerment of a specific Indigenous group. The data for rhetorical criticism is multimodal but even within texts there is a natural hybridity, that is, as Mary E. Hocks, elucidates, 'at once verbal, spatial and visual ... which scrutinizes conventional expectations and power relations ... to a new understanding of how designed spaces and artifacts impact audiences' (2003: 644-645).

This chapter encompasses three distinct sections. A review of literature pertaining to the San is presented, classified by various representations of the peoples over several centuries into the present, such as infantilising rhetoric and imagery present within literature under the heading 'The San as children'. The theoretical
framework showing a natural blending of postcolonial analysis and post-tourism critique is demonstrably based on a recognition of common tourist practices as a manifestation of neo-colonial attitudes and misconceptions. Tourist credulousness and its extension in practice is categorised into tropes of colonial belief arranged conceptually by David Spurr (1993). The methodology characterises the typology of tourist to whom the analysed texts are targeted and by whom they are consumed. It also defines ‘tourist text’ for the purpose of this investigation as broadening the definition from solely those texts purpose-produced for the tourist to encompass material that inadvertently entices tourists to Botswana.

The chapter justifies, in theoretical and practical terms, the purposeful sampling of texts for analysis and the semantic and semiotic tools employed to deconstruct the colonialist elements of rhetoric and imagery representing the San for tourist consumption in Botswana.

The following chapter opens the three-part analysis of tourism representations of the San in Botswana against Spurr’s tropes.

At various points within the thesis I make reference to constructions of particular tropes as being more inherently acceptable or objectionable than others in the Botswana postcolonial context. My distinctions are founded upon a perception of intent. For example, the Debasement of a person or group is, in my view, a conscious and malicious act of vilification; Eroticization, whether acted upon or not, is an assumption of sexual supremacy; Appropriation a hegemonic assertion of a right of acquisition, etc.; whereas Affirmation, Idealization and even sometimes Negation are frequently at work unconsciously, based on (often benevolently projected) misconceptions. Of course, mine are not uncompromisingly applied distinctions, since the practice of, for example, Aestheticization by a well-meaning but credulous tourist is not based on the same motives or sentiments as Aestheticization as it is manifest in the purposefully constructed imagery and rhetoric of the tourism industry.
Chapter Three
‘You have that gift from your people’:
Literary representations of the San.

Lose yourself in the wilderness … then find your soul
(Adventure Safaris, Botswana).

No one knew where he came from or who his people had been. Whether he knew himself, no one could tell. I stood there, stirred to the heart, watching him progress across the burning water into the papyrus, standing so erect before the night. In that mythological light of the dying day he seemed to me the complete symbol of the silent fate of his race (Laurens van der Post 1958: 14).

This chapter analyses representations of the San in literary form for tourist consumption. It includes discourse analysis of several genres: tourist blogs; guidebook excerpts and purportedly objective commentary from tourism literature available in-country; poetry which lyrically extols the virtues of Botswana; advertisements and captions; museum text and literary offerings including a fiction series; a novella; wildlife writing, and Laurens van der Post’s memoirs which, despite being dated, are ubiquitously cited within Botswana tourism ephemera as the authoritative perspective on the Kalahari San.

All texts analysed in this chapter represent (or conspicuously negate by under-representing or failing to represent) the San. No deconstruction of such representations can be made in isolation from the social and political realities of the San in Botswana, or without reference to their historical positioning. The poet Albert Malikongwa bemoans the Insubstantialization amounting to Negation embedded within San imagery in the depiction of them as a mythological people. Such a code of representation
'dehumanize[s] them' in a process that Gagiano (2008) describes as ‘Kitschification’ when the San are seen as ‘markers of cultural authenticity’ (cited in Mwikisa 2006: 98). Malikongwa's poem ‘Protest from a Bushman’ (cited in Chapman and Dangor, Eds., 1982) has a San narrator express disappointment at the treatment of his people:

I frown on the insensitivity of my countrymen
And those that
paraphrase my plight and my life
And with plethora of questions and stories
Donate bushman paintings
To foreign museums and archives.

The blameworthy ‘countrymen’, supposes Mwikisa, are those who perpetuate ‘the iconic use of Basarwa art and culture as emblems of national cultural identity’ (98). However, there are more subtle and insidious ways of employing the San to uphold the national agenda of assimilation through the denial of ethnic minorities.

Far from referencing the iconic, an example of ostensibly harmless but in fact negating representation of the San people of Botswana is evident via their fictional presence in The No.1 Ladies’ Detective Agency series (1998–). Alexander McCall Smith’s series was not penned specifically for tourists, but it has had the effect of luring tourists to Botswana as evident by the following tour and paraphernalia. Infotour Africa describes the phenomenon of the literary tour as ‘[a] great reason to see Gaborone en route to safari: literary tour based on Alexander McCall Smith’s beloved books provides unique Botswana travel experience’ (www.africainsight.com, accessed 16/12/2013). Exclusive license for the tours is owned by Africa Insight in an agreement with McCall Smith. This company’s website warns tourists against being duped
by the pirate offerings of rival companies: ‘Alexander McCall Smith has put a huge amount back into Botswana from the revenues raised from these wonderful books. Don’t compromise his intellectual rights by buying bootlegged material’ (www.africainsight.com, accessed 10/12/2013).

A recent message from Alexander McCall Smith in his monthly online newsletter to his devoted readers informs them that

[...] for the rest of November I shall be in Botswana, where I shall be doing a readers’ safari. This is organised by Belmond Safaris ... I did the same thing last year, and a number of readers joined us on it. I know that is not cheap, but if you are in a position to treat yourself to something rather special it is a most interesting trip. The important thing to remember, I think, is that these safaris are held in areas where there is no other employment for local people, and they provide a lifeline for the local community in these remote places. I am delighted to be
able to support the safari industry in Botswana because I know that Botswana is very serious about conservation and has developed its safari industry as a way of achieving conservation goals while at the same time allowing very vulnerable communities to live in villages that they would otherwise probably have to abandon (marketing=littlebrown.co.uk, accessed 27/8/2014).

The verb ‘abandon’ is semantically ironic here, although McCall Smith appears oblivious. Abandonment of villages inside the CKGR has certainly occurred, forcibly, so to accommodate just such safari companies, and the subsequent associated employment of San is an imperative brought about by the abandonment of villages. Villages outside the CKGR are not abandoned, but rather reception centres for evictees. The tone of the ‘important thing to remember’ I read as defensiveness in the light, perhaps of some less than salutory critique (for example, Thomas, 2012) of McCall Smith’s effective dismissal of San evictions from the CKGR through his omission of any reference to the policy or its implementation.

The No. 1 Ladies’ Detective Agency novels are omnipresent in tourist outlets and enormously popular in many countries. The literary series and its spin-off television mini-series has in fact spurred film production in the country, as an industry representative asserts: ‘[U]n until recently there was no reason to come here as a tourist and in fact it wasn’t encouraged at all and having had these books written about it and set in Gaborone and … the television series produced here … we have Hollywood, we have Bollywood, we now have Kgalewood’8(www.youtube.com, No.1 Ladies’ Detective Agency: Gem of Botswana, accessed 13/10/2009). Indeed, McAllister (2010) asserts that the No.1 Detective Agency series is ‘being used by

---

8 Kgale is the district of Gaborone where the film set for the No.1 Ladies' Detective Agency is located. Sadly, the film set was recently burned down in an act of apparently random vandalism.
marketers to promote safari tourism’ (6) and recounts his personal experience of ‘living on Zebra Way in Gaborone and sometimes seeing groups of tourists combing the street in search of Precious Ramotswe’s house in Zebra Drive’ (7). In his fiction series, Alexander McCall Smith endorses, by way of his sympathetic characters, the less overtly objectionable tropes of Spurr’s spectrum (according to my articulation of such distinctions in Chapter Two, footnote 8) in his depiction of the San.

This is engaging, light-hearted literature, written by a European in a tone apparently of great affection and respect for the people of Botswana including the San. McCall Smith is, however, seemingly unaware of the infantilising narrative tone and the potential for further systemic marginalisation of the San through the manner of their representation in his series. Indeed, in the academic works on The No. 1 Ladies’ Detective Agency series cited in this chapter, the authors have all mentioned McCall Smith’s romanticising of Africa, the mismatch between the tragic realities of modern Africa and the idealised rhetoric. Even with the acknowledgement of the series’ portrayal of an ‘Edenic African utopia [which] refutes inherited Western guilt for colonial exploitation and justifies contemporary apathy to address the problems of the continent’ (Graves, 2010, in McAllister et.al.: 15) none of these critiques once refer to the San children fostered by the protagonists. Indeed, the children are rarely mentioned in the series itself and certainly they do not develop to be three-dimensional characters, rather act as symbols of the main characters’ altruism; the children’s relative invisibility in the narrative reflecting their race’s effective invisibility in modern Botswana, outside the commercial representational paradigm.
Although I am critical of McCall Smith’s negating representations of the San children in his narrative, even he – albeit indirectly, via a character in another of his fiction series set in Scotland – appears to have misgivings about the perception that the San are now not as anthropologically exotic as they were: ‘[e]verybody knew about [the Bushmen] after Laurens van der Post wrote all his nonsense’ (2005: 66).

In much government literature for the consumption of outsiders, van der Post is still lauded as a celebrated authority on the region and the San in particular. As just one example, in keeping with Spurr’s Appropriation, the 2010 edition of the Discover Botswana magazine features an article for tourists about the Tsodilo Hills, showcasing a panel in the rocky outcrop that was named for van der Post (‘one of the most spectacular rock art sites at Tsodilo … [it] can be seen towering over the veldt from 500 metres’: 64). Van der Post famously and Eurocentrically named the labyrinth, replete with ancient San rock art, ‘The Louvre of the Desert’ (1958: 189) and this comparison to the ‘definitive’ Parisian original is a form of Spurr’s concept of Affirmation, much like the attribution of ‘Hottentot Venus’ to abducted – for display in Europe – San woman Sara Baartman in 1810. Tsodilo rock art ascribed as ‘The Louvre of the Desert’ is broadly quoted on tourist ephemera in Botswana. In an example of Insubstantialization, enhancing the sense of a supernatural relationship with the hills: ‘it was here that, famously in his book The Lost World of the Kalahari, van der Post was to come to grief at the hands of the gods. Attacked by bees, his equipment malfunctioning, he was forced to write an apology to the gods, and bury it in a bottle that is supposedly here to this day’ (Botswana Tourism Board, 2010: 55). The question as to whether van der Post’s portrayal of the people is that of ‘the writer who intends to use his
audience for the specific task of providing professional … scientific material … [or] the writer for whom a real or metaphorical trip … is the fulfilment of some deeply felt and urgent project … built on a personal aesthetic, fed and informed by the project’ (Said 1987: 157-158) is investigated throughout this chapter.

Postings on the worldwide web are often revealing of their authors’ credulousness. The uninformed, often idealised assumptions made by recent tourists in blogs, having been influenced by some texts, are documented within this chapter to argue for a correlation between tourism imagery/rhetoric and continuing disempowerment in the case of the Botswana San. Semiotic and discourse analysis of these texts (as well as against Spurr’s colonial tropes) is necessarily embedded within—and informed by the broad context of modern Botswana’s socio-political response to the San minority. My purpose in foregrounding a selection of tourist blogs in this chapter is driven by optimism that tourists will become more discerning, perhaps through more rigorous prior research, about the rhetorical bias founded in vested interest of much of the literature and imagery pertaining to Indigenous groups such as the San.

Travel guides are usually the first reference point for tourists visiting any country and can be influential in shaping visitors’ views. The overall project is about enticing tourists to a site in order to appreciate the ‘Other’ and thus, the practice of Aestheticization at the very least, is prominent as well as the kind of passive Appropriation of (albeit sketchy) ‘knowledge’ of a culture that goes along with this. As evident from the associated responses, the ‘blogs appear to perpetuate precisely the mythology the tourism industry constructs and disseminates so calculatedly.
Museum text is also influential in forming or perpetuating tourist perceptions about an ethnic group once they are in-country. The rewriting of the museum’s role in society is an encouraging trend, claims Moira Simpson (2001) but the problem of representation still exists, with the curators and contributing anthropologists and historians still being largely Western and/or trained within Western paradigms. Most museums and galleries within Botswana still very much fit this description, as is demonstrated further into the chapter with text from two museums. The university educated Tswana staff and the displays support the rhetoric of the San as an extinct race with no place in modern Botswana.

Text within tourism packaging produced by industry and government in Botswana employs language to exoticise landscape and wildlife, with the San relegated to an historical aesthetic whose antediluvian skills and lifestyle epitomise the ‘doomed race’ concept, which is also evident by omission of any substantial mention of the San in an iconic memoir. Years after the first publication of wildlife researchers Mark and Delia Owens’ book Cry of the Kalahari (1984) some readers are still open to Aestheticization of the Kalahari and its place in the Western imaginary as an untouched wilderness, evidenced by the publication of recent editions due to popular demand. A reviewer for the book writes thus in 1998: ‘Now I simply re-read [Cry of the Kalahari] everytime (sic) I need to visit Africa in my mind. For those people who wish to explore and experience (non-tourist) Africa this is a great place to start’ (www.amazon.com, accessed 23/9/2013).

A 2008 novella by Gaselbalwe Seretse, ‘dedicated to the San of the Kalahari’ (iii) and cited in Chapter Two, was published as a result of its winning a literary competition initiative of the British Council and
Books Botswana. It is prominently on sale in Botswana tourist outlets and bookstores. On superficial analysis, it appears to be a treatise on the San’s disenfranchised position in Botswana in the pre-colonial and colonial periods. Further analysis renders it, however, a celebration (*Affirmation*) of the apparently newfound largesse of the dominant culture (historically the Bangwato\(^9\) tribe) in conceding equality of the San (collectively called ‘Masarwa’ and Basarwa interchangeably in this book) and of the British clergy who upheld the notion of Bangwato and San sameness. This further enhances the notion of dominant culture altruism and paternalism, by way of the tone that assumes this group has the authority to concede a growing maturity on the other in a spirit of largesse.

Literary representations are analysed here within some of the thematic categories first established in the review of literature (Chapter Two): the San as children; as hyper-real/commodity; as ‘less than’; as victims, and as doomed race. Spurr’s tropes are embedded throughout the analysis. The thematic headings, as with Spurr’s tropes, overlap conceptually at various points, so the distinctions drawn within such categorisation are nuanced. For example, the representation of the San as a *doomed race* is frequently appropriated within tourism depictions as a *hyper-real*, deliberately *commodified* image; the infantilisation at work in the drawing of the San as *children* dovetails naturally with the representation of their status in Botswana as ‘*less than*’, but also with the *hyper-real/commodity* concept of the exotic through marketed *Aestheticization*. These drawings form a useful – and necessarily integrated – conceptual structure to identify the ways in which the San are represented for commercial purposes.

---

9 Bangwato (or Bangamwato) is the dominant of the eight Tswana chieftaincies in Botswana pre-independence. Paramount chiefs of this clan have, for several centuries, been members of the Khama family.
The San as children

Jennifer Hays (2007) alerts the reader to the unjustified hubris in infantilising the San:

Let us remember that ... the San and other indigenous (sic) peoples are the direct descendants of peoples whose subsistence strategies and systems of knowledge transmission allowed them to survive for thousands of years in the regions that they occupied. We have no such assurance that our own modern “subsistence strategies,” which we now know are affecting the planet in ways that could be disastrous, will last beyond a matter of centuries—or even decades. We should not forget this perspective when we are construing ourselves as the “adults” and San, or other indigenous peoples, as “children” (314).

I begin this chapter’s detailed analysis of literary texts with McCall Smith’s No. 1 Ladies’ Detective Agency series (1998 –) which features two San orphans fostered by the main character, Precious Ramotswe and her husband Mr J.L.B. Matekoni, who are Tswana, members of the dominant ethnic group in Botswana. Before the narrative opens, the two San children were discovered alone in the Kalahari, much like Bessie Head’s character in her iconic novel Maru10 which, as P.W Mwikisa asserts, is an attempt to ‘register and insert the voice of Basarwa in Botswana’s monophonic national discourse’ (92).

Unlike Head, McCall Smith apparently feels no obligation to deviate from the monophony of the national (Tswana) discourse that Mwikisa (2006) identifies. Indeed, as McAllister (2010) claims: ‘[he] seems to buy into these simplifications ... [publicly bemoaning negative representations of Africa as] forgetting “the laughter. The

---

10 Bessie Head’s novel Maru (1971) is set in Serowe, Botswana, the protagonist of which is a Mosarwa (San) orphan girl adopted and named by a white missionary. This novel is prominently on sale in tourist outlets and bookshops in Botswana.
kindness. The beauty’ (3). In McCall Smith’s series, much as the children are loved, they are always defined by their assimilation into Tswana culture, just as children are obliged to conform to their parents’ lifestyle and values while under-age.

The San children’s positioning within McCall Smith’s Botswana series (1998 -) is metaphorically significant, as is their positioning as children, which I read as a particularly insidious form of Negation in the sense that it appears innocent yet has a political agenda at the systemic level. Negation of an apparently benign nature can be read as infantilisation, since in this series the entire race could be romantically symbolised by these two children, much loved but ultimately required to conform. The suggestion inherent in the text is that without Mma Ramotswe’s well-meaning intercession in the children’s lives (which can be read as symbolic of NGO and other external intervention in the San’s lives generally) they would remain disempowered, that they could never become self-determining citizens of Botswana (Thomas, 2012: 118). Indeed, they probably have some sense that former President Festus Mogae’s insensitive and inherently racist remark, ‘[i]f the Bushmen want to survive they must change, or otherwise, like the dodo, they will perish’ (cited in Gall, 2001: 84) expresses, sadly, some measure of truth.

In McCall Smith’s series, the trope of Aestheticization and Idealization are evident as Precious contemplatively regards the sleeping Puso: ‘[s]he would gaze at him, at the perfection of his features – for he was an attractive child, with the honey-coloured skin of the Bushmen side of his family ... His Kalahari ancestors had bequeathed him eyes that shone with light’ (McCall Smith 2009: 36). Jonathan Schroeder argues that gazing signifies ‘a psychological relationship of power in which the gazer is superior to the object of
the gaze’ (2008: 208), similar in relativity to a gendered reading of the gaze such as Laura Mulvey’s (1975) interpretation of the traditional male-female dynamic. Puso’s sleeping state adds a further dimension to his vulnerability as it lacks the potential for consent. Precious’s maternal affection for her foster son notwithstanding, her elevated ethnic status renders this scene metaphorical of a systemic power imbalance involving infantilisation of the San within both Aesthetization and Negation-by-assimilation manifestations of a (neo)colonialist worldview in modern Botswana.

Infantilisation (which could also be drawn in this example as Spurr’s trope of Negation) is also at work in the representation of Puso’s attitude towards his foster parents at a point in the narrative where he is consumed with self-hate and becomes surly. Hays (2007) comments on the pervasiveness of such metaphors of a San versus dominant culture relationship:

as the communities “mature” and slowly gain the ability to navigate these channels on their own (goes this discourse) they begin to resent those they feel dependent on and strive to disassociate themselves from them. Much like adolescents, they rebel — wanting to be independent, and yet also fearing that independence (316).

An epitome of such concurrent disassociation and fear manifests in Puso’s anguished yet feeble attempt at suicide – borne, as he admits to Precious, of self-loathing as San – and his subsequent gaze towards his foster-mother at a point in the narrative where he attempts to jump from Previous’s moving car. His despairing act is a momentary reversal of the traditional positioning loaded in favour of a dominant power; a childish (read: ineffectual) attempt at Resistance to the passivity expected of the subordinate position. The
The brevity of the gaze, which soon ‘slid away’ is suggestive of the futility of such a direct challenge to the position of authority and Puso effectively backs down, explaining his actions submissively. Precious reiterates the orthodoxy of ethnic ‘sameness’ in an apparently guileless manner, and Puso accepts this. For the remainder of the narrative, spanning several subsequent novels, Puso is drawn as compliant and content.

The children could be read as substitutes for Mma Ramotswe’s lost baby of years before, filling her childless void. Even the two San children to replace one Tswana child could possibly be interpreted as a statement about the relative value of San and Tswana, especially in the light of the long-entrenched majority view of San inferiority (and although I am sure McCall Smith did not intend such an interpretation, the two-for-one is nonetheless open to such a reading). The adoption is seen by several of the protagonists’ Tswana peers to be misguided altruistic, the premise being that the San children will only cause problems. The Appropriation of the children by members the dominant culture for their own ends, couched in well-meaning rhetoric, rather than any attempt to return them to their own culture, is written up as only natural. The omission of such a return as a possibility suggests the San are not fit custodians of their own kind, redolent of similar justifications for the ‘stolen generations’ in nineteenth - and twentieth century Australia. The dynamic operating between the protagonists of this fiction series and the San children is a metaphor for Botswana’s positioning of the San (among other minorities) whereby ‘dominant elites extract material taxes in the form of labor, [etc] in addition to extracting symbolic taxes in the form of deference, demeanour, … and acts of humility … every public act of appropriation is, figuratively, a ritual of subordination’ (Scott 1990: 188).
Affirmation extends, naturally, to exalt the paternalistic benevolence of the dominant culture. Motholeli, the older child fostered by Precious Ramotswe, is an excellent student who, despite being wheelchair-bound, is determined to be a mechanic and watches closely while her foster father works on cars, asking questions, helping out. Her disability can be read as a metaphor for her race’s disenfranchisement, yet this girl makes the most of the slightest opportunity and the narrative suggests she will thrive as a citizen of Botswana. Mma Ramotswe stresses the importance of education in this quest and Motholeli empowers herself, within the context of the dominant culture. Indeed, as the Matron from the orphan farm says to Precious Ramotswe:

“It is very kind of you to adopt them like that … [it is] such good news [that Motholeli wants to be a mechanic]. Why can’t a girl become a mechanic? Even if she is in a wheelchair … She will be able to help Mr J.L.B.Matekoni fix our pump … [to which Precious replies] He is going to make a ramp for her wheelchair … Then she will be able to get at the engines (McCall Smith 2002: 143).

Later in the series, Mr J.L.B.Matekoni hears of a miracle cure for afflictions such as Motholeli’s and takes out a loan for the treatment, for which they must drive to Johannesburg. It is difficult to be critical of such self-sacrifice and in a glorious revelation Mma Ramotswe informs her husband that there is no need for a loan, she had sold some of her cattle. But this renders Motholeli indebted to her foster parents for their altruism, and she resiliently says ‘I don’t want anybody to cry for me … I am happy. I will carry on being happy’ (McCall Smith, 2008: 247). Postcolonial analysis of the discourse can read Motholeli’s wheelchair ramp as the external assistance provided (by the central culture) for assimilation (of a peripheral
culture) to occur. The tone of affectionate paternalism is also pervasive in the work of Laurens van der Post.

Within his drawing of the San as children, van der Post can be charged with *Eroticization*, albeit in an era where such presentations of Indigenous people were commonplace. He writes of the San with great admiration and fondness, but with no little (erotically charged) paternalism. Demonstrating the natural interchangeability of the thematic categories in this chapter, his descriptions read like an exhibit's caption at a museum of natural history, the people depicted as an anthropological aesthetic:

> In a lean time the Bushman behind would shrink until it was much like any normal behind except for the satiny creases where his smooth buttocks joined his supple legs. But in a good hunting season it would stick out so much that you could stand a bottle of brandy with a tumbler on it. We all laughed at this, not derisively but with affectionate pride and wonder that our native earth should have produced so unique a little human body. Somehow my heart and imagination were deeply concerned with this matter of the Bushman’s shape. The Hottentots, who were very like him, much as I loved them, could not excite my spirit as did the Bushman. They were too big. The Bushman was just right. There was magic in his build (1958: 13).

*Eroticization* (‘smooth’ ... ‘supple’) in this excerpt can also be interchangeably interpreted alongside other tropes on Spurr’s spectrum. Both *Classification* and *Affirmation* are inherent to the inscribing of ‘normal behind’ (read: European) as the definitive type. Drawing attention to the San’s natural adaptation for changes in desert conditions is an example of *Naturalization*, conceding that the civilised Westerner is not built for survival in this way: ‘the Bushman was just right’. The author’s more general and essentialised admiration (Spurr’s *Aestheticization*) is evident in the affectionate
tone: ‘much as I loved them’ and (my identified) sub-category of infantilisation: ‘so unique a little human body’. The standing of a brandy bottle on the extended buttocks of a Bushman and the associated amusement is, to thinking people’s sensibilities in modern times, outrageous and is certainly illustrative of Spurr’s concept of Appropriation, in conjunction with the obvious Eroticization as though the Bushman is the human plaything of his European masters, and brings to mind Kobena Mercer’s 1994 observation about a white photographer’s human subject-matter: ‘[t]he black man’s bum becomes a Brancusi’ (179). Negation is also evident here, transposable with Appropriation, with no San feelings towards – nor right of refusal of – this practice assumed. Negation is evident through the generalised designation of ‘the Bushman’ who apparently has no name or individual identity. Negation can perhaps be extended to Debasement in this excerpt, also; an ‘animalistic’ drawing of the San as a circus beast made to perform tricks for an audience.

It is important to contextualise such descriptions, since van der Post is a product of his time and his enculturation, although he does appear incapable of self-analysis as regards representation. The effortless assumption of right and the (apparently unconscious) superciliousness with which van der Post in Venture to the Interior (1952) claims the necessity of appropriating fertile chunks of Africa to satisfy food demand in post-war Europe (while simultaneously claiming an intense love and intimate understanding of that which he repetitively calls his ‘native land’) is astounding to a postcolonial mindset. Such rhetoric is characteristic of the time and exists in myriad modern imitations of colonialism. In Gaselbalwe Seretse’s novella (2008) the drawing of the San as children appears to be
similarly unwittingly articulated within the author’s espoused motive of raising awareness of San disenfranchisement in the area.

Apart from the San protagonist in Seretse’s novella, the narrative sympathy lies with the homily of Old Matente, Bangwato chief of the kglotla or council in the region who, in his ancient wisdom (his credibility heightened due to his having lived through both world wars) advocates assimilation: ‘things have changed, our own sons are now marrying the daughters of [white people] and I believe the time has come to allow our children to marry Masarwa’ (79). Old Matente, a representative of postcolonial power by way of pre-colonial lineage, is the one doing the allowing, however, so that his benevolence is still within a paradigm of dominance and subordination. The concept of aspirational progress (Affirmation) is drawn in terms of such assimilation; first the intermarriage of Bangwato and Europeans, followed by the welcoming of San into the Bangwato domain; the systemic suggestion (the council as government) being that in both cases respectively, Africans are ‘moving up a rung’. The protective authority over issues pertaining to the San assumed by the dominant culture as fictionalised in this novella finds a real-life postcolonial parallel in NGO interventionism, such as that of the KFO operating in the Ghanzi area, perhaps most notably in the San settlement at D’Kar.

The San museum and art gallery at D’Kar, in north-west Botswana is self-representative to an extent, and the wall-text does briefly mention (with no detail provided, nor blame leveled) ‘negative things that still hurt and confuse us’. However, while the narrative is from the point-of-view of ten year old Coe’xae, it appears contrived; designed to endorse the KFO’s agenda as essentially benevolent in its acting as agent between San artisans and tourists.
Its paternalistic concession of allowing the San a voice, however disingenuous, as well as KFO’s expedient choice of the child’s voice rather than that of an adult San person, engenders enhanced sympathy from tourists and ensures their corresponding charity:

I live in D’Kar with my mother and grandmother and aunt ... When I finish primary school in D’Kar, I will be taken on the back of a truck to a school far away from here, and then I will only see my mother every three months, when the government will bring me home. I am scared of that time, I wish I could stay with my family, but my mother says I have to learn so that one day I can get a job in an office and make more money. I think I’d rather stay home and make ostrich egg necklaces and sell them to Kuru, like my aunt, and then I can make some money to buy meat and clothes. Or I can be an artist too and sell my paintings. Or dance for the tourists, I love dancing and I am proud of the skin clothes our people used to wear. My mother dances at the Cultural Centre and then she looks so beautiful I want to be like that too (Accessed 10/6/2009).

The product placement embedded in this wall-text is designed to entice tourists to buy San-produced craft, to participate in entertainment featuring the San – and to feel magnanimous in the process. Again, this tangibly illustrates the overlap between infantilising representations (the San as children) and their drawing as commodified hyper-reality and a doomed race, a mesh that occurs pervasively in the tourism literature. For example, even where San evictions from the Kalahari are acknowledged in tourism literature, the semantic softening of the facts renders them acceptable to tourist sensibilities and indirectly infantilise the San by promoting the paternalistic largesse of the government, as evident in this excerpt by a Botswana Tourism Board writer:

Mokgethisi is from the nearby village of Kaudwane. His parents died when he was a child, and he was raised by
his grandfather, a ngaka or traditional healer, who taught his knowledge of the bush to Mokgethisi. The land in and around Khutse is his ancestral land and he says his ancestors lived in Khutse, but were resettled to Kaudwane where homes were built for them’ (2005: 13).

This acknowledgement of the lack of San agency and an assumption of paternalistic government intervention being necessary in the area constitutes tangible infantilisation. This is reminiscent of Susan Thomson’s work in post-genocide Rwanda where a government official described the peasants as ‘just mere peasants who need us to tell them what to do. Really they are like infants. We need to parent them so they know about peace and reconciliation’ (2011: 35). ‘Reconciliation’ in this context deployed in the same sense as ‘assimilation’ in the Botswana context; ethnic uniqueness is dismissed within an agenda of national unity. In the light of the acknowledgement of ‘ancestral land’ in this article, it is interesting to note a contradiction in terms with the same writer subsequently describing the desert itself with this header: ‘The Kalahari Desert (or Kgalagadi, the proper Setswana name)’ (15), further infantilising the San in the manner of a parent correcting the rudimentary language of a child. The selection of the word ‘proper’ here establishes the Setswana naming of locations in Botswana as the definitive ones, in the manner of Spurr’s concept of Affirmation of the dominant culture, further metaphorising the dynamic of parent-child in Tswana/San relations.

**The San as hyper-real / commodity**

The commodification of the image of the San is heavily based upon a notion of Insubstantialization and Aestheticization, whereby the San are not represented as reality but as hyper-reality; a cultural artifice structured by the process of its transmission. McAllister (2010) asserts that McCall Smith’s Botswana novels are disingenuous, in
that they purport to be a celebration of exotic Africa but are, in fact, ‘elegies for a supposed Western past’ (4), an Affirmation of the superior place of the Northern/Western over ‘the monstrous other that tests and validates European virtue’ (4). An example of this in McCall Smith’s series sees Puso, the younger of the two San children, constantly reminded by his foster-parents of the necessity to be proud of his heritage; they remind him of the San’s ancient and unique culture: ‘ ‘You could be a great tracker’, Mr J.L.B.Matekoni said to him once. You have that gift from your people’’ (McCall Smith 2009: 36). In this case, Spurr’s trope of Idealization comes into play, where a group is no threat, so the dominant culture can afford to use glowing rhetoric about the strengths of the Other, since it is now only of historical interest – apart from situations where it is carefully contained and contrived for tourists, as the ingenuously idealised comments of the tourists in Dithunya Lekoa’s (2007) documentary attest (further cited in Chapter Four).

In the ‘African pastoral’ trope, McAllister (2010) notes a common feature of ‘order and simplicity, rather than sensuality, offering an escape from the complexities and ambiguities of modernity’ (5). This is very much the case in the McCall Smith series, with the reality whitewashed, including the euphemising of AIDS, implied-only sexuality, no blasphemy and no mention of systemic corruption. Although McAllister does not mention the series’ representation of the San children in his critique, he acknowledges that McCall Smith’s Idealization ‘cannot work convincingly if the contradictions are completely trivialized’ (9). With relation to this thesis, the representation of the San in this fiction series which, by way of a benevolent requirement of their assimilation, negates their uniqueness and denies their twenty-first century realities, is Idealization at its most offensive. This phenomenon operates in van
der Post’s work also; his mythical representations of the San an extension of his Jungian scholarship.

As LeRoux and White (2004) assert, van der Post’s writings and lectures perpetuated the myth, to the point that it is now ingrained, that the San live as ‘innocents’ in perfect harmony with nature and with each other, and that these are expectations that the San cannot live up to: ‘[t]oday we know that Laurens van der Post fabricated most of his mythologizing literature for the purpose of his own interest in psychology and symbolism … preceded by romanticist writers who created their own fantastic images of the San [which] added more fantasy and mystery … and attracted many more voyeurs’ (70).

While van der Post employs a paternalistic rhetoric, he does at least show some remorse at the ‘sins of his fathers’ and attempts to lovingly and respectfully depict the Bushmen who had captivated him since childhood. His passage from The Lost World of the Kalahari (1958) underscores Spurr’s distinction (Idealization) between the colonial and the colonised – redolent also of Said’s (1978: 150) notion of ‘overesteem’ – and ostensibly captures the general sentiment of the symbolic nature of people’s relationship to land:

Today we tend to know statistically and in the abstract. We classify, catalogue and sub-divide the flame-like variety of animal and plant according to species, sub-species, physical property, and use. But in the Bushman’s knowing, no matter how practical, there was a dimension that I miss in the life of my own time. He knew these things in the full context and commitment of his life. Like them, he was utterly committed to Africa. He and his needs were committed to the nature of Africa and the swing of its wide seasons as a fish to the sea. He and they all participated so deeply of one another’s being that the experience could almost be called mystical … his
world was one without secrets between one form of being and another (van der Post, 1958: 21).

Holland and Huggan (2000) have little time for this attitude of ‘afflatus’, but as is demonstrated in the analysis of modern tourist text, van der Post’s and similar rhetoric of Aestheticization and Insubstantialization is still alive and well in southern Africa:

[t]he shamanic ring to van der Post’s [travelogue attempts] not only to quest after Aboriginal sources of knowledge, but to mimic ... the legendary ‘wise men’ ... Van der Post’s hieratic rhetoric, invoking the mysteries of creation, helps set himself up as a kind of visionary, a divinatory Western seer (182) ... it is Van der Post, ... not the ‘magical’ Bushman, who is sanctified in a narrative that ends up by reinstating the white man’s proprietary myths (184).

Laurens van der Post mourns the ‘world’ of the San, as becoming increasingly ‘lost’ to the Western imaginary. It is worth wondering what van der Post would make of the new manifestation of lostness the San experience today, and whether he would see or acknowledge his part in that outcome, given the popularity of his idealised and metaphorised descriptions of the San within tourist rhetoric to which many tourists evidently respond favourably.

In a response to an amateur video entitled ‘Tracking and Living with the Bushmen’ (14/6/2010) a blogger writes: ‘[t]o see this reminds us how once we had song and connection and it is something we can still have ... but then the modern world intrudes and it gets lost in the shuffle again. Thanks for the vid (sic) and the reminder. I hope one day we all find our songs’. And another response to the same footage: ‘what have we become?’ (https://www.facebook.com/video, accessed 4/7/2013). Similar ingenuous Aestheticization of the San is evident from a blogger who
is ‘amazed’ by a video ‘Kalahari Bushmen Build a Fire’ produced by safari company The Wild Source (17/6/2009): ‘while we live in lazy surroundings waiting for the waves to wash our ass, these people find all their sources through nature. Great video! Thanks!’ (www.wilderness-safaris.com, accessed 3/5/2013). Another blogger suggests that tourists ‘really should see this professional video before you start on a journey’ (my italics).

Blogs praising the hospitality of the Kalahari Plains Camp show these tourists to be seemingly unaware that the San treks in which they participate are constructions, beyond the obvious fact of their walk being part of a package. A couple from Kent (10/9/2010) post: ‘our walk and demonstration of skill by a San bushman was interesting and entertaining although I don’t think the nice young man was a bushman’. There is no reason given for the couple’s suspicion here but it does hint at the myth of authenticity, of Aestheticization thwarted; perhaps the ‘nice young man’ was not dressed traditionally, so that his status as ‘authentic’ San was deemed questionable. Authenticity is as much an issue with Indigenous people as it is with their artefacts, and is linked with the rhetoric of Aestheticization and Appropriation. The adjectives ‘interesting’ and ‘entertaining’ render the walk educationally worthwhile; the tourists have learned something. The text of the San walk (often in triangulated translation: mother-tongue to Setswana to English) is apparently accepted as the final authority on San skills and lifestyle. Another couple from California writes that ‘even though the game was quite sparse since it’s the dry season, I was still able to see some Kalahari animals: bat-eared foxes, oryx and springbok … I also really enjoyed the bushman walk. It was really very interesting to learn about how the bushmen survive in such an arid region (www.africatravelresource.com, accessed 13/9/2013). The use of present
tense (‘survive’) suggests that the tourist believes that the San still live in the CKGR, hunting and gathering and there is Idealization in the tone of admiration for the San’s desert expertise. No posts mention any sceptical discussion having occurred within the tourist groups as to whether such walks reflect the San’s modern reality.

**Ghanzi — Friday January 26:** We ... arrived at the Botswana border around midday. We arrived at Ghanzi and explored a museum about the Bushmen people. In the afternoon we changed to 4x4 vehicles and travelled 3 hours into the Kalahari Desert. Once we got to Grassland Safaris campsite, a group of Bushmen showed us a traditional dance.

**Grassland Safari — Saturday January 27:** In the morning, our Bushman guides showed us how they live in the desert. After lunch we played traditional games with our Bushman guides (africatravelresource.com, accessed 20/1/2014).

A tourist produced video (the visual elements of which are analysed in the next chapter) entitled: ‘How to find water in the Kalahari Desert’ – Bushman walk, Ghanzi’ (Africafreak, www.youtube.com, accessed 6/5/2011) elicits some interesting responses. The creator of the video had participated in the Ghanzi Trailblazers package which lists its attractions as guided walks for tracking and gathering, visits to NGOs, traditional dancing and cattle trekking. Semantically, the very name of this safari company and its package is one of power; ‘trailblazing’ suggestive of conquest, penetration (Spurr’s Appropriation) and of nothing being the same again once the trail has been blazed. Africafreak’s videographic testimony of the Ghanzi Trailblazer experience has an ‘infomercial’ tone, connoting commodification of the Indigenous knowledge tourists become privy to.
This video employs figurative language (Aestheticization) to enhance the (apparently believed) myth that the San live in the desert as they did for millennia: ‘Water is the source of life and for the bushmen people this is no exception. However there are no ... “stores” in the Kalahari, so people who live there ...' [my italics]. In answer to a blogger wanting to know how the San locate subterranean tubers, Africafreak responds: ‘[t]hey know where to find them. Once they’ve identified a spot, they dig the bulbs out with a stick, then extract the water content ... But I must admit the root had already been unearthed when we got there. Apparently so, they aren’t that easy to find’. This practice of pre-establishing the site of the root before the tourists arrive on the spot is mentioned by Lekoa (2007) in her research but she asserts the practice is one of deception. Her San guide, Size, told Lekoa of this necessity since tourists want instant gratification and most gullibly believed the tubers were found in situ and at that exact time by their San guides. He also told Lekoa that this practice was becoming more prevalent as the ancient skills were dying out, and fewer San could read the signs in the earth that indicated the presence of tubers. Dithunya Lekoa’s (2007) documentary features the manager (a Tswana man) of the Khutsi Kalahari Lodge, in Kaudwane, eight kilometres from where the lodge’s San guide, Size and other San families live:

Lodge Manager: We offer accommodation and activities like San walk. Most of our clientele want to know about San culture.

Researcher: Why?

Lodge Manager: can you stop [the tape] because it’s going to include things that we don’t want like Survival International. People think that Basarwa are ill-treated.

Researcher: OK, are they not?
Lodge Manager: No! The government says come closer to development so that our journeys are not so long from each other. Mam, tourists like those people very much, each time they come here they book San walk. I think these people want to see how San people live.

*Idealization* of the commodified San and *Affirmation* of modern consumerism sit alongside each other in advertising John Chase Safaris (through Safaris Botswana), encapsulated in the promotional homily: ‘[o]ld world values, modern comfort’. A paternalistic tone, suggesting a lack of San actual or potential agency, pervades the information about the ‘Bushmen’ and *Affirmation* extends to the Kuru Development Trust, described as ‘an organization in Botswana dedicated to alleviating the problems encountered by the bushmen communities spread across the country’. The Westerner interpretation of the San’s excitement at sharing their culture with tourists seems presumptuous at best. Omission of any mention of evictions and dispossession in the CKGR is evident in the following commercial text for tourist consumption, as though the reserve is still inhabited by traditionally living San:

Activities with the Bushmen include learning about the language, known for its tonal clicks, discovering how the traditional huts are constructed, and guided bush walks focusing on animal tracking and trapping. They can determine the age and sex of animals by reading the signs that are left behind.

On our first morning we have a scheduled walk with the bushmen, and return to the guest house for lunch. In the afternoon is a game drive through the game reserve, which is well stocked, with [wildlife]. We return to the guest house for dinner and an evening of Traditional Dancing and Storytelling, which has always played a very important role in the culture of the Bushmen. The community of D’kar are always excited to come out to the Reserve and share their traditional dancing with you. You are most welcome to join in!
Before returning to Maun, we also visit the Kuru Development Trust where local Bushmen learn to make arts and crafts which provide them with a modest income. This is the centre of the renowned Kuru Art Project, where you will see a collection of paintings, batiks, and leatherwork, as well as have the opportunity to meet some of the artists (www.africaodyssey.com, accessed 1/1/2014).

Not all tourists, however, are oblivious to the San’s evictions from the CKGR, particularly among those who subscribe to the sensibilities of certain travel guides which purport to endorse the rights of the disenfranchised in the face of a dominant hegemony; naming up some of the marginalising orthodoxies and policies within a nation. This awareness, though, while having some positive effects in terms of awareness-raising and some proactive measures, can be, in representational terms, Appropriation of a less overt ilk. Commodification is evident in the account of the San within Lonely Planet text. An entry pertaining to those San originally from the CKGR (Firestone and Karlin, eds., 2010) does not shirk from value judgement, acknowledging the dispossession (of lands, hunting and mineral rights) and the coerced relocation of the San as ‘one of the biggest political hot potatoes for the current Botswana government’ (64). The authors cite the reprimand the government received from the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in 2006 and employ emotive language to describe New Xade, Kaudwane, West Hanahai, among other specially administered villages as ‘squalid, handout-dependent and alcohol-plagued settlements’ (64). Referring back to Gillespie’s (2007) ‘post-tourist paradigm’ (involving the type of traveller who habitually reads Lonely Planet guides rather than ‘touristy’ guidebooks), this kind of text, embedded within its broader purpose of traveller’s ‘companion’, appears to include such information merely as background to a
context, following which the text seamlessly moves on to general tourist information such as itineraries and currency conversions.

With similar scepticism for the tone and substance of the travel guide genre, Fiona Allon (2002) notes that such ‘gospel[s]’ catalogue cultures and celebrate heterogeneity and diversity, ‘combining a liberal awareness of ‘postcolonial’ complexities, environmental populism, cultural relativism (we’re all different yet we’re all really the same) and a disdain for the crassness of mass tourism’. Yet these texts simultaneously market the sense of difference for a particular demographic of tourists who are ‘keen to demonstrate their sensitivity to the geo-political and economic inequities often inherent to their cultural encounters with ‘others’ (87). She observes that such an inventory is never neutral but, in fact, a form of Appropriation. I contend that rendering the San and their disenfranchisement in this way is also effectively commodification in that they are not recognised as people but as a monolithic, hyper-real cause with which to sympathise, enhancing the sympathisers’ socio-political credentials.

There is some merit in Lonely Planet’s liberalist policy (and that of other exemplars of the genre) of not omitting the political inequities that certain groups experience and this information is presented in an unapologetically independent, unaffiliated timbre, attractive to tourists fancying themselves politically aware and socially responsive. However, the very packaging of the detail, with small boxed sections and limited space to explore issues is an emulation of the typical commercial ‘tourist package’ in presentation and as such, could be read as a form of Negation in the sense that social concerns are trivialised by effectively being ‘brushed over’. Such dismissal by omission or near-omission is ubiquitously evident in the
rhetoric produced for the more ingenuous tourist, such as that employed within a booklet entitled *Bushman Crafts* (n.d.) available for tourists in the popular tourist mecca, Gantsi Craft (which calls itself ‘a non-profit project’) in Ghanzi, northwest Botswana.

The booklet’s brief introduction concedes the San have ‘been propelled into the 20th century through forces often not under their control’ but does not identify these forces, rather commends the Government of Botswana for its benevolence as ‘many Bushmen … are now settled down in places where they are provided with water, schools and clinics’ (1). Considering this brief concession to reality, it is interesting to note that the rest of the booklet itemises the various craft items for sale that replicate traditional San instruments, clothes, adornments and toys. These are described in the present tense, as though these items are still in everyday use: ‘[t]hese bags are used by women when they are out gathering roots and nuts (4) … Bushmen play the thumb-piano when sitting around the fire (5) … The spear is used to kill big game when it has become weak after poisoning’ (12). This booklet is a further example of the San’s firm placement within the historical rather than the present, serving to simultaneously *idealize, aestheticize* and *negate* demonstrating anew the interplay between the colonial tropes deployed in this thesis and the representational categories into which this chapter is structured.

The introduction to the booklet exhibits *negation* in its immediate privileging of Tswana nomenclature for the San: ‘The Bushmen, known as the Basarwa in Botswana’. The sentence continues with the fabrication that ‘[the Bushmen] live in the harsh environment of the Kalahari desert’, employing present tense to support this mythology. *Negation* also occurs through the juxtaposition of
‘Bushmen’ and ‘lives’ (1) as though the people are condensed into a single entity (the hyper-real) rather than made up of individuals, families and clans (the real). Hyper-real representation of the San for tourist consumption is perhaps most palpably obvious in the commonly known ‘trance dance’.

The dance as visual text is further analysed in Chapter Four for its graphic elements. Here the rhetoric extolling the allure of this intimate forum can be identified as Spurr’s concept of *Idealization* which dovetails with *Insubstantialization* in the sense that tourist *Idealization* of this (based on pre-established perceptions) is a precursor to luring ‘spiritual tourists’ for whom involvement in ceremony like the trance dance is hoped to serve some psychological need and/or fill a spiritual void. The safari enterprise Ghanzi Trailblazer’s description of this attraction for tourist consumption itself gathers to a crescendo: ‘the music initially sounds monotonous, discordant … slowly attains a rhythm and fluidity … the dancers start slipping into the trance state … laying their hands on the spectators … removing the ills from their bodies and casting them away’. The tone of the pamphlet’s rhetoric is seductive: ‘Do not be afraid. Relax’ (n.d).

**The San as ‘less than’**

*Debasement* of the San, alongside Tswana *Affirmation* of their own superiority is centuries old. P.W. Mwikisa cites Bessie Head’s recognition of San subalternity: ‘[i]t is argued that [the San] had been conquered by the more powerful Botswana tribes and from then onwards assumed the traditional role of slaves … [and] are also abhorrent to Batswana because they hardly looked African but Chinese (1990, in Mwikisa 2006: 92).
Seretse’s 2008 novella purports to be sympathetic to an overturning of the historical place of the San in Botswana and through his characters illustrates the entrenched pre-colonial social and systemic disenfranchisement and vilification and the ongoing legacies into Botswana’s colonial period. The narrative does, however appear to be celebrating a newfound self-determination for the San, hinting at their equal status in a country on the cusp of independence. The assimilationist agenda of the BDP is metaphorised by the two protagonists, Xhai, a San youth and Thsepo, a Bangwato girl, who are in love. The book closes on the suicide of Sebeso, Thsepo’s father and a representative of the old system of inequality between the dominant tribe and the San, who refuses to accept his daughter could marry a San. Sebeso’s dying thoughts epitomise *Debasement*: ‘damn Xhai, damn that son of the sand dunes, damn that Mosarwa’ (82). A peripheral character earlier says to Sebeso: ‘I long for the good old days when Masarwa knew their place. I think the white man is to blame for the way things have turned out because the white man always complains about the way we treat them. Nowadays Masarwa think they are equal to us’ (23). In a poignant scene, one San character, knowing herself to be despised in the village and that it ‘was only a matter of time before something terrible happened to the Xhanadu family’, encounters Bangwato\(^{11}\) women at the well and greets them as ‘owners of the soil that I walk on’ (28). This attitude is still pervasive today. As San woman Nxisae Nxau from Tsodilo, northern Botswana, relates, prejudice is entrenched in the Tswana culture, even when San individuals are objects of affection:

\(^{11}\) Bangwato (or Bangamwato) is the dominant of the eight Tswana chieftaincies in Botswana pre-independence. Paramount chiefs of this clan have, for several centuries, been members of the Khama family.
I met this man, he came up to me and said that he liked me and would want to marry me, then he asked me my name and I said ‘Nxisae’. He said, ‘But what is your Tswana name, don’t you have a Tswana name?’ and I said, ‘No, I don’t have.’ He walked away, saying, ‘No, I cannot fall in love with a San woman.’ So I said, ‘So?’, for I am proud of my culture (cited in LeRoux and White 2004: 71).

When the two San children of McCall Smith’s No. 1 Ladies’ Detective Agency series first come to live with the protagonists, the maid expresses an attitude of Debasement towards the race, purportedly typical among the dominant Batswana, and certainly there is no narrative sympathy for this sentiment, with the maid in this excerpt drawn antipathetically: ‘[t]he maid’s eyes widened … Masarwa children being brought into an ordinary person’s house … was something no self-respecting person would do. These people were thieves ... Mr J.L.B. Matekoni may be trying to be kind, but there were limits to charity’ (McCall Smith 2000: 99). Along with the Debasement evident in these representations, Negation also serves to draw the San as ‘less than’ and omission can be as powerful in this project as overt vilification, as evident in much of the rhetoric around safaris.

In a tourist-made video of a wildlife expedition in the CKGR in 2012, the creator described the experience thus:

**Camping expedition in Botswana, southern Africa.**
Experience Botswana wildlife close and sometimes very close.
Lions sleeping between our tents. Fortunately no hunt no attack and no kill.
Elephants eating from the tree we were sleeping under.
Baboons stealing our food.
Impalas chasing each other on the campsite
We stayed in:
Central Kalahari Game Reserve
HATAB campsites.
(Johnny Woozer, 10/2/2013).

Formatted on the page much like a free-verse poem, and using some poetic conventions such as repetition – I assume to reinforce the aesthetic effect of the safari – Woozer’s posting makes no mention of the San, their eviction from the CKGR to accommodate just such a tourist enterprise as the campsites in which he stayed, nor the lack of San mineral and hunting rights to the area. Woozer is, by way of his blog, practising overt, if perhaps unintentional Negation, heavily suggestive of the tourist industry’s intentional omission of that information.

Various responses to the posting thank Woozer for the ‘inspiring’, ‘excellent’ and ‘awesome’ video and ask for more information. A Motswana’s reaction to the video is illuminating in its romanticised abstraction and implied assimilationist credo, making no mention of evicted traditional custodians of the natural resources: ‘Botswana as my country has a vast array of animal species and fauna, to this I say to all Africans to respect and take care of our natural habitats and what they can offer! This time the resources are ours, next time they are for our children and our children’s children. Africa unite for this natural beauty!’ (2013).

**The San as victim**

The San’s place in modern Botswana is often represented as simply an extension of the past, drawing the San as victims in the own land, with little agency. San author Kuela Kiema (2010) elucidates this sense of alienation as an apologist for a re-inscribing of the officially sanctioned narratives:

> Our oppression and land dispossession are colonial legacies which have been institutionalised by the
Botswana government ... Botswana’s political independence was hell for us. The residents of CKGR began to sense trouble soon after the Botswana government came to power in 1966 ... the government started harassing us in our own land. Our parents were jailed for being on their tribal hunting grounds (81-82).

In direct contrast to a glowing endorsement (Affirmation) of the departed colonial rulers and its postcolonial Tswana replacement, the San narrative on both custodianships is, revealingly, not once articulated or even alluded to within the McCall Smith Botswana series.

McCall Smith also appears insensible to the fact of the San’s eviction with this description of the protagonist’s house, having Precious Ramotswe lament the encroaching urbanisation and modernisation only insofar as it affects relatively privileged people like herself:

It was a large house by modern standards, built in a day when builders had no reason to worry about space. There was the whole of Africa in those days, most of it unused, and nobody bothered to save space. Now it was different, and people had begun to worry about cities and how they gobbled up the bush (McCall Smith, 2007: 7).

Systemic physical marginalisation over centuries, the most recent being the CKGR evictions, justified traditionally by ethnic Debasement and in the modern era by expedient rhetoric of ethnic homogeneity, has generationally affected San self-esteem. Puso, the younger San child in McCall Smith’s series, bitterly denies his race for a time, being bullied for it at school in Gaborone, effecting, inevitably, a sense of self-loathing, a Debasement of one’s own kind, a reality that Bihela Sekere, a young San man contributing to a
booklet of San voices (Hays and Stewart eds. 2010) relates to: ‘I could not touch anything that has to do with Anthropology – if I saw the word ‘Bushman’ or ‘San’ or ‘Basarwa’ I would just put the book aside’ (5). Such a story was also related to anthropologist Sandy Gall during his interviews with displaced San: ‘[s]ome of the other children beat us up and the teachers, too … [because] I was depending on wild foods. They picked on me because I am Bushman … [my sister and I] dropped out because we were discriminated against and threatened so I could not go to classes’ (2001: 122), and as Kua San author and activist Kuela Kiema (2010) remembers with some horror: ‘[t]he teachers said the government wanted to make us human beings and that we should stop being Basarwa. They started teaching us ‘proper’ human behaviour … We didn’t know what it was called then but it was ethnocentrism of the worst kind’ (39). Later, as a teacher-in-training in 1998, Kiema was warned about the insidious process of ‘Tswanatization’ (Lekoa, 2007): ‘[y]our tax, young man, will be used to enhance the traditional customs and norms of Setswana-speaking people but not yours … Your loyalty to the country will be measured only in your obedience to the Setswana-speaking peoples – and not to your own. These things will only lead to low self-esteem for you and your people’ (18-19).

In Cry of the Kalahari, the San are vilified in a form of Debasement when a fire comes dangerously close to the Owens’ camp and an Afrikaaner visitor explains to them: ‘‘[m]on, the bloody Bushmen set these fires every year, you know. They can hunt – track – better with the thick grass burned away. And it’s easier for them to collect bauhinia nuts, one of their staple foods … I suppose you can’t blame ‘em too much … And the Bushmen aren’t the only ones to blame’ ’ (42). Despite the grudging admiration that equates to Spurr’s
Naturalization (in this case, the concession that the annual burn-off is a pragmatic, long-established practice with ecological merit) the interruption to the white man’s agenda in the Kalahari is an irritant, an aberration, evident via the Afrikaner twice using the word ‘blame’. The Owens record this explanation from their friend uncritically; it is of anthropological interest alone to them. The attitude justifies the agenda of the government as regards the CKGR in its assimilation-or-perish agenda forced upon the San by current President Ian Khama. As the activist group The First People of the Kalahari (FPK) asserts: ‘Bushman villages have been cut off from their main sources of food and water and outsiders have been prohibited from entering [the CKGR] to provide relief ... heavy contingents of police, military and park rangers trucked out about 40 people – most of the remaining inhabitants – at gunpoint’ (Global News Monitor, 1-15 October, 2005:1). This was justified dismissively by General Mompati Sebogodi Merafhe, Botswana’s vice-president until 2012, who questioned why the Bushmen must ‘continue to commune with the flora and fauna’ when they could ‘enjoy the better things in life, like driving Cadillacs’ (Survival International, 10/11/2010).

In McCall Smith’s The No.1 Ladies’ Detective Agency, Spurr’s trope of Appropriation is evident in the lack of sensitivity within the dominant culture towards their absolute commandeering of San land when Puso, the younger of the two fostered San children, becomes churlish and willful, informing his foster parents that he hates them. On hearing of Puso’s belligerence, the Matron at the orphanage is aghast at the boy’s ingratitude: ‘Nobody should hate Mr J.L.B. Matekoni, and certainly not a little boy who has been given a home by him, and by you’ (2002: 144). She advises that what Mr J.L.B. Matekoni should do is ‘take the boy out with him in his truck.
Take him out to the lands, to see the cattle. Things like that’ (McCall Smith 2002: 145). The Matron (and Precious Ramotswe who considers this good advice) is apparently oblivious of the fact that these same lands are those wherein the boy’s ancestors once lived freely and these same cattle, now owned by members of the dominant Tswana, are the reason (along with tourism, its associated big game hunting, and mining) the San have been summarily evicted. This is redolent of Laurens van der Post’s travel narratives wherein, as Holland and Huggan (2000) note, the author acts as ‘an unlikely precursor of New Age gurus ... [and] obscures the history behind its own triumphal mythology, inadvertently [erasing] the circumstances that have led to [the San’s] near extinction’ (183). Puso’s despair climaxes at a later point in the narrative and he tries to jump from Precious’s moving car. Precious rescues him here also and he finally reveals the reason for his self-Debasement as being his San identity:

Puso opened his eyes and looked at her briefly, as if to see her for the first time. Then his gaze slid away. ‘I don’t want to be ... that’, he said. ‘I don’t want to’ (2008: 38) [to which Precious replies]: ‘I should have talked to you about these things that some people say. Unkind things about Masarwa. They’re not true, you know. We are all the same. All the same people. Bushmen, San, whatever you want to call them’ (39).

However, it is this re-drawing of the victim model that underscores this thesis. Kiema (2010) argues against the implied victimhood of a revisionist narrative, and in favour of the self-determination of his people. This concept is extended in Chapter Five of this thesis in terms of non-combative, innovative, artistic and self-generated San Resistance to the established hegemony. On sale in some Bostwana bookshops and deigned for tourist consumption is Mike Main’s Botswana: A quick guide to customs and etiquette (2007). The book
describes the San as an ‘autochthonous people [who] either moved on, or were absorbed, or entered into what has eventually become a subordinate relationship with [the incoming Bantu]’ (15). Main attempts to represent all stakeholders, since while conceding that ‘It is true that the government is encouraging Bushmen to leave the ... CKGR’ (15) he appears to believe that the San have no capacity for initiative and seems to act as an apologist for government: ‘[t]he CKGR is a tough environment and its inhabitants would die without government subsidized food and water – provided at huge cost. A large village outside the reserve has been built and services provided (16). In a recognition of the complexity of the ‘vexed’ issue, and appears to diplomatically (‘previously marginalized people’ ... it is not about game reserves or diamonds’) admit that the San do have legitimate grounds for protest:

Today they are in the grip of far-reaching cultural and social change, and, as a previously marginalized people, the surviving 60 to 80 000 are struggling for recognition and for a fairer share of natural resources. [The Bushman question] is a vexed ... The fundamental issue is not about game reserves or diamonds, as some think; it is about political leverage and the ability of a cultural minority to garner sufficient influence in any way they can (by a claim to the CKGR for instance) to protect their long-term cultural interests (17).

Perpetuating representations of the San as victims can be read as insulting in their worst manifestations and infantilising and limiting in more well-meaning ones, emanating from a perceived lack of agency, resilience and initiative to effect change and develop autonomy. The following section deals with representations drawing the San as a race that no longer exists, or that exists on an historical and social precipice. This kind of portrayal is sometimes the result of ignorance, especially from outside the country, but its most insidious expression is evident where it serves as a conscious basis for
commodification, or to endorse a government policy of assimilation.

**The San as doomed race**

My postcolonialist deconstruction of literary texts depicting the San is in keeping with P.W. Mwikisa’s (2006) discourse analysis subtitled *Representations of Basarwa in Four Botswana Postcolonial Writers*. One text featured in Mwikisa’s analysis is also ubiquitous in tourist outlets in Botswana, namely Bessie Head’s 1971 novel, *Maru*. Mwikisa asserts: ‘*Maru* powerfully contests [the corralling of San] into exclusive reserves where they would, supposedly be happy to practise their stone-age hunting and gathering lifestyle but at the same time remain available to the scientific scrutiny of the modern world’ (93). San assimilation into the modern world is drawn as preferable and inevitable in McCall Smith’s series.

Having been buried up to their necks in the sand by their dying mother, Motholeli and Puso, the two San characters, are discovered and rescued. Before the narrative introduces them, the children had been taken to an orphan farm, and from there fostered by the protagonists. Significantly, it was Motholeli who dug herself and her baby brother out of the hole in the sand and walked for miles until they were picked up and taken to the orphanage, calling up the Idealization trope and suggesting agency by highlighting the fact that the race has the definitive genetic blueprint for survival.

---

12 This is an ancient San survival practice also alluded to in the 1980 film *The Gods Must Be Crazy* where M’pudi recounts ‘I fled, deep into the Kalahari … I died you know. Dehydration. Some of those little buggers found me, and they buried me. Only my head stuck out’.
But the postcolonialist could justifiably assert that the narrative endorses a *retreat out of the desert* as the only way the San can survive, that their status can only be realised as fully human by ‘growing up’ (read: urbanisation, assimilation into the dominant culture, or, as Lekoa (2007: 51) dubs it ‘Tswana-tization’) conveniently in accord with the corporate interests of safari-lodge and cattle owners and diamond companies.

There is no suggestion by the adults in McCall Smith’s narrative, when the San foster children Motholeli and Puso are bullied at school, that perhaps some facets of San culture could work their way into the curriculum, even incidentally, unless, as Bennun (2004) asserts, it is as an historical narrative of an ‘extinct’ race. To this extent Spurr’s trope of *Negation* is evident, in the systemic omission or dismissal of a rich cultural knowledge system despite the fact that recognition of – and systemic accommodation for – Indigenous Knowledge Systems is an acknowledged necessity in the *Preamble to the World Declaration on Education for All* (1990). This declaration upholds the fact that: ‘traditional knowledge and indigenous (sic) cultural heritage have a value and validity in their own right and a capacity to both define and promote development’ (cited in Hays, 2007: 239). As San men James Morris and Aron Johannes articulate in the booklet of San voices (Hays and Stewart, eds., 2010), ‘We do not want to cast away the importance of education today, but traditional education must become intermingled so that the essence of both can come together’ (2).

So although Precious Ramotswe consoles her foster daughter when bullied at school with the words ‘Sir Seretse Khama said that every person in Botswana … is of equal value. The same. That means you too’ (McCall Smith, 2002: 35) the very assumption of sameness in this
context means downplaying her uniqueness as San for the purpose of survival at school. The irony of this is that the Human Genome Project has found ‘there is a San woman in the ancestry of each one of us, as far back as 200,000 years’ (Global News Monitor, 1-15 October, 2005: 2). Kenneth Good (2008) articulates the policy behind Precious’s homily to her foster daughter about her standing as a person of the same value: ‘In purportedly homogenous Botswana, Seretse Khama imposed a new identity on San as ‘Remote Area Dwellers’ (RADs). This emphasized geography and avoided the issues of ethnicity, though it was clear that the majority of new remote people were San’ (107). Again, within the Negation trope, there is no mention of the foster children in McCall Smith’s series retaining their mother-tongue and their names are Tswana names, not San, suggesting they were re-named at the orphanage. This encouragement to discard all traces of San identity is a reality for San people, as Kiema (2010) recalls clearly, ‘One day in 1987 Miss Susan Supang, our class teacher, wrote a list of English names for us to choose from. I chose ‘Charles’ ‘(41). However, as is demonstrated in Chapter Five of this thesis, nomenclature is an issue now being addressed by some members of the San community in Botswana as a fundamental form of self representation.

David Naude, of Shakawe, Botswana, also recounts, ‘I found out that when these other people married our women, the man would not allow the woman to speak her language, and when the children came, they were taught only to speak the language of their father ... So that is how our language is dying out (cited in Le Roux and White, 2004: 69). Mma Ramotswe demonstrates Spurr’s identified attitude of Affirmation in every novel of this series as she ‘sings the praises’ of former President Sir Seretse Khama (deceased), the architect of modern Botswana and a member of the clan that
dominated in the land long before British colonisation. Precious has a photo of him on her mantelpiece in Zebra Drive, alongside one of her beloved late father and the Queen of England.

This assembled ‘triptych’ is an Affirmation, apparently unquestioned, of the (paternal and imperialist) place of the Tswana culture, (a marriage literally personified by the current President Ian Khama, offspring of Sir Seretse Khama and an English mother); a symbolic assumption of its ‘right to rule’, as well as the affection with which the departed colonial establishment is still viewed by the dominant culture. McAllister (2010) lists the ‘governing virtues of Precious Ramotswe’s world – neighbourliness, courtesy, trust, family, loyalty, and individual courage’ as being the virtues of ... mid-twentieth century small-town Britain or America’ (6). Such is the fondness the readership of this fiction series (and viewers of the spin-off television production) has for the central character with her homespun wisdom and traditional build, it is to be assumed that the narrative sympathy also extends to her attitude towards the Khama assimilationist policy and hegemonic place of the Tswana, much as Precious would never articulate her views in these terms:

There was her ornamental plate with its picture of Sir Seretse Khama – a prize possession ... and there was her Queen Elizabeth II teacup, with its picture of the Queen looking out in such a dignified way ... it reminded her of her duty and of the traditional values ... Not once had Seretse Khama faltered in his duty, nor had the Queen, who admired the Khama family and had always had a feeling for Africa ... and that made Mma Ramotswe feel proud of being a Motswana, and of all that Seretse and his wife had done (McCall Smith, 2004: 14).

As a contrast to the above relational between Britain and the Tswana, the Queen’s role in the San’s standing as citizens of
Botswana is poignantly expressed in this letter from San man Komtsha Komtsha of D’Kar:

Dear Queen
I am an old man. I am a Bushman. If we are too small to see or you have forgotten, you must ask other people what a Bushman is and where they live [...] Not very long ago you gave the Tswana people their land. At that time, when you came here, what did you see? Were there only trees and black people here? Is that why you did not talk to us? The Tswana people think that you have given us to them. They do not understand that you did not see us and that it is a mistake (cited in Le Roux and White, 2004: 182).

The blurb of Mark and Delia Owens’ Cry of the Kalahari claims that the authors ‘met animals that had never seen humans before’. This book is another that, although decades old, has generated a life of its own among visitors to Botswana, as evident in its new editions placed prominently in bookshops and tourist outlets. The purpose of the Owens’ prolonged residency in the Kalahari was to record animal behaviour, so the scientific foregrounding of wildlife over human life is not at issue here, but the presence of the San as custodians of the area is effectively negated with the description of the CKGR as ‘one of the biggest wildlife protectorates in the world, more than 32,000 square miles of raw, untracked wilderness ... no people, except for a few bands of Bushmen’ (1984:17). The Negation implied with the description of ‘raw, untracked wilderness’ as though there were no human presence, is then explicitly evident in the reference to ‘no people’. This is reminiscent of the Negation through exception in the film The Gods Must be Crazy (analysed in Chapter Four) where the narrator describes the Kalahari as being ‘devoid of people [pause] except for the little people’; the words ‘except for’ implying the San almost constitute an afterthought, as does the lyrical language employed in tourism literature. Such
Negation as this is not exclusive to the San, of course. Salazar (2009) notes this is a fairly common phenomenon across Africa, where animals are privileged over humans by visitors. This is patently evident in tourist publications in Botswana.

The opening of Linda Pfotenhauer’s article in Air Botswana’s in-flight magazine, Peolwane (June 2010) describes the Kalahari (known as the ‘Kgalagadi’ in Setswana) for tourists to the country using romanticised rhetoric, the epitome of Spurr’s Aestheticization trope:

Journey back in time
When earth was pure and perfect ...  
When animals freely roamed  
The still and sweeping plains 
Against a shimmering, scarlet sky  
And human footprints scattered small 
And insignificant 
Across the endless desert sands.

Return to Nature 
And savour lingering moments of intimacy 
In the myriad moods of 
Africa’s last great wilderness (13).

The poetic milieu is, in this text, so much a romantic aesthetic that one could overlook the inherent Negation alongside Insubstantialization operating in the text. The use of past tense throughout is reminiscent of van der Post’s sojourns to the ‘lost’ world of the Kalahari, where he finds footprints in the scalded earth that he suggests have been there for hundreds of years. The reference to ‘insignificant’ footprints here could perhaps be charitably read as pertaining to the comparatively minor mark on the earth’s history that all humanity has made, but within the rhetoric of homogeneity and assimilation operating in postcolonial Botswana, it is insulting. The verse is in the form of an invitation to those who can afford to stay at the safari lodges, ‘Journey ... Return ...’ enticing and mystical.
in their entreaty to experience that place which the San of the ‘insignificant’ footprints can no longer call home.

Laurens van der Post’s pilgrimage to find the ‘talismanic Bushman’ as a form of Negation in the effective inscribing of the San in ‘noble savage’ terms: ‘the desert and its original – now endangered – inhabitants are spiritual entities, an antidote to the destructive material culture of the West … the tone is serious, moralistic, lamenting the plight of ‘primitive’ peoples … whose way of life … is now ‘degenerating’ (Holland and Huggan, 2000: 180). Negation is especially evident (and easy) when a narrative of racial extinction is employed successfully. Van der Post wrote of the Bushmen as an extinct race, traces of whom could be seen in desert sands, and this misapprehension constitutes the treatise of Bennun’s 2004 book about the San, subtitled: ‘The last words of an extinct people’. Tlou and Campbell (1984, cited in Kiema, 2010: 68) note that the very term ‘Bushman’ means those people who occupy an unoccupied land. This begs the obvious question for Kiema, a (Kua) San man: ‘[s]o the presence of people in a piece of land is not perceived as an occupation of that land by those people and the land is then perceived to be occupied only if tribes rather than the ‘Bushmen’ are in that land. What a convenient definition!’ (68).

Omission of salient facts is also effective Negation and at work in tourist literature regarding the former inhabitants of the CKGR. Botswana Tourism Board’s 2009 Travel Companion, after two pages of glowing description of the Kalahari’s wildlife attractions, calls the San ‘Middle Stone Age inhabitants’ who ‘superbly adapted to … their environment … Today settlements, including cattle farms, dot many areas of the desert’ (9). The San’s relegation to history in this extract, the use of past tense regarding their lifestyle, and the
choice of the benign, almost childlike verb ‘dot’ connoting ongoing connections to the land, are active Negations and omit the fact of dispossession. The reference to settlements within the same paragraph as the San’s historical relationship to the area implies that the cattle farms belong to the San, when in fact they are employees only. Negation through omission and semantics is also at work in Peolwane (2007) which refers to the San thus: ‘deemed first inhabitants of the Kalahari’, the use of the verb ‘deemed’ in the vein of ‘alleged’, summoning an element of doubt about the San’s First Peoples status. The article (a thinly-veiled infomercial for Gantsi Craft) continues: ‘today they reside in remote settlements where it is difficult to earn an income and even more difficult to retain their old way of life. Their culture is fast disappearing and as such, any project geared towards promoting and preserving …’ (21), thereby simultaneously omitting any mention of eviction and congratulating the organisation’s largesse in fostering craft workshops for the San.

The Botswana Tourism Board’s annual glossy Discover Botswana 2009 issue has an eight-page article on the CKGR, a thinly veiled infomercial for the Grassland Safari Lodge set in ‘a private concession in central Ghantsi District … through what is called No-Man’s Land – a 58-kilometer wide buffer zone between the many cattle farms in the district and the CKGR’ (70). The article poetically extols (in order) the grasses and rocks, the weather, the vast expanses, the wildflowers, animals, birds, the cattle and Botswana’s beef industry, then moves on to the colonial history: German settlers among whose descendants now run the Grassland Safari Lodge. Finally, almost as an afterthought, the San: ‘[b]efore [the Europeans’] arrival, of course, the area was inhabited by the San … nomadic hunter/gatherers who masterfully exploited the resources of the Kalahari Desert’ (70). Semantically, the choice of the verb
‘exploited’ is dichotomous; the more insidious interpretation of which could be deployed to underscore the government’s official reason for the San’s relocation. More overtly offensive, and a clear case of Negation, is the historical inaccuracy of the San’s habitation of the Kalahari only before the arrival of the first colonists, a claim which suggests they no longer exist. The article goes on to advertise the specific lodge’s uniqueness, by way of Appropriation of San culture, seemingly unaware that the use of present tense verbs (below, my italics) contradicts the Negation quoted above, and ignores the fact of relocation and cultural decimation:

Today the descendents of the Kalahari’s original people usually work at the district’s cattle and livestock farms, but are increasingly becoming involved in the tourist industry. Some are engaged in community based tourism projects, others prefer to produce their unique arts and crafts for sale to tourists. There are a number of farms in the area that offer cultural tours with the San – learning how they source wild fruits and vegetables in the desert, find traditional remedies, make fire, and play and dance. None other than the Grassland Safari Lodge, however, has the unbeatable combination of San cultural tours, a wildlife concession and excursions to the CKGR. (70).

Such Negation sits comfortably with Idealization in a commercial collaboration between tourist operators and a major diamond company. Another Discover Botswana article – ‘Ghansi Kuru Dance Festival’ – reveals that the person who officially opened the festival was the CEO of Debswana Diamonds, the Botswana affiliate of De Beers, who is quoted as saying: ‘The majority of us see value in the old ways, but also see virtue in many of the new ways, and would like to try and preserve the best of both’ (30). This again could be read as an example of the phenomenon noted by Nadia Lie (2001), namely that when a subaltern group poses no threat to the agenda of the dominant culture, Idealization of that group often occurs in
colonial and neo-colonial contexts. Lie shows that it is from here but a small step to exoticism (effectively Spurr’s Aestheticization) and such noble rhetoric certainly serves to leave a positive, altruistic image of the diamond companies in tourists’ minds. Indeed, in a CNN three-part series ‘African Voices: Botswana (2009), San eviction from the CKGR is afforded a fleeting mention in Episode 3 (quickly refuted by Ian Khama: ‘they were never kicked off’, which thus becomes the definitive message), while the Botswana diamond industry is cited only insofar as the Gross Domestic Product is concerned in Episode 2, and not aligned at all with the issue of San dispossession.

While these opening words of the Ghanzi Traliblazers brochure: ‘the Hunter-Gatherer life of the San/Bushman has all but disappeared. There are few remaining Bushman who still retain the survival skills of their ancient ways of life’ (n.p) may appear honestly unidealised, such a tone of urgency is a common tourist lure, suggesting that tourists must hurry while the ‘few remaining’ are still available for tourist scrutiny, heightening the San’s exotic appeal as a disappearing race and the tourist sense of privilege for being privy to this experience before the imminent demise of an ancient culture. This once again demonstrates a conceptual interconnectedness of the categories in this chapter, in this case the San’s representation as doomed race used as a hyper-real commodification. This is a Negation of the San’s modern identity, as is the omission of any detail as to why the survival skills have been lost, leaving tourists to tacitly accept that eventually progress will inevitably catch up with the San, as with every other Indigenous group.
Negation is also evident by way of the ‘&Beyond’ tour group which refers to the ‘rapidly vanishing way of life’ and lyrically promises a ‘fascinating glimpse into the world’ of the San, describing the Kalahari as ‘untouched wilderness … where San Bushmen still roam’ apparently impervious to the contradiction inherent in the juxtaposition of ‘untouched’ and ‘still roam’. The choice of the verb ‘roam’ here is also commonly allusive of wild animals, further undermining the San’s humanity. This is redolent of San trackers’ coerced conscription by the South African Defence Force in the Namibian war of independence where their tracking skills were ‘grounded not in humanity but in animality’ (Gordon, 1992: 2). The enticement of validity is here also with the guarantee of an ‘authentic Bushman hunt’ and the experience of ‘true village life’ omitting the fact that the villages are faux reproductions for tourists and that the San now live outside the reserve. Haina Safari Lodge, on the northern border of the CKGR, continues in the vein of Negation in the order of activities listed for tourist gratification, and deception via the assertion that the San are still inhabitants. Haina boasts ensuite safari tents and pursuits that include: ‘game drives (Haina is home to a couple of very vocal prides of lion!), quad bike safaris and a never to be forgotten opportunity to interact with the local San people’ (Botswana Tourism Board, 2009: 77, my italics).

Similarly, the ‘Best of Botswana Promo’ (GVPedia, 2011) demonstrates Spurr’s Affirmation in a self-congratulatory tone, the narrative voice a Motswana talking about the ‘sound of my country’. This text endorses the assimilationist agenda of the BDP (reminiscent of Precious Ramotswe’s homily to her foster daughter about sameness) by exalting ‘so diverse a people … [yet with] a common melody that sings a song of hope’. Negation is operating concurrently with such Affirmation in the omission of any mention of
ethnic minorities, serving to further Aestheticize a ‘doomed race’. This orthodoxy is to be found within the non-commercial domain also, such as museum text which purports to be objective and academic. Text from an exhibition at the Supa Ngwao museum in Francistown, north-east Botswana is a case in point.

Apart from the Negation manifest, as with all the texts in this chapter, in the use of third person (the text is written about the San, not by the San, referring to the people by the Setswana name, Basarwa), there are no depictions of the San as a people who participate in – or contribute to modern society. Rather, the San are drawn as primordial, supporting an already entrenched mythology. The use of past tense throughout means that text does not, at least, suggest the San are still living this way in a freely accessible CKGR; their custodianship of the Kalahari is acknowledged in historical terms only, the semantics suggestive of extinction. However, in an apparent contradiction to the use of past tense, colour photography also accompanies the text and this suggests uninterrupted primordialism with modern technology depicting ancient lifestyle. Paraphernalia of traditional hunting garb and tools also feature in the exhibition, with no modern accoutrements of San life or details of notable modern San people on display:

From about 20,000 years ago Late Stone Age hunters and gatherers lived around [Francistown]. They were the ancestors of the Basarwa, probably Khoe-speakers. They hunted with bows and arrows. They put a poison on the arrows, which was so strong it could kill a giraffe (thutlwa) or kudu (tholo). Their stone tools were made by putting small shaped quartz segments into a wooden or bone handle. They also ate smaller animals, such as springhare, birds and tortoises [and] bulbs and plant foods … Rock paintings are found in caves and on slightly hollow areas on granite kopjes. They were made by the forefathers of the Basarwa … They were not just fun drawings by artists, but rather expressions of their religious beliefs and spiritual
experiences. The paintings were done by healers who recorded what they had experienced while in trance (accessed 11/1/2009).

The D’Kar San museum, near Ghanzi, has published, with the assistance of the Kuru D’Kar Trust, a collection of symbolic creation stories passed down through oral tradition by the Naro San of the area. The book, entitled Ncoa ne khoe ne di hua ne: San Stories in Naro and English, is available for tourist purchase. The collection is illustrated with San art created in the workshops run by KFO; art which is, in turn, based upon the ancient rock art. While Idealization of a vanishing culture and language appears to be the intent and spirit of the publication, there is a palpable sense of Negation through relegating the San to history, along with the evident Appropriation by way of the San’s anthropological status as commodity. According to the blurb, the book was published ‘to be used by the children of the D’Kar community’ but is prominently on sale in the tourist shop within the museum. The (non-San) museum curator’s foreword closes with infantilising sentiment: ‘[e]njoy reading these little treasures of a culture, which will soon disappear if we do not carefully preserve and promote it’ (n.d: 5).

In a publication sold as an education supplement for upper-primary aged children visiting the National Museum and Art Gallery in Gaborone, Botswana, the San are referred to using the Setswana name ‘Basarwa’ and although they are mentioned in terms of modern existence, the information is euphemised or omitted in a clear case of Affirmation, implying a past and present egalitarian partnership between the Tswana and the San which naturally promotes the façade of an equal society:

As Iron Age [farming] communities grew in size, some [Basarwa] bands may have been forced to move into
harsher environments where they could continue to hunt and gather. Other Basarwa, however, joined Iron Age communities and began to herd and farm. Over time these two ways of life – farming and foraging – have merged. Today, for example, [Basarwa] labour is an important part of cattlepost life ... Basarwa share their waterholes with Herero and Tswana herdsmen (Denbow and Denbow, n.d: 55).

The ‘important part of cattlepost life’ is true, although the salient fact that the posts are Tswana owned and that the San constitute cheap labour at these sites is not mentioned. The assertion that the San ‘share their waterholes’ implies the San have some jurisdiction over the holes and that they still live around them. This has been widely documented as a falsity, with San access to the waterholes and to hunting and gathering in the CKGR denied by way of the prohibitive permit system.

This chapter has identified exemplars of rhetoric to which tourists to Botswana are exposed and deploys discourse analysis alongside Spurr’s tropes to reveal the active appeal to tourist credulity as regards the San within written text. The chapter organised these texts, not by genre but into the same classifications of literary representation employed in the review of literature (Chapter 2) and Spurr’s tropes are applied to texts within these sub-sections as relevant. The literary texts include that which is purpose–produced by government and industry for tourist consumption, often depicting the San as an ‘authentic’ element of a safari package, value-added with San art- and craft work on sale; or, as Salazar has it ‘additional anecdotes in the safari experience’ (2009: 59) along with that literature which has indirectly lured the tourist to San contexts. The following chapter analyses a range of visual tourism texts using semiotic tools in conjunction with Spurr’s identified categories of colonialist principle and standard.
Chapter Four
‘Look Fierce and Don’t Smile for the Camera’:
Visual Representations of the San

If the key to ancient beliefs is in the trancing of shamans and the records of these experiences are what is represented on rocks, shelters and cave walls, it makes the vulgar appropriation by Western advertisers seem all the more inappropriate (Groenewald, 2008: 39).

Still and moving images from the tourist domain are analysed here against the colonialist tropes identified by Spurr (1993) simultaneously applying a semiotic schema. Tropes are not identified in any particular order, rather they appear at the point of their manifestations in particular texts. Analyses are supported, where relevant, by critical tourism literature, serving to universalise the attitudes, power dynamics and practices evident in the produced imagery. As with their literary counterparts, the analysis of visual representations is embedded necessarily within a framework of historical race relations which have given issue to the socio-political place of the San in Botswana since independence.

Photography
The camera (and now smartphone) are commonly accepted as universal signifiers of tourism. In this chapter I classify photography in two ways. First, it is defined here in the manner that Urry (1990) identifies, whereby the technology has ‘become emblematic of the tourist ... of being seen and recorded and seeing others and recording them (138); a form of Spurr’s Appropriation and associated Aestheticization, Idealization, among other tropes. This definition covers the photography taken by cultural tourists and assumes their contact with the outside world, through the uploading of images and information to social media in ‘a new blurring of
space’ (Wang, Xiang, Fesenmaier, 2014: 52). Wang et. al cite Pearce and Gretzel’s (2012) attribution of this relatively recent phenomenon as ‘digital elasticity’ for the capacity of tourists to be in a touristic space simultaneously with their everyday lives at home, thus broadening the geographical reach of their (often erroneous) impressions. In their research in Namibia’s living museums described in Chapter Five, Hiri and Mokibelo (2012) note the use of smartphone as growing in popularity among tourists taking photographs and posing (taking ‘selfies’) with San. Thus, binaries that traditionally characterised the travel experience (‘home/away, authentic/inauthentic … extraordinary/mundane’: 52) are, by way of the internet’s global connectivity, potentially undermined, thereby de-exoticising the experience to an extent, although there is some tourist reticence towards this practice still, as though the San are still held at an exotic ‘remove’. While, as is demonstrated with tourists’ personal contact with San in Lekoa’s 2007 documentary (analysed further on in this chapter), the exoticisation underscoring the myth of authenticity is an industry imperative, the smartphone’s capacity to ‘blur’ space may eventually have a ubiquitously positive outcome, as with Moses’ and his students’ self-representation outreach to tourists.

The tourist experience is reflected in photography produced in brochures and magazines by government and industry. Photographs and other visuals in this chapter are patently attempting to create an impression of authenticity for tourists and can be analysed in the light of categories of San representation identified in the review of literature (Chapter Two) such as ‘doomed race’ and ‘children’.
The second manner in which photography is presented in this chapter relates to (at least the intention underlying) my own photography appearing herein, a manner articulated sympathetically by Moynah (2008): ‘[i]t is important not to take the camera as a metonym for the tourist [since] tourists exceed their gazes and in that excess lies the potential for disrupting domination … rendering unstable the tourist’s gaze … [it provides] a means of challenging the Eurocentric epistemologies’ (39). In this way, I hope representations of the San in my photography is performing a Resistance of sorts.

![Figure 1: French television crew filming the San, Central Kalahari Game Reserve, Botswana. Photograph by Frans Lanting, National Geographic, Vol. 178, No. 6, December 1990.](image)

The obvious set-up evident in the above photograph reveals the contrived and decontextualised nature of much commercially produced representation of the San for tourist and general Western/Northern consumption. It epitomises Spurr’s colonialist attitude of Idealization in its appeal to audience ingenuousness,
suggesting as it does that the San are still hunter-gatherers with unfettered access to land and wildlife, and by extension, with no role or place in modern society. This calls up Roland Barthes’ (1981) contention that it is the nature of the photograph to show what ‘is dead and is going to die’ (96). The position of National Geographic, having included the camera and crew with the San ‘hunters’, in their double-page spread is one of ironic exposure of the French crew’s fabrication, but the fact of the device endorses the unequal power relationship between the viewer and the viewed. The magazine acknowledges the ‘commercial fantasy’ depicted in this photograph, and even in 1990, was aware of the disruption and subsequent decimation of culture that relocation from the CKGR caused and continues to cause. The caption accompanying this photograph reads:

Look fierce and don’t smile for the camera: Those were the instructions given by this French television crew to Dzu Bushmen living in the Tsodilo Hills. Today few Bushmen, if any, live as simple hunter-gatherers in the manner of their ancestors. Paid to shed their Western clothes – and to pretend to stalk the crew’s helicopter – they are being used to perpetuate a commercial fantasy (50-51).

The insult inherent in this contrived ‘fierceness’ is embedded in the irony of the San’s actual powerlessness in the face of ‘Tswanatization’, Lekoa’s inscribing of the assimilationist project of the Botswana Democratic Party whereby ethnic minorities are not systemically recognised but rather required to conform to the dominant Tswana agenda (2007: 51) and the marginalisation and poverty that result from such Negation. Also, the ‘paying off’ of the San to perpetuate a lie is anathema to the cultural mores of the San whose ethic is traditionally open and honest, uncharacterised by deception’ (Hays, 2000: 198-199). And as Lekoa asserts in her
empirical research (2007), payment to the San for their participation in this charade is meagre and often in the form of clothes, tobacco and food parcels. Sylvain (2005) critically notes San exploitation by the tourism industry on the Namibian side of the border with Botswana: ‘[w]here Bushmen ethnotourism ventures … are in the hands of non-San … the very people who help to sustain the myth that the … San remain pristine foragers, in need of nothing but game and wild fruits, are the first to believe that myth when payday comes’ (365).

The moving image implied by Figure 1 (as it would have eventually appeared in the French television production) is reminiscent of the curatorial introduction to a catalogue of a 1987 exhibition titled Cross-References: Sculpture into Photography where ‘[t]hese artists have little interest in photography as documentation of visual fact; rather, they prefer to arrange events to create their own realities … By fabricating their own subject matter, these artists maintain an unusual degree of control over the resulting photographs’ (cited in Barrett, 1996: 139). In this case, the San are being fashioned much as a sculpture is manipulated by its artist. The effect this photograph could have on the more ingenuous viewer of the television program becomes effectively a kind of reversal as Resistance, of the kind identified by Alex Gillespie (2006) who, apparently parodying Urry’s ‘tourist gaze’, writes of the ‘reverse gaze … the gaze of the photographee on the photographer as perceived by the photographer’ (343).

The illusion that the people are still living on the land in their natural state is cleverly contrived when, in reality:

tourism schemes have replicated the colonial system of separating people and the environment. As a result
local people may be excluded from national parks, and can be fined or arrested for trespassing and hunting in areas they have historically used. These exclusive areas are then developed with relatively open access for international tourists (Duim et al. in Smith and Robinson, 2006: 101).

Liesbeth Groenewald (2008) notes within a South African San context, applicable also to the Botswana setting, that despite a postmodern capacity to apply critical literacy, tourists often gaze upon San artefacts and performance without understanding or engagement, as

the overabundance in number, variety and presence of images ... interferes with our ability to look and reflect on individual images ... with the result the images have become part of everyday life and not the power repositories of Bushman shamans (42).

Terry Barrett (1996) draws attention to the phenomenon (also critically appraised by Spurr as being a feature of some highly respected journals) of the aestheticising of photographs in spite of - or even enhanced by their depictions of poverty and despair, thereby dismissing the plight of the people photographed and effectively hindering any attempts to transcend their position in society. Barrett cites Marxist critic Walter Benjamin who in 1934 bemoaned the fact that photography ‘has succeeded in turning abject poverty itself, in handling it in a modish, technically perfect way, into an object of enjoyment’ (93). Barrett then cites Susan Sontag who holds certain photographers accountable for distancing us using:

superb photographs of Agony, conforming to Surrealist standards of beauty ... their lovely compositions and elegant perspective easily outlast the relevance of the subject matter ... The aestheticizing tendency of
photography is such that the medium which conveys distress ends by neutralizing it. Cameras miniaturize experience, transform history into spectacle. As much as they create sympathy, photographs cut sympathy, distance the emotions (ibid).

Note the capital for the word Agony (above) as though it is an aesthetic genre unto itself. Roland Barthes (1981) discusses the capacity of a photograph to offer up singular nuances of feeling. Roland Barthes (1980) writes of the insidious Classification at work with photography, where the subject becomes object, thus ‘Death in person’ (14) since, ‘what society makes of my photograph, what it reads there, I do not know ... they turn me, ferociously, into an object, they put me at their mercy, at their disposal, classified into a file, ready for the subtlest deceptions’ (14). This is extrapolated as regards the Botswana San in terms of access to that which is rightfully theirs, by Cook and Sarkin (2009) who note that it is ironic that Indigenous groups have occasionally had to reformulate their ethnic identities in order to access resources. They cite the fact of the San being expected to perform as authentic ‘bushmen’ if they are not to be labeled opportunistic in their claims to land, royalties and self-determination, yet the English can live as modern people while simultaneously laying claim to a heritage of idealised landscapes, supremacy at sea, colonial glory and royalty.
Figure 2 (a): the San village of D’kar: Note the commentary below the photograph of a Motswana teacher posted to D’kar against her will (from I Don’t Know Why I Was Created, by Goliifer and Egner 2011).

Prasad and Prasad (2002) concur, observing that: ‘[T]ravel agencies, hotels, tour operators, cruise lines and the like design and market a set of experiences that supposedly provide opportunities for close and playful encounters with exotic native cultures’ (cited in Prasad, 2003: 161). This set of experiences in the Botswana San context takes the form of art and artefacts to buy, ritual dance to observe and survival tours to join; all products satisfying Aestheticization and Idealization of the San as hyper-real and commodities, resulting in Appropriation with, as the ‘blogs quoted in Chapter Three of this thesis suggest, little critique applied to the process.
The above photograph is another example of the Appropriation of San craft with absolutely no critique applied to the Danish woman, Birthe Gjer (pictured) a former co-ordinator for Gantsi Craft. Her elevated position in the chair while the San women are seated on the ground serves as a metaphor for her position over them, redolent of a teacher in an early childhood class. Whether this was a conscious set-up or not, the impression of the San as children and as ‘less than’ is laid open for tourist interpretation since the photo
appears in a book for their consumption. Certainly Gjer, on behalf of Gantsi Craft, remunerated the San women for their handiwork but since she sells the craft on her regular trips to Europe, the creators of it have no knowledge of the amount actually paid by the consumer (Lekoa, 2007). Craft-making, especially the preparation of ostrich egg-shells for stringing, is a laborious process and the women receive a token amount for their efforts, despite Gantsi Craft’s claim that they buy from the people in the villages and re-sell at a ten percent mark-up (Peolwane, 2007). Le Roux and White omit this well-documented fact and act as a de facto promoter of the company in the process.

It must also be pointed out that Willemein Le Roux and Alison White’s liberalist perspective, comprehensively cited throughout this thesis, on the San’s positioning and representation, both historically and in modern Botswana, is somewhat undermined by the visual presentation of their book *Voices of the San* (2004) which, certainly on first impressions, befits the glossy coffee-table genre of many published examples of Idealization.
The book is available in almost all tourist outlets within Botswana and does, as the title suggests, quote the San extensively, but these ‘voices’ are framed and contextualised by the (non-San) authors, despite their having ready access to San academics and authors. Louise Olliff (2004) notes a phenomenon of representation produced by NGOs which is designed to counter ‘compassion fatigue’ in potential Western/Northern benefactors from years of bombardment with graphic imagery of Third World suffering. This practice is the ‘narrative of hope’ (imagery including smiles, purpose and creativity in poor communities) where the implied message is that with strategic and ongoing assistance from NGOs (such as KFO, of which Le Roux is a founder) this group will eventually become self-sufficient. There is a version of this practice occurring in the case of the KFO in D’Kar and Ghanzi through the strategic set-up of photographs for tourists.
Moving images also impact on perceptions and are often produced by tourists for other tourists. The video clip ‘How to find water in the Kalahari Desert – Bushman walk, Ghanzi’ (Africafreak, May 6, 2011) – previously discussed in Chapter Three – is analysed here in terms of its visual elements. This and a related clip, ‘How to Make a Fire the Bushman Way’ depict the San in traditional clothing in the desert, showcasing ancient skills. The tourists in the ‘How to find water’ are mostly standing over the family group, the patriarch of which shaves at a tuber, producing handfuls which are then kneaded and squeezed, producing water for drinking and washing. While admiring Idealization of the San for their skills is evident and there is, refreshingly, no voice-over offering Western interpretation of the tableau, there is also no critique. The scene is simply taken at face value; the title of this and the related ‘How to…’ videoclip suggesting these San practices are accepted by tourists as sui generis and definitive, with no corporate deception operating. Tourist largesse (Affirmation) is suggested with the cigarette being passed around the family. Although the occasional laughter of the San suggests they are not unwilling participants, witnessing and close-up filming of an intimate family scene (albeit contrived within this setting) with infants at mothers’ partially exposed breasts and people washing themselves could be read as voyeuristic, or a mild form of Eroticization. The line between voyeurism and awareness-raising is sometimes difficult to locate, however.

The taking of the following photograph, which serves as a bridge between the Photography and Arts and Crafts sections of this chapter, was referred to in Chapter One as an example of the quandaries faced by those wishing to expose injustice and who may unwittingly violate human spaces and sensitivities in the process.
Just as photographic images can manipulate the credulous tourist, commodified artefacts also play a role of contrivance (in feigning authenticity) and fraudulence in allowing tourists to believe that the proceeds of the sale always benefit the makers. The photograph shows a woman creating craftwork for Gantsi Craft. It brings to mind Roland Barthes’ concept of the punctum which disturbs the spectator’s experience. This woman’s direct gaze is reminiscent of Homi Bhabha’s (1994) ‘strategic reversal of the process of domination [which turns] the gaze of the discriminated back upon the eye of power’ (107-108). While the woman is emphatically not discriminated against by me, I know her to be a member of group which continues to experience Debasement in the region and although I had no desire to exploit it, I acknowledge my position of economic and social advantage over her. As a result, the dynamic of my brief encounter with this woman and the taking of the photograph certainly disturbed me.

Figure 5: San woman making beads from ostrich egg-shells, Ghanzi. Taken by the author with permission from the woman (please see Chapter One: Footnote 4), 2009.
Figure 5 shows a San woman making ostrich-egg beads for necklaces such as those displayed on the shop wall in a photograph (Figure 8) further on in this chapter. She and a few other women are seated on the ground outside Gantsi Craft shop in Ghanzi, undertaking an everyday enterprise.

By way of comparison to the contrivance evident in Figure 1, certain salient factors occur to me on scrutinising this photograph. Certainly I made no requests of the woman to ‘be’ a certain way for the photograph. I am physically ‘with’ her; there is eye contact. The woman’s body is open towards me, which can be read as a human connection, perhaps trust, although, the brevity of the time-frame could simply mean she was not able to rearrange herself. The light is a ‘capture’ in that the reality of the woman’s yellowish skin – an oft-noted feature of the San – is accentuated. The manner in which the woman uses the stick to fashion the egg-shell into beads is redolent of the rubbing of sticks for the production of fire, another ancient practice which could, in a commercial production, be read as a compositional device. The unconsciousness of my elevated position while taking this photograph is recognised later to my shame. Such a position implies the higher value of that being gazed upon, reducing, as Barthes would suggest ‘subject to object’ (13). This recalls the concept of the Panopticon which is relevant, as Spurr (1998) observes, to any context where the (comparatively) invulnerable observer asserts a visual advantage or authority in a ‘disproportionate economy of sight’ (17). This dialectic also extends to interpretation.

Referring back to Connell (2007) my interpretation of the woman’s facial expression and body language is in itself a product of ‘majority world’ privilege and there is an inherent arrogance in
imagining I know what the woman might be thinking. The intent in this photograph was to capture the look of (what I read as) melancholy on the woman’s face, her look directed at me unambiguously, reflecting her difficult life and presumably believing me to be yet another tourist with the capacity to afford the luxuries she labours over, but from which she receives little benefit. Homi Bhabha (1988) calls this phenomenon an ‘ambivalence in the act of interpretation’, asserting that interpretation is never a simple I-You exchange and that the ‘discursive conditions of enunciation … ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read anew’ (23). My gaze subjectively identified with the woman (see Burgin, 1982) but I concede I was perhaps identifying with what I know of the experiences of her people (thus, essentialising her) rather than with the woman herself.

Although I read (correctly or not) the woman’s ‘reverse gaze’ as being acutely aware of the disparity between us, ethnologist Dithunya Lekoa (2010) subscribes to the view that the San are largely ignorant of the extent of the difference, partly because they do not see their handiwork overseas: ‘[t]he sad part is that here they don’t know how much tourism is exploiting them. I saw a San painting in an exhibition in Norway, selling for thousands of Euros and I know the artist himself received a pittance for it (ix).’

The rhetoric of the Botswana Tourism Board, however, suggests the San reap the benefits of their labour: ‘[t]oday the descendants of the Kalahari’s original peoples usually work at the district’s cattle and livestock farms, but are increasingly becoming involved in the tourism industry. Some are engaged in community-based tourism
projects, others prefer to produce their unique arts and crafts for sale to tourists’ (2009: 70). Even an academic onlooker appears to stand as an apologist for KFO and Gantsi Craft without critical analysis, endorsing the rhetoric: ‘Gantsi Craft currently serves several remote settlements within Ghanzi and Kgalagadi districts, buying crafts directly from producers and the majority are women’ (Bolaane, 2014: 55) yet the sources of Bolaane’s information are the Gantsi Craft flyer for 2008 and the Molapo Kalahari Lodge flyer of 2008! It is not mentioned that the community-based projects largely benefit corporate tourist outlets and the San have little choice but to comply, given their (linguistic and other social) incapacity to deal directly with the public.

**Arts and Crafts**

San man Kachau Daxoo, resident of D’Kar, is quoted in *The Botswana Guardian* (29/05/09) as saying, ‘[w]e collect ostrich shells from the bush to sell. The whites pay us anything they feel like paying. They pay 12 Pula for the eggshell’ (3). Eggs decorated by the San are typically sold for P188 at nearby Gantsi Craft. The absence of any direct payment for crafts produced is corroborated by San craftsman Dawid Kruiper from Welkom in the southern Kalahari: ‘[w]e just depend on craft making, that is our best income, after everything we’ve tried. We sell at Kagga Kamma, but we have to wait for the money to come’ (cited in Le Roux and White, 2004: 216). Iaxo, from D’Kar sold her crafts to San Arts and Crafts in Ghanzi and claims she was issued an invoice ‘bearing neither the logo nor a dated stamp’ (*Botswana Guardian*, 29/05/09: 3); clear *Appropriation* whereby artists are dispossessed of their creative subject-matter and process, as well as the profits of their production; they are relegated merely to the means of production. Workshops, established by NGOs to up-skill the San of the region, act on behalf
of the retail outlets and control the subject-matter of the artistic output as elaborated on a little further.

The Kuru Family of Organisations (KFO) operating out of Ghanzi and D’Kar, runs a series of self-help programs for the San. A booklet (n.d) produced for tourists by the Kuru Art Project (‘kuru’ meaning to create) showcases some of the artwork, with sales contact details on the last page for those wishing to order from afar, alongside photographs of the artists and some of their voices. The commentary is not written by a San person but by a representative of the organisation, acknowledging that there are difficulties for modern San but minimising the San’s economic, political and social disenfranchisement:

Through their art, the San of the Kalahari come to terms with today’s pressures and expectations. By developing their own voice, the artists are creating an awareness about the loss of their hunter-gatherer existence and the impact this had had upon their lives ... the art of these artists confirms that they can adapt, be accepted and live in a changing world, without losing their identity, and that the beauty of their knowledge and values can still make a contribution (5).

The sub-text of this idealised commentary is an unspoken mandate that the San accept ‘their lot’, a tone that renders the prospect of struggle ineffectual, precludes activism and does not challenge the morality or legality of San dispossession or relocation that brought about their status quo. Ironically, juxtaposed with the above text is this voice of San artist Thamae Kaashe: ‘[a]rt is like politics in your mind. You may dream of so many things or hear so many stories. Art is to put these things together, to give meaning to them and make them visual’ (5). Even with a concession to honesty from the Kuru Art Project, admitting that ‘[s]ince its inception, a number of the artists
have sadly succumbed to the realities of their transition, such as modern diseases and poverty’ (10) the statement begs the question why artists, supposedly fairly remunerated for their work, would die in poverty. Pieter Brown (1999) calls the Kuru Art project in D’Kar, ‘one of several projects of the Kuru Development Trust, a San-owned organization for self help’ (30) [my italics]. Interestingly, Tsimane (2009) claims San people of the D’Kar and Chobokwane regions say ‘they derive little benefit from … KFO … their artifacts are bought for a song while NGOs make a roaring trade out of them … Related to this, Basarwa are worried that their images could be paraded … as freaks overseas like Sarah Bunton13 (5). Again, the blithe assumption that readers from within Botswana, as well as tourists, will trust that the ownership of such enterprises lies in San hands, which is not, at present, the case.

The Kuru Art Project, D’Kar, can be considered a case in point of Idealization, selling artefacts designed for the unwitting tourist, and which extols the virtue of the Kuru self-help project. The rhetoric of the project omits any mention of dispossession of the Naro San of their traditional hunting ground, which originally occurred at the hands of Afrikaans-speaking white farmers (encouraged by the British government) and more recently by government on behalf of Debswana and Wilderness Safaris and other lodges in the CKGR. Jonathan Schroeder (2002) identifies the sequence of commodification’s power over the customer: the initial sensory anchoring or interpretation of an image; the lure of instant access; a personal engagement (either positive or negative), and a cultural multi-connectedness.

13 Otherwise known as Sara Baartman, a San woman who was taken to England in 1810 to be displayed for her condition of steatopygia, paraded around Europe as the ‘Hottentot Venus’, and examined by scientists. She was the subject of many nude portraits and died destitute at the age of 26. Her remains were repatriated in 2002.
Paul Weinberg (1997) who took the photograph below, chronicles his observations of D’Kar, its origins, rhetoric and realities: ‘Bushman are regularly evicted from farms and dumped at D’Kar. I meet Qama Qaxee and his wife, living in a tiny shack. He asks for money and points to his stomach’ (24-25). It is apparently contradictory, though, that Weinberg is publicly sceptical of the Kuru Development Trust’s motives for intervention in the San’s lives, yet his photographs are sold as postcards at Gantsi Craft with the contact details of KDT on the back.

Weinberg labels his photograph of the mother and child (below), giving the name of the mother, thus asserting her individual personhood. It is, at least, refreshing that the imagery does not overtly suggest primordialism or employ Idealization by way of harmonious family scenes, hunting or gathering. The photographic set-up is not a hyper-real representation, rather one that is unconstructed, reflecting, in the meagre surroundings of the camp, the general reality of San conditions in the Ghantzi area (see Lekoa, 2007). The black and white rendering of the scenes, however, may be read as an Aestheticized construction, suggestive of the ancient, the elemental (no technology evident, organic textiles and utensils) with the obvious poverty perhaps serving as an aesthetic to certain interpretations.
The Aestheticization of poverty is cynically analysed by Spurr (1998) and could certainly be at play in the two images of Figure 6. Spurr contends that people of the developing world are represented as being unprotected by more advanced civilisation; their suffering depicted as ‘raw’ and ‘elemental’, those aspects that are successfully suppressed and reined in in the West. Further, such representation is itself a metaphor since ‘the aesthetic stance itself is taken from within a position of power and privilege; the power to perceive poverty as aesthetic value is a privilege not granted to the poor’ (47).

Aestheticization of disproportionate power also reveals itself in an attitude of infantilisation (my own identified sub-category of, in this case, Spurr’s third trope). Brown asserts that: ‘[t]he approach of the art centre has not been to present art lessons at all but rather to provide facilities, materials and encouragement to the group of ten San artists who are invited to play and experiment and thus teach themselves a personal way of handling the materials’ (30) [my italics]. This calls up the problematic concept of authenticity once again. Graburn (1999) notes that art curators’ professional reputations are based on their perceived ability to discriminate against the authentic and the mass-produced. He cites Cohados as
showing that: ‘the imprecation of authenticity is a device for maintaining power and stratification in colonial systems’. Yet, he claims, native peoples are, of necessity, enterprising and ‘the importance of authenticity to tourists and collectors is soon learned by Native artists and mediators take a central place in the language of selling’ (cited in Phillips and Steiner, 1999: 352). Brown (1999) attributes international recognition of San art to the centre, as does Qaedhao Moses, whose award-winning artwork has sold in the USA and Australia and who now has a workshop within an artists’ cooperative in Botswana’s capital.

Moses was given an apprenticeship by KFO but this indebtedness to the centre comes at a price which, apart from the substantial commission the organisation extracts from the selling price, is the obligation to create art that only represents what it is assumed tourists expect depicted in San art, in keeping with the preconceptions they have about the San.
As is evident from the one of four similar pages of artwork and artists of the Kuru Art Project booklet (Figure 7) not one collection depicts modern realities of the San, rather images based on ancient rock art. Pushkala Prasad (2003) identifies the Aestheticization at the core of this practice:

\[\text{[n]ative arts ... are largely undifferentiated, reproducing an older colonial discourse in which Western art is appreciated for its variation and nuances, while native art is valued for its capacity to symbolize certain broad cultural patterns ... [with] little interest in vibrant contemporary native cultures given their romantic preoccupations with preserving supposedly dead ones. ... the native is of interest only as an exotic other who typifies a 'pristine' non-Western state uncontaminated by the effects of change and modernity ... [museums] soon began to strongly resonate with the scientific-scholarly moments of the ethnographic imagination, devoted to ordering, classifying and cataloguing natives and their cultures (164).}\]

Steiner (1999) is rather uncomplimentary towards tourists who ‘quickly seize upon the orthodoxy of the already-known, grasping
for the creature comforts of the canonical ...Evaluations of tourist art are grounded in modes of production and systems of perception that are deeply rooted historically' (101-102). Gantsi Craft, in operation for almost thirty years, makes much of its interactions with fourteen resettlement communities to produce craft, understanding the market, sourcing natural products obtained under government license and refusing material from poachers. Steiner’s observations are patently manifest in exhibitions staged by Gantsi Craft, collaborating with the Kuru Art Project and some other NGOs to produce work that has the stamp of authenticity (original and in the ‘defined style’) overlayed with the ‘creature comforts of the canonical’, as this article from Peolwane, Air Botswana’s inflight magazine (2007) reports:

San craftmaking has recently caught international attention and has entered the scene of haute couture! During the past few years, Gantsi Craft has taken part in a regional initiative with the internationally acclaimed French designer Michael Kraa, who inspired the craft producers to turn their traditional San ostrich egg jewellery into highly fashionable and trendy jewellery for their European market’ (21).

San artist Qaedhao Moses is revisited in the Chapter Five of this thesis, demonstrating the way in which he practises Resistance against the official rhetoric of San ‘authenticity’, by way of his representation of modern San realities. In Figure 8 below, he is photographed (by the author) at his workshop in Gaborone with some of the traditional artwork he paints, typical of the work produced by the San of the D’Kar region, supported by the KFO. Moses claims that although tourists are still interested in buying images they believe to be based on the rock art, they are becoming educated towards an understanding of the San as a race with the potential to have a place and a voice in modern
Botswana but whose efforts at self-determination have been systematically thwarted over many generations. In the interactions between Moses and myself, the ‘tourist gaze’ is not occurring with any manner of imbalance since he readily agreed (in English) to be photographed with his art. Also, his and other workshops in the centre exist primarily for tourist access.

Appropriation as a form of reinterpretation applies to stylistic elements of culture where outsiders have preconceived notions about an ethnic group, then reproduce it – or, in the case of art such as Moses was required to produce before deciding to strike out on his own – have it reproduced to align with their perception of authenticity. Ruth B. Phillips (1999) gives the example of French-Canadian ladies’ practice of producing bark and fabric objects embroidered with moose-hair, identifying their art as typically Indian, whereas in fact, ‘nuns and ladies constructed images of
Indianness out of a conventional array of tropes of the ‘Noble Savage’ and the picturesque exotic (cited in Phillips and Steiner: 34). Such reproductions of the rock art as Moses still feels obliged to create for tourists is paradoxically, a stylistic fabrication, in that they ‘separate the content of a painting from the form which expresses it [since] re-creations of the paintings ... bear little resemblance to the originals’ (Skotnes in Deacon and Dowson eds. 1996: 237). Portrayal of such ‘“traditional” versions of themselves for tourists’ shows a ‘well developed sense of self-objectification and self-commodification’ (Salazar, 2009: 60). This phenomenon shows how some ethnographic and archaeological conclusions can foster representations that become commodities, thereby perpetuating a myth of authenticity and essentialism that can keep minorities disenfranchised. Mathias Guenther (2006) concurs, noting a similarity in style in the paintings produced through KFO in D’Kar to the rock art, ‘in part because some of the artists have taken Kuru-sponsored trips to far-away rock-art sites’ but he calls these ‘eerie echoes’ merely a ‘romantic ringing in Western ears’ (176). Guenther cynically attributes the common tourist desire for the ‘tribal, feral, childlike, primal, ancient and archaic, dark, at one with nature and kindred to animals’ (176) in the art they buy to a correlation in the Western mind between authenticity and primitivism. He posits this perpetuated and constructed orthodoxy in terms of the authenticity myth in that the ‘externally derived’ values and techniques of Western NGOs drive the artistic process and the subject-matter with no relation to San realities in modern times. This phenomenon also inevitably results in cultural essentialism.

Pippa Skotnes (1996) considers such essentialist artistic recreations disrespectful since they do not account for the intra- and inter-
regional stylistic, formal and iconographic differences and contradictions which stand as tangible markers of cultural diversity:

...deprived of their aesthetic significance, they are viewed as ethnographic specimens or productions of the ‘primitive’ mind however full of religious feeling it may be acknowledged to be, mere illustrations of San belief or illustrations of theories of San belief ... it is this reduction of the paintings ... that has enabled the researcher to find such widespread similarities in the paintings and posit a pan-San cognitive system (238).

The photograph above shows San work on sale for tourists in Ghanzi, Botswana. In Figure 9, Aestheticization is evident in the fact of the credit card icons on the windows, demonstrating the level of prices charged for the handiwork (high, even by Western standards) which is undeniably beautiful. Also, the Idealized suggestion inherent in the collection is that the ostrich shell necklaces, leather pouches, etc. are authentic items, still used by the San today, while in fact they are used and worn only for tourist gratification. While interpretation of images is essentially an individual designation, the lines are
blurred as to where exactly Aestheticization becomes Eroticization, as Figure 10 illustrates.

Figure 10: San Arts and Crafts. Photographs from Kuru Family of Organisations Annual Report, 2010.

Cara Aitchison (2001) asserts that the tourist industry is heavily marketed with sexualisation: ‘[f]eminized, sexualized and
radicalized imagery can be seen to inform a symbiotic relationship between colonialism and sexism that constantly reinvents itself within the globalized tourist industry’ (140). She also acknowledges the metaphor of the feminised (and thus relatively powerless) site as a ‘social–cultural nexus of gender-power relations in leisure and tourism ... in which the gendered Other is constructed as subaltern in and through tourism’ (134-135). This is a semiotic exercise, the prevalence of ‘signs’ that seduce visitors with the old ‘sex sells’ adage and which, as Aitchison quotes Butler (1990), is part of the ‘epistemological, ontological and logical structures of a masculinist signifying economy’ (136). Lack of resistance from the locals is highlighted by Aitchison, who, placing tourism firmly within a neo-colonialist paradigm, comments that the landscapes offered up for tourists (including corporeal ones) are ‘frequently represented ... as ‘hidden treasures or as canvases upon which the explorer or the tourist can make his (sic) mark without any local resistance’ (138).

I eschew any suggestion that the women in Figure 10 have no agency in their roles as models. There is undoubtedly, though, Eroticization at work in the images showcasing San craft in a KFO glossy annual report advertising ostrich-shell jewellery adorning San women and while the same could be claimed for all such imagery in this genre, the irony of the symbolism in this case is particularly pertinent. Glowing Affirmation of the role of KFO in the sourcing, design and marketing of such a quality product is also evident, as well as loving Affirmation in a memorial spread about the recently deceased Bram Le Roux who founded KFO. The report is ostensibly for the information of NGOs affiliated under the KFO banner but is available gratis to tourists in KFO–supported outlets, such as Gantsi Craft and the D’Kar Museum and Art Gallery, thereby serving as a
material promotion of the organisation(s)’ benevolence and as an advertising medium.

Rhetoric for tourists celebrates the international market the product has garnered and tacitly suggests the purchase of this product will benefit the San community: ‘[f]acilitating improvement of livelihoods in the settlements of Ghanzi district’ (30). To those incensed by government treatment of the San, these words are evidence of KFO’s tacit acceptance of the fact the settlements exist at all. This lack of any protest about the communities created to accommodate evictees, sits alongside the Eroticization of the models as at least two glaring examples of offensive neo-colonialist hubris, couched in rhetoric of compassion and altruism.

The models’ poses and facial expressions, as well as the photography, are Western conventions of the medium recontextualised in the desert setting. In the main photograph, the woman’s face is only partially shown, shielding identity to enhance a sense of mystery, with the universally unsmiling and moistened pout of fashion models exuding sexual allure. David Spurr (1998 :178-179) quotes the German poet H.F. Freiligrath’s Eroticized vision of Africa and its women, penned in 1874:

Oh, zone so hot and glowing,
Queen of the earth art thou;
Sand is thy mantle flowing,
The sun dost crown thy brow.
Of gold, thou queenly woman,
Are all thy clasps and rims,
That fasten with fiery splendour
The garment to thy burning limbs.
– and a century and a half later this aesthetic is still promulgated by way of texts such as Figure 10. But there is an insidious edge to the photographic images that tourists would almost surely miss.

One model is draped in a necklace fashioned into a chain with large links, which item, apart from being a suggestion of sexual bondage, is allusive to slavery. Since the San have been enslaved literally and metaphorically in chains for centuries and given the KFO’s espoused mission, it seems in dubious taste to have one of the models so attired. Sensitivity to this historical and current fact in the setting up of this photograph was evidently overlooked.

The youth of the women is evident in all photographs in this spread; not one is middle-aged. In fact, the girls appear pubescent, innocent, virginal. As Camille Paglia observes, ‘[smoothness is always social in meaning: it is nature subdued by the civil’ (1990: 533). The fact that the images are designed and produced to solicit specifically Western custom categorises them in the vein of allegorical eighteenth- and nineteenth-century imperial text such as that of Diderot, Flaubert, T.E. Lawrence; personifications of Henry Morton Stanley’s 1891 description of Africa as ‘still a virgin, locked in innocent repose’ (231). The desert features indistinctly in the background of all images; muted sunset lighting enhancing the sense of Insubstantialization and Eroticization simultaneously with the suggestion of untouched territory. Paglia’s interpretation of Leonardo’s Mona Lisa comes to mind with these models in that persona’s denotation as an ambassador from primeval times, when earth was a desert inhospitable to man. She presides over a landscape of raw rock and water … But the background is deceptive and incoherent. The mismatched horizon lines … are
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subliminally disorienting. They are the unbalanced scales of an archetypal world without law or justice (154).

The reading of the background as untamed, suggests the relative ‘necessity’ to dominate such a context; to bring it into sharp relief, thereby to define it. In the vein of *terra nullius*, Paglia suggests that Mona Lisa’s assumption of power over the landscape is, in fact, illusory; that the landscape is but a formless imaginary until defined and appropriated by an external (read: colonial/neo-colonial and male) agent. A ‘metonymic association’ between a landscape and a woman’s body is made by van Eeden (cited in Pritchard et al, 2007) who cites as a case in point a South African theme park created in 1979, a neo-colonialist extension, suggests van Eeden, of the old colonial project where Africa was considered by Europeans to be their invention and construction.

Paglia inscribes this phenomenon as a manifestation of the daemonic; the pagan imperative where ‘[s]ex is the point of contact between man and nature, where morality and good intentions fall to primitive urges ... This intersection is the uncanny crossroads of Hecate, where all things return in the night. Eroticism is a realm stalked by ghosts’ (3). Trevor Millum (1975) reads *Insubstantialization* in the ‘soft introverted’ gaze where the model is ‘pouting, rarely smiling’ as an ‘inward-looking trance-like reverie, removed from earthly things’ (97). But this photographic spread goes further: the androgynous aesthetic established for most of the women depicted (breasts covered by arms, masculine hat, etc) also situates the assortment within the Apollonian ‘correction of life’ whereby ‘the early and high classic beautiful boy perfectly harmonizes masculine and feminine ... the beautiful boy slides towards the feminine, a symptom of decadence’ (ibid: 123) as well as being ‘exclusive, a product of aristocratic taste’ (117). This
androgyny could also be read as a challenge to the voyeuristic objectification of women (to Laura Mulvey’s 1975 ‘power asymmetry’ of the male gaze) that pervasively characterises fashion spreads. Again, this interpretation of the aesthetic renders it ironic considering the San’s conditions in the settlements, and conveniently, in terms of government and corporate agendas in the CKGR, the photographic set-up has the beautiful boy ‘[fleeing] the superfluity of matter, the womb of female nature’ (117) as though the area could not have any appeal for the San in any case; their aspirations are materially and culturally beyond that place. Subliminal Appropriation is taking place by way of the suggestion to tourists that the CKGR belongs to a hazy past for the San who now subscribe to Western aspirations and values. This would appear to be a ‘bridging’ sentiment, aimed at those tourists unconvinced by the primordial representations of the tourist industry, needing some reassurance that the San are content within an assimilated paradigm.

Paglia contends that the merging of humanity and wilderness into a continuum is ‘a classically Dionysian view of man’s immersion in organic nature’ (ibid: 236), but in these photographs, there is a foregrounding and elevating of the sharp-focus human form against the ‘fuzzy, misty’ (98) backdrop that Paglia identifies as ‘the western eye victorious’ (104) and quintessentially Apollonian: ‘Apollo freezes the living into objects of art or contemplation. Apollonian objectification is fascist but sublime, enlarging human power against the tyranny of nature … [in Greek society] what was far away, invisible, was ipso facto ‘not there’ ‘ (106). This can stand as a metaphor for the San in relation to the Kalahari, with the desert now unavailable to them, far away in terms of free access. With the metaphor extended to the models wearing ostrich shell (or residual
markers of nature) now manipulated and appropriated into embellishments in which the models are attired momentarily before returning them to such demographics as can afford such luxuries.

The company showcasing their wares in Figure 10 is San Arts and Crafts, the only Propriety Limited company within the Kuru Family of Organisations. It has consulted experts in the fields of design, marketing and branding and now has outlets in many countries. While the company boasts Fair Trade accreditation, the images are innately imbued with Cornel West’s (1999: 80) notion of the Eurocentric ‘normative gaze’ by which other races are socially constructed. The following exemplar of San arts and crafts is more traditional but no less a contrivance for tourist gratification.

![Figure 11: from ‘Bushmen Crafts’, Gantsi Craft, Ghanzi District, Botswana.](image)

The text of the booklet (n.d) from which the above page (Figure 11) is reproduced was subject to a discourse analysis in Chapter Three, and here a scrutiny of the illustrations depicts the Idealization and Aestheticization (including infantilisation) at work in the line drawings of San craft work for sale. The booklet itself is plain-cover, unsophisticated, decidedly non-glossy, using font from a typewriter rather than a word processor. This, along with the present tense of the rhetoric, fosters the mythology of the San as an historical race
only, a people that does not need or use modern conveniences or
materials, that lives a hunter-gather lifestyle as an Aestheticized
relic, occupying no position in modern Botswana. As Groenewald
(2008) asserts with regard to the promotion of San artefacts,
'[a]dvertising sells the past to the future via a sophisticated
technology system, or a dream world where anything is possible.
Advertising imagery therefore idealises the Bushman by portraying
a specific ‘image’ of a primitive hunter and gatherer’ (28-29). The
booklet was produced for tourist consumption by Gantsi Craft,
which outlet, as Figure 9 shows, sells very expensive versions of the
items primitively sketched in Figure 11. Enhancing the concept of
San primordialism in the tourist imaginary is a conscious construct
manifest in the naïve style production of this booklet.

Appropriation of culture and artefacts for tourism is a practice
explored by Rosaleen Duffy (2002). The definition of ecotourism
extends to encompass culture, Duffy asserts, and she states: ‘it is
meant to be socially and culturally aware [ensuring] genuine
participation for local people’ (98). However, Duffy is well aware
that her tourism ideal is the exception, that usually the case is that
‘local people and their ways are customized, packaged and sold
for consumption ... [as] when traditional rituals and festivals are re-
enacted for the ecotourists’ benefit ... the tourist intrusion has
brought social and cultural change that is more in line with
commercial values’ (102).
Figure 12 shows San art on display and for sale to tourists is a *Classification* in itself. The gallery was established by the Le Roux family and now produces art which is exhibited and sold at high prices in Europe and North America (although this is mentioned only with reference to the fact of exhibitions, not to sales) as well as being sold to tourists on site. The art the San are encouraged to produce is based on the rock art of the Tsodilo Hills and certain other sites across southern Africa. It is meticulously catalogued and limited edition prints are made of each original. The *Classification* of the artistic subject-matter further endorses the suggestion for tourists that the San are of the past, with no real position in, or contribution to make to modern Botswana.

*Appropriation* of the artwork is also evident, as Coex'ae Qgam (known as Dada) of D’Kar asserts: ‘[w]e do these paintings and everyone says we are rich. They say we are getting a lot of money.'
Now I can’t see that money so how can I believe that it is enough? If it was so much money, why would it be finished even before I have paid everything I need to and have given the children something?’ (201). This is endorsed by Hitchcock and Brandenburgh (1990) who assert that jobs given to Basarwa are often menial, consisting generally of catering positions. None of the safari companies is owned or operated by Basarwa. Management positions in the rapidly expanding tourism companies are usually reserved for non-Basarwa, many of whom are Western trained or have extensive experience. According to some Basarwa, tourism is out of their hands; it is controlled, they say, by private businesses or by the government, and they have little or no access to well-paying jobs (n.p).

Some years ago, Dada’s artwork (depicting a jackal in the bush) adorned British Airways aeroplanes and company paraphernalia, symbolically aligning Botswana within the old colonial dynamic including the Appropriation of Indigenous artefacts that has always characterised colonialism. Moses also notes a lack of transparency.
from Kuru Art Project as regards the cost of art materials, used as a justification for the meagre payment of artists. The exploitation involved in the Appropriation of specifically San art in this instance is evidence of a neo-colonialist phenomenon in the fact that ‘Tswana (or dominant culture) art could not have been so cheaply acquired by a corporation without contract or royalties. As Sheridan Griswold of the Botswana daily Mmegi (28 October, 2011) recalls:

When British Airways ripped off [Dada] she was given a one-off payment when it should have been a combination of payment plus royalties, a proportion paid on all use over time (her art work not only went on a plane, but on tickets, luggage tags, even buses at Heathrow Airport) … I had some interesting exchanges with British Airways at the time over their exploitative way of rewarding her. They refused to budge.

A book showcasing Dada’s work was published in 2011 and features in Chapter Five of this thesis as an example of Resistance. It should be noted though, that while the book is a loving tribute to Dada’s artistic talent and her place as San elder (she died in 2008) it was produced with the assistance of the Kuru Art Project, contracts were drawn up by Ditshwanelo and authored by two of the artist’s non-San friends. Although this collaboration is laudable, and Dada’s book would not have been published without such assistance at that time, Chapter Five argues for the necessity of San self-promotion, such that San issues are articulated by the San themselves.

The statues in Figure 14 are life size, showing the diminutive stature of the San. The photograph was taken with a view to capturing the lush surroundings which are anathema both to the vegetation of Botswana and the modern lifestyle of the San. The photograph was also deliberately taken from a standing position, simulating the
typical (physically larger) Western gaze as looking down upon the San, as both a literal and a figurative positioning. The figures appear incongruously in the grounds of a luxury safari lodge in Botswana, an Aestheticized image of two hunters in traditional garb involved actively in the pursuit of an animal.

The statues are an example of Idealization in the sense that it is exactly this image of the San that tourists come to Botswana to see (after the animals) and, as such, the artifice is a tourist text, suggesting to tourists staying at the lodge that the San are not only present but available and looking exactly as they appear in the statue. The image is contrary to the San’s modern realities, their general marginalisation and poverty at odds with the sumptuousness of lodges such as this one. The hunting depicted in the San’s pose is given the lie through the postcolonial Appropriation of their traditional lands for tourism and the associated big-game hunting (lodges are issued annual licenses for a quota of kills of specific species) which brought about their disenfranchisement. The physical fact of the statues is also interesting, a manifestation of the French impressionist concept of
the ‘museum without walls’. Sculpture’s heyday in the 1880s cast the ‘noble savage’ in bronze as a timeless memorial in the same manner as the heroic dead of past wars were immortalised and this statue, although modern, certainly epitomises the genre. The immutable and frozen sculpture, assert the curators of a 1987 exhibition, is ‘a container that holds its subject sealed off, separated from the world like a photograph in which everything must be enclosed in a square piece of paper’ (cited in Barrett, 1996: 139).

**Visual representations in tourism literature**

Among the most explicit examples of San representation available to tourists are those portable and handy, with glossy visuals and reader-friendly summaries offered as in-flight packages for tourists. Figure 15 is two decades old, yet the San selling ephemera to tourists is a typical scene at the Tsodilo Hills, described by Laurens van der Post as ‘the Louvre of the Desert’ (189) a description still prevalent in tourist literature of the area, most recently in the 2010 issue of Botswana Tourism Board’s *Discover Botswana* (64). The matter-of-
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fact statement: ‘the days of the traditional Bushmen are gone’ in the above caption is a Negation of culture in present day Botswana which denies the fact that the rhetoric and imagery designed for tourists suggests that traditional culture persists, and neglects to mention the forced relocations. As Oza Boo, a San from Tsodilo, claims:

Tourists come to the Hills because of the rock paintings and also to come and see the San people and buy their crafts. These people are really helpful and very important to us; they buy our crafts and we earn a living through craft making. It is not that all of them are good; some don’t even care about buying crafts and some, they ignore us (cited in Le Roux and White, 2004: 217).

In keeping with this tourism phenomenon, epitomised in photographs such as the above, Gemma McGrath (2004, in Timothy, 2007) comments on the local guides living near sites of interest, whose ‘information is derived from myth and legend passed down from the locality and from watching official guides at work’ (271). As such, the Indigenous guides especially provide ‘local colour’ and, as McGrath quotes van den Berghe (1980): ‘[i]n ethnic tourism, the native is not merely ‘there’ to provide services, he is an integral part of the exotic spectacle, an actor whose ‘quaint’ behaviour, dress and artifacts are themselves significant attractions’ (271). Groenewald (2008) suggests that the proliferation of rock art reproductions ‘reflects the idea that the social context of their production is so lost in the depths of time that they have become common cultural property. This belief denies the possibility that their art was produced with specific holistic intentions’ (33). She cites Dowson’s (1996) observation that nuances are often missed in many insensitive and unfaithful reproductions of San art, so that interpretations of shaman symbolism are simplistic.
The above image is predominantly an example of romantic *idealization*, where one family group of San is generalized, promoting the notion that all San still live and dress this way, their behaviour and relationships described as *inherently* (or naturally) one of harmony (*naturalization*), such a ‘sharing’ disposition also essentialised and idealised in 1980 film *The Gods Must Be Crazy* (analysed later in this chapter). Spurr’s categories inter-relating as they do, it is possible to simultaneously read *negation* (even possibly *debasement*) in the title of this composite text, giving, as it does, precedence to ‘Wild dogs’ rather than to ‘San’, the syntax also technically extending the adjective ‘wild’ to the San. *Affirmation* of the tourists’ culture is present in the assumption that Western largesse (in the form of lollies) will quell the children’s crying, restoring order and harmony. This implies that a Westerner’s intrusion into a San space can only improve their situation, if only temporarily. There is imperialist hubris evident in the tourists’ ‘irritation’ at the crying’s disruption to the performance put on for the tourists’ benefit. This assumption of cause-effect can be read as Westerners’ treasure (a ‘superior totem’ in the same vein as is the white scientist’s soporific
drug Davis (1996) identifies in The Gods Must be Crazy) having the capacity to restore San children’s satisfaction, followed by the San adults’ renewed capacity to create fire for tourist gratification, the ‘Voila!’ carrying an intrinsic ‘all’s right with the world’ tone.

The seamless juxtaposition of the San with safari animals in tourism representations such as Figure 16 is a blatant example of Spurr’s Debasement and Naturalization concepts. This is ironic, since the official reasons given for the relocation of the San from CKGR, published in a report of the Ministry of Commerce and Industry, assert that ‘[t]he Reserve could not carry both Basarwa and wildlife ... they were no longer nomadic traditional hunter-gatherers ... It was not economically and administratively feasible nor sustainable to provide services to scattered populations within the CKGR’ (Circular No.1, 1986). A form of Debasement may be interpreted with this alignment, as Groenewald (2008) suggests, ‘the religious underpinnings of the West do not conceive of an equality between humans and animals, rather man is the master of the animals’ (24), so to place the San alongside animals may imply the San are considered less than human by way of the left to right orientation implying the hyenas as the ‘Given’ with the San the ‘New’ (Kress and Van Leeuwin 2006: 179). The juxtaposition of the hyena, the desert and the San in Figure 16 suggests an uninterrupted relationship with the land, while relative sizing means the details of the hyenas’ faces can be seen and even the blades of grass are discernible, in sharp focus, as against the smaller framed soft-focus silhouette enhancing the code of the San as an imaginary rather than a reality (Insubstantialization).

‘Wild dogs and San’ is an example of composite or multimodal visual ‘whose meanings are realised through more than one
semiotic code’ (Kress and Van Leeuwin 2006: 177), in this case written text and image. The written text is dense, representing cultural capital, or a ‘high’ cultural form which, according to Kress and van Leeuwin, was a way in which ‘the ruling class … attempted to maintain its hegemony by taking control of popular culture [and] commercializing it’ (179). The top of a composite text represents the Ideal (or most salient) and the bottom the Real (presenting more practical information). Thus, in Figure 16 wherein the pictures occupy the top section of the text, the ‘ideologically foregrounded part of the message is communicated visually, and the [written] text serves to elaborate on it’ (ibid: 187). The conversational, almost intimate tone and anecdotal style of the written text serves to personalise the experience, suggesting an invitation to join in, as though the space was the private domain of the writer. Voyeurism is very much at the heart of this type of Idealization where tourists move into intimate spaces, adding, potentially, an obscenity to it. Briedenhann and Ramchander point to the South African ‘township tourism’ phenomenon which sees tourists looking into the heart of Soweto from their ‘airconditioned minibuses from luxurious accommodation’ or going on guided tours at designated stops, experiencing the social atmosphere of (safe) shebeens, not to mention the opportunity to marvel at the paradox of ubiquitous poverty into which two Nobel Peace prizewinners were born!’ (cited in Smith and Robinson 2006: 126). Along with voyeurism, the Western desire to connect with the primal, to tap into the collective unconscious, manifests also in interpretation of the mundane, such as in this image, a hunting party, as archetypal.

The tourists’ assessment of the fire as miraculous in Figure 16 also speaks to a classical longing for a return to a natural state, which the San, in their contrived settings, represent to ingenuous
Westerners. The San in silhouette can also be interpreted as a form of Negation as though they have no place in the material modern world. This is evident in a short video produced for tourists where filmmaker Steffi Presske showcases the luxury lodges and the attractions the company offers. For five seconds of this film, the San are depicted in silhouette at dusk walking across a desert landscape with bows and arrows (www.gondwanatoursandsafaris.com accessed 30/4/2013). Outline representations are similarly insubstantial as silhouette and are produced to create a similar illusion for the viewer.

An outline image of Bushman hunters in Figure 17 incorporated into constellations in the night sky is a mythical representation of the San, set in a tourist publication. This image acts as an example of Spurr’s Insubstantialization, an attempt to establish the San in the tourist imaginary as primordial. The depiction suggests the San and their lifestyle constitute a narrative, not only of the past but one that is intangible, ethereal and, most significantly, elusive; out of reach of mortal humanity, as are the stars. Such a narrative enhances the notion that the tourist is privileged to have any contact whatsoever with such an elemental culture, in a practice of Appropriation which Groenewald (2008) describes as the ‘exploitation, adoption and marketing of Bushmen imagery by the tourist industry’ (iii).
In a similar construction to the silhouette, this kind of representation does not afford the San any detail that would humanise them; they are not ‘fleshed out’ or substantial, rather outlines, in the manner of all shapes imagined into the constellations. Although there is ancient San cosmology upon which much of their high culture is based, Groenewald explains the reproduction of such imagery by the tourist industry as a clear case of Appropriation: ‘Bushman images reproduced for advertising purposes involve altering, re-interpretation, or the juxtaposition of images originating in sites that are geographically or historically apart’ (2008: 35). Artist and art historian Pippa Skotnes (1996) asserts that much of the ‘thin black line’ translation of pictorial form into diagram in San art distorts their content and has been applied to the illustration and recording of various other forms of African art by Westerners, more commonly in the anthropological literature and is peculiar to the
study of what was previously known as ‘primitive art’. Indeed, the depiction and recording of these arts has never been subject to the same standards of verisimilitude as has the study of Western art (Skotnes in Deacon and Dowson eds. 1996: 236).

The stars as agents of Aestheticization of the Kalahari and its inhabitants (animals and – according to tourist rhetoric – the San) constitute part of the attraction offered by The Kalahari Plains Camp, located inside the CKGR. The package incorporates a San walk which ‘Ms C.’ from Canada (15/8/2012) describes as a ‘fantastic experience ... The San bushman walk was fun and informative’. The use of the adjective ‘informative’ suggests, as with previously cited ‘blogs in Chapter Three, that this tourist believes the rhetoric unquestioningly. Ms C goes on to describe the safari’s luxuries, similar to that depicted in Figure 17 below, effusively writing: ‘[t]he camp itself was very comfortable ... good food and very nice staff who welcomed us with a song. The platform tents were roomy, well set up (ladies with coloured hair beware of the salt water shower!). There is a deck above the tent where you can sleep under the stars’ (www.wilderness-safaris.com, accessed 24/9/2013).
The type of tour offered in the advertisement above is for more ‘intrepid’ tourists, presumably, than those choosing to stay at a safari lodge. This kind of tour is increasingly popular in its appeal to those who wish to experience an ‘authentic’ taste of San culture, imagining themselves more grounded than those staying in luxury hotels or travelling as part of a package tour. Edward Bruner (2005) notes the phenomenon of backpackers wearing their intrepidity as a badge of honour; ‘adamant in distinguishing themselves from tourists’ (15). The placement of the three images in Figure 18 is significant. MacCannell (1999) identifies the ‘front’ and ‘back’ areas (the contrived sites/experiences and the genuine cultural realities respectively) making it difficult for tourists themselves to discern the difference between the idealised façade and the genuine article. Certainly there is an easy ‘flow-through’ for the eye, from the foreground of the top picture to the tent itself, as though the tourist is integrated into the picture, walking along the path, straight out of the desert. Again, Spurr’s concept of ingenuous idealization is at
play in Figure 18, with tourists unwittingly engaging in a deception, ignorant of the fact that recently a three billion dollar diamond mine has been given the go-ahead by the Botswana Government in the CKGR, concurrent with the San’s appeal against the Botswana government’s refusal to allow them access to water in the reserve. Survival International, in a press release (18/1/2011) quotes a San man who wished to remain anonymous:

This is final proof that the government’s argument that they don’t want us to live in the CKGR to protect the wildlife is a lie. Who do they think will damage the wildlife? The people who have lived there for thousands of years, or a $3billion mine with roads, power lines, thousands of tons of waste and hundreds of people going to and fro?

In terms of the subliminality of Figure 18, the top photograph of the triptych can be read as ‘a bias towards hierarchy’ with the tourist trappings of luxury suggested as dominant and (there being only one tent) suggestive of a ‘unique’ experience for a special couple or group, while the San are relegated to the less important bottom hemisphere. This vertical layout, which, suggests Kress and van Leeuwen (2006) ‘creates a more pronounced distinction’, is more oppositional than a horizontal elongation which deals with ‘given’ and ‘new’ information (57). In terms of the use of space the message is clear: the accommodation offered is of greater importance to tourists than the people to be encountered; one luxury tent which is more ‘eye-catching … is in sharper focus and receives the greater amount of light’ (ibid: 177) takes up the same amount of space on the page as two people.

The profile shots of the San people also suggests a power imbalance: rather than them gazing directly at the camera, they are to be gazed upon as representatives of a culture rather than
individuals. There is no ‘tourist gaze’ to prick the conscience, as there is no eye contact, the gaze is manipulated and at a remove. In this way, the viewer is not connected to the culture or the people and the main deception is that the viewer is time-travelling, in a non-threatening, remote, authentic setting. Here Urry’s (2002) concept of ‘tourist gaze’ is epitomised in the human desire to experience the exotic and the unknown, to interact with the ‘other’, ‘allowing one’s senses to engage with a sense of stimuli that contrasts with the everyday and the mundane’ (2). It is, though, a constructed gaze, one that comes to the experience with a predetermined ‘knowledge’ and an inherent assumption of power, the tourist being that which attributes value to the experience and to the culture under the gaze. Both the San people in Figure 18 are looking down in a manner that a Westerner would traditionally read as deferential or submissive, and which also suggests their photographs may have been taken without their permission. The San in this triptych are depicted as part of the ‘package’ for tourists, but the more ‘salient’ or ‘more worthy of attention’ element of the package is the accommodation (Kress and van Leeuwin: 201).

The imbalance of power implied by Figure 18 is reminiscent of Barthes’ treatise (1980) in its questioning of the very ownership of a photograph, asserting that the practice of photography makes ‘a cunning dissociation of consciousness from identity’ (12) transforming ‘subject into object, and even, one might say, into a museum object’ (13). He writes of the disturbance to civilisation that the ‘new action’ of photography causes, and that this disturbance was ‘ultimately one of ownership’ (12, 13). In this way, photography itself could be read as a metaphor for the San’s general disenfranchisement. Figure 18 suggests the San living in desert serenity, in their home, at one with nature, into which tourists can be
cordially introduced with the San’s blessing, and so far as the intended audience is concerned this is the truth. As Barthes cynically notes: ‘[t]he photograph possesses an evidential force ... its testimony bears not on the object but on time. From a phenomenological viewpoint, in the Photograph, the power of authentication exceeds the power of representation’ (89).

Susan Sontag (1977) writes of images used in the manner of Figure 18 (as with the smaller silhouette image in Figure 16) that the ‘reality’ presented (that which the above photographer hopes tourists will be duped by) is a surrealist delusion. Sontag notes the common fallacy that such images emanate from the depths of the unconscious, something that perhaps the photographer personally believes, but which certainly, in the tourism context, is the intention for the audience to believe, ‘whose contents they assumed as loyal Freudians to be timeless as well as universal [but that what] renders a photograph surreal is its irrefutable pathos as a message from time past, and the correctness of its intimations about social class’ (54).

As such, in its commodification masquerading as authenticity, the image in Figure 18 endorses the identified representations of the San (in Chapter Two) simultaneously as children, ‘less than’ and members of a doomed race.
Tourists in the thousands annually witness a San ‘trance dance’ as part of a package of ‘authentic’ San experiences, and classified in this chapter as a tourism text. In the context of the Botswana San, there is much controversy over the ceremonial dances the San perform for tourists. Mmila and Janie (2006) assert that such ‘trance dances’ are ritualistic, shamanistic and show the eternal relationship between the people and their ancestral powers: ‘[t]hese dances and songs are believed to contain supernatural powers that affect the minds and bodies of the participants … Theatre on the other hand is an artificial device. It is an imitation of life whereby actors enact fictional characters’ (12-13).

The imagery of the photograph above asserts Spurr’s trope of Insubstantialization in its use of the colour metonymic (reds connoting an element of danger and death) and barely defined silhouette. The ethereal sense is heightened by the elemental presence of fire, suggesting an intimate relationship with the earth,
a spiritual realm which the uninitiated tourist may respectfully enter for a set time and redolent of the original ancient furnace, as though emanating from the centre of the earth. The San dancers appear in this visual metaphor as sentinels, dignified, reverential to the fire in a ritual apparently unchanged since time immemorial, the night performance suggestive of a divided world of the earth’s origins, separating day from night, as in all creation myths. The focus on the feet suggests a rooted stability, the San like trees, growing out of the earth and at one with it.

Performance of the so-called ‘trance dance’ has become an enormously popular commodity, one that superficially appears to reverse the role of (economic) centre and periphery, with the dancers seemingly in charge of proceedings and the audience gathered on the fringe. However, in a typical case of Appropriation, proceeds from the performances are due to members of the centre (read: First World) and distributed among the San meagrely (Lekoa, 2007: 5) and so the relationships of power are perpetuated. The trance dance may be one of the few theatres wherein San are able to engage in some ironic and subversive production without its being evident to tourists and Mmila and Janie’s observation about drunkenness during the dance endorses such a theory. This naturally calls up the authenticity debate of MacCannell (1999) who argues that tourists habitually ‘sought backstage (or genuine or non-contrived) experiences’ (cited in Moscardo and Pearce: 304). However, the Mmila and Janie assert that ‘many people recognized the inauthenticity of the trance dance experience, but … still enjoyed it’ (305). Moscardo and Pearce paraphrase Crang (1996) as claiming that ‘there are magic moments of authenticity in living history presentations and dramatic presentations … something stirring about being drawn in … where the time and the spirit of the
contact is vividly felt ... tourists may feel that they have a rich understanding of the visited culture' (305). It appears that the authors allow for the possibility that such Aestheticization as this can be a force for the good, where tourists feel genuinely enriched by their experience of a culture, even if some are aware the product to be stylised and watered-down.

The notion that other societies operate on alternative planes of consciousness to that understood by the European again calls up Said’s concept of ‘standard commodities’ (190) – also cited within the application of other tropes – insofar as Goldie’s (1989) assertion that cultures without writing were often thought to be on a ‘different dimension of consciousness. This suggests [another] commodity, mysticism, in which the indigene becomes a sign of oracular power, either malevolent, in most nineteenth-century texts, or beneficent, in most contemporary ones’ (cited in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin, 1995: 236). An example of beneficent rendering of the trance dance, justified in terms of academic unlocking (Appropriation) of the mysteries of ancient spirituality, is to be found in a text for primary-aged children published by the National Museum and Art Gallery of Botswana (Denbow and Denbow n.d) wherein Idealization is evident, although the use of qualifications such as ‘people say’ and ‘healers believe they’ and ‘is thought to’ semantically implies the authors’ scepticism as to the veracity of San claims about the dance’s potency:

During trance dances, people say they feel as though they are flying out of their bodies. Like the figures in rock paintings, they describe their arms as being stretched out behind them like wings. When in trance, dancers often lose track of their surroundings and sometimes even walk over red-hot coals without feeling pain or being burnt! [Basa] healers believe they receive the power (n/um)
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to cure from God during trance. This power is thought to enter through the healer's back while he is dancing (56).

The response of Idealization in such contexts, suggest Holland and Huggan, ‘is characteristic of the modernist desire for ecological reconnection: one in which nature is presented in an edifying spectacle for consumption and as a repository for spiritual wisdom available at market price’ (2000: 180) ... nostalgic fervor and almost biblical intensity’ (ibid. 181). In The Lost World of Kalahari Laurens Van der Post writes in a manner that fits perfectly with Spurr's Insubstantialization trope, in terms of the ‘dying race’ romanticism where the Bushman is depicted as an imaginary rather than reality, with no presence in the modern world, let alone agency, and also as a representative of an esoteric spiritual plane, ‘sentinels’ overseeing the world of modern man. In travel frameworks, the psychological is foregrounded, the responses of tourists who relate their experience as a meta-narrative. In this way, Spurr’s trope of Insubstantialization is evident; ‘a semiotics without any reference to a real place’ (Barthes, in Holland and Huggan: 162) constituting a metaphorical abstraction in the traveller’s mind; rather than reality, sites of internal renewal or escape, stabilisation or otherwise. This is the perception of ‘existential authenticity’ signposted in Chapter One, where ‘[f]or many tourists the dance becomes their entire world at that particular moment. Time and tensions are suspended. The discrepancies of the real world are postponed’ (Daniel, 1996: 789). Groenewald (2008) cites a general lack of intensity in westerners’ dream-life that necessitates an engagement with ‘glimpses of a world that is more fully visited by religious specialists or shamans in deep trance’ (34). So, again demonstrating the multiple applicability of Spurr’s tropes, the San trance dance is shown to be a salient example of a slightly tangential form of Appropriation:
The phenomenon of modern ‘third world tourism’ as a form of Appropriation is highlighted with the recognition of ‘the market potential of [the longing for ‘authentic’ experiences with ‘natives’ ... as clearly as the tourism industry, which is systematically engaged in producing images of ... difference in order to promote different native worlds as desirable travel destinations’ (Britton 1979; Enloe, 1989, in Prasad, 2003: 161).

The fascination of the tourist for Indigenous connections to a spirit dimension largely inaccessible to the Western imaginary sometimes manifests negatively, as evident in response to the San ‘trance dance’, where there is a common perception of occult elements contained in the ritual, interpreted in such manifestations as hyper-ventilation and intense concentration. This has caused some tourists to leave early, frightened by what they deemed to be out of control, as though they were possessed. As such, responses to the dance can stand as an exemplar of Debasement from the perspective of loss of control. J. David Lewis-Williams (2002) suggests that this may be due to a Western privileging of intelligence which tends to suppress the inward directed state or the ‘entoptic phenomenon’ (from the Greek ‘within vision’) by regarding it as ‘irrational, marginal, abhorrent or even pathological’ (121). Sium and Ritskes (2013) assert that such performative storytelling is threatening to the Westerner because they ‘position the teller outside the realm of ‘objective’ commentary, and inside one of subjective action. Indigenous stories affirm that the subjectivity of Indigenous peoples is both politically and intellectually valid’ (IV).

Many a tourist has commented that the performers appear to lose command of their bodies and senses while dancing, some fall into the fire, make incoherent sounds or appear unconscious (Lekoa, 2007). Jean Clottes and J. David Lewis Williams (1998) remind us that one school of thought in anthropology concludes that stone-age shamans were mentally ill due to the pathologies of schizophrenia,
epilepsy and migraine accompanying the trance ritual. This is reminiscent of Lanny Thompson’s account of the imperialist view of a Malay trait of ‘running amok’, a ‘violent frenzy that implied the incapacity of the Malay for reason, judgement and self-control’ (2010: 127) and of a 1928 comment on Australian Aboriginal dance during a corroboree: ‘The weirdly painted natives issuing from the dense bracken of the bush to perform the dances, looked more like wraiths than human beings’ (cited in Gilbert, 1992: 135). Such constructions dovetail with Naturalization the notion of people ‘naturally’ or innately lacking a capacity to temper their behaviour or demonstrate self-government. Such ‘proof’ of an uncivilised disposition in itself and by extension becomes a justification for Appropriation, the imposition of imperial and/or commercial dominion.

A clear example of trance dance Appropriation is detailed in Gaone Thela’s article accompanying the image in Figure 19 which tells of the origins of the trance dance and the annual festival which now showcases it, instituted in 2000 in D’Kar. The article speaks to the popularity of the spectacle among tourists from around the world, and the intricacies of the specific dances: some for healing, some for worship, some for contact with the dead, some purely for entertainment. The KFO is at the helm, a spokesperson for the Trust claiming that the festival ‘aims at curbing the loss of culture and providing a platform for sharing, as well as encouraging the preservation of culture’ (36):

Repetitious but spellbinding, the dance can last for hours, so that a deep trough is eventually etched in the sand. As it reaches a crescendo, one or more dancers enter into a trance, whereupon, it is believed, their spirits leave their bodies, visit God in the sky and do battle with the
spirits of the dead. It is at this point that the dancers gain the power to heal others (36).

Lekoa’s documentary (2007) records a dance at D’Kar, Dque Qare game farm, Ghanzi where a tourist comments favourably:

A lot of tourists want sort of a genuine cultural experience maybe untouched. You know people have been in contact with people for a very long time so it’s difficult to get people who are culturally pure, but I think it’s very important that old ways don’t die out. For example, Europeans have lost touch with their culture and ancestors, practices, rituals and stuff so they have to come and watch how other people do it.

Mmila and Janie (2006) are more circumspect about the dance’s manipulation by operators, effectively naming up its status as the hyper-real: ‘[P]eople no longer adhere to the conventions of the healing space as some of the participants come drunk … The Xgoe has been appropriated by Setswana speakers … and the music and dance has now been commodified and commercialized’ (16).

Edward M. Bruner (2005) writes of this phenomenon as a ‘tourist borderzone’ which is partially a physical, spatial reality, the ‘point of conjuncture … between the tourists who come forth from their hotels and the local performers, the ‘natives, who leave their homes to engage the tourists in structured ways in predetermined localities for defined periods of time’ (17). But the borderzone is also a cultural imaginary, a fantasy, in itself not a real-life culture but a constructed theatrical one … each group knows its part in the touristic drama … the roles are not fixed or a priori … locals are not passive recipients of a touristic invader from the outside. Rather, both locals and tourists engage in a co-production: they each take account of the other in an ever-shifting, contested, evolving borderzone of engagement … But if peoples like the Maasai or the Balinese were to step out of their assigned roles in exotica, or if they were to portray their culture with
too much irony or political commentary, it would be bad for business (18).

However, while Bruner’s observations may well be astute as regards the fantastical, constructed nature of the performance, they cannot be applied universally since they are founded upon the premise of a group’s (relative) self-determination within their own country. The San, while supported to an extent by NGOs and other interest groups, are rarely in a position to be either political or ironic around tourists. Their performances are heavily scripted and managed by the dominant culture allied with Western operators. The extent to which the apparently ordinary is commodified (thus appropriated) is also investigated by Barker, Putra and Wiranatha (cited in Smith and Robinson: 215). They cite the example of Balinese dance as an ‘important element of the cultural tourism trade’ (216). The performance of such dances for tourists is controversial and different solutions are offered to maintain some of the dance’s sanctity in the Bali context. Some such solutions include shortened versions of the dance, using different masks, performing outside temples or making ritualistic offerings beforehand when performed for tourists. Others condemn tourist performances altogether (222).

The central point, I suggest, is the extent to which the dancers are stakeholders in the commodity and exercise choice in the transaction. Bruner (2001) asks, in the context of Kenya, to what extent the Maasai control their represented image whether or not they are ‘in it for the money … and willing to play into the stereotypic colonial image of themselves to please their clients, the foreign tourists’ (896). He concludes that while, unlike the San, the Maasai now have significant economic and political power ‘they do not exercise it to influence how they are presented in tourism’ (ibid.) The danger of this, suggests Bruner, is that the Maasai might ‘eventually become (rather than just appear as) the pop culture image of
themselves ... Where does Maasai culture begin and Hollywood image end?' (897).

In the case of the San in Botswana, the level of control and agency over representation is still negligible at present (Lekoa, 2007) but as the following chapter demonstrates, this is changing incrementally. Still, long-held tourist Idealization is not easily disabused. Noel B. Salazar (2009) notes within imagery of the Maasai produced for tourists, romanticised preconceptions being ‘reinforced by different types of popular visual media such as ... mainstream Hollywood entertainment’ (52). A similar phenomenon is evident with tourist perceptions of the San originating from representations in the The Gods Must be Crazy (1980).

The cinematic San
In this section Lekoa’s 2007 documentary Culture on Sale helps to establish the feature film The Gods Must Be Crazy 1 (1980) firmly within my definition of tourist text articulated in Chapter Two. The former attests to the way the latter has impacted upon the misconceptions of many tourists regarding the San and is shown to be a case in point of James Monaco’s observation (2000) of the mimetic effect whereby ‘the politics of film and the politics of ‘real life’ are so closely intertwined that it is generally impossible to determine which is the cause and which is the effect’ (262).

The Gods Must Be Crazy 1 has follow-up productions but these do not enjoy the ongoing popularity of the first, nor do they have the same impact affecting tourist perceptions of the San. There is a nod to academic tourism in the exoticised locale selected for a conference in The Gods Must Be Crazy 2, but the elements of San hunter-gatherer lifestyle in the Kalahari that many tourists still hold to
be true (as demonstrated further on in this thesis) are not featured significantly. As a result, I considered it relevant to analyse only the first film in the series. Lekoa’s 2007 documentary speaks to the well-meaning tourists who genuinely wish to engage with what they perceive San culture to be, a perception largely based on their viewing of this film, but who are so screened off from the San’s modern realities by the tourism industry, that essentially nothing changes, either for the San themselves or for the tourists’ understanding. Blake Lambert asserts that ‘Western movies contribute to that faulty perspective by depicting [Africa] as a monolithic land of difference’ (cited in McAllister, 2010: 87). Monaco (2000: 185) draws attention to a filmmaker’s composition of ‘open form’ shots where the audience is at all times subliminally aware of the area outside the camera’s frame, in this case the immensity of the Kalahari, thereby illustrating Blake’s assertion.

A synthesis of mise-en-scène and montage operating concurrently, manipulating space and time respectively, can be read as both realism and expressionism. Monaco (2000) sees the filmmaker’s motive for this as inherently psychopolitical in the aim, via realism, to ‘decrease the distance between viewer and subject … and [via expressionism] to change, move, or amuse the observer’ (263). The four simultaneous plot-lines within the film eventually converge, creating the basis for both these aesthetic devices.

The device of the omniscient narrator in The Gods Must be Crazy, giving information in the colonial discourse and in documentary style supports an impression of verisimilitude; the colonial code being accepted as interpretive and dominant. In keeping with Spurr’s concept of Affirmation, the decision to have the Coke bottle fall from the sky (the domain of the gods, evident via the Bushmen in the film
exercising the universal code of looking upwards to the deities) equates a common synecdoche of Western materialism with the assumption of the continuity and inevitability of supremacy. The Coke bottle is simultaneously a paradigmatic connotation (in that the brand has almost universal iconic status) and a syntagmatic connotation (in its contrast with the depicted world of the Bushmen that precedes and immediately follows this scene).

Monaco (2000) is interested in whether the voice of any film is ‘operating in good faith … [is it] an honest discourse?’ (411). The narrator’s tenor in The Gods Must be Crazy, with its aristocratic accent of imperial authority, is serene and knowledgeable with a slightly bemused quality, eliciting trust and suggesting benevolent paternalism. The discourse, in this regard, is honest if extrapolated to reflect the neo-colonial dynamic of Tswana hegemony in modern Botswana at the expense of ethnic minorities. The text, however, is demonstrably dishonest by way of omission and connotation, as well as being more overtly disingenuous in places. But perhaps this is an unavoidable aspect of the medium. Monaco cites Godard’s (1968) extension of the concept of realism to encompass the filmmaker’s ‘dialectical, or conversational, relationship with the audience’ (411) and notes that the language of film has ‘become so debased by being used manipulatively … it cannot reproduce reality honestly and truthfully’ (415).

The film’s voice-over, after flying close to Spurr’s trope of Negation when it narrates: ‘[the Kalahari is] devoid of people, except for [pause/sweet music] the little people of the Kalahari’, subsequently demonstrates the Idealization trope with apparently no concession to irony: ‘[t]hey must be the most contented people in the world. They have no crime, no punishment, no violence, no laws, no police,'
judges, rulers or bosses ... In this world of theirs, nothing is bad or evil ... for the most part they live in complete isolation, quite unaware that there are other people in the world'. While such Idealization might be considered acceptable given the vintage of the film, the same sentiments are evident in a recent brochure for Bona Safaris (cited in Sylvain 2005: 364): ‘[t]his race of people is ancient – as shown in their ability to store fat reserves in their buttocks, to be used when food is scarce. Bushmen live on game and wild fruit. They are still mainly hunters and gatherers ... unable to comprehend what happens beyond their world'. The filmmaker’s selection of nursery-style music and ‘cartoonesque’ sound effect enhances the notion of San childish innocence and wonder. Salazar (2009) sees this in operation within the documentary Africa: the Serengeti (1994) wherein the Maasai are relegated to a ‘time-frozen past’ stereotype (56).

Nicks (1999) notes that stereotyping epitomised in cultural representations for tourists, even when depictions are apparently positive, undermine any progress towards autonomy: ‘[a]s long as people in mainstream society think of [Indigenous] cultures as something that existed only in the past and of ... people as having no role in mainstream history and society, they will not be inclined to take seriously the aspirations of First Nations’ (cited in Phillips and Steiner 1999: 313-314). The Gods Must Be Crazy appears to indulge in some amusing personifications of white-man arrogance via the character Jack Hinds, owner of a safari lodge, a character the audience is positioned to dislike. His ignorance and assumption of the right to Appropriate (San protagonist) Xi’s desert skills for the benefit of exactly those whose blood-lust for big game has partly caused San eviction from the Central Kalahari is certainly afforded no narrative sympathy but clearly reflects the mindset of the tourist
industry, perpetuating the entrenchment of perceptions, and thus, socio-political positions:

Jack Hinds: I hear you’ve got a Bushman working for you. Are they good trackers?

M’pudi: Best in the world.

Jack Hinds: Mind if I borrow him? One of my guests wounded a cougar. My trackers can’t find it.

Hinds’ use of the pronoun ‘him’ referring to Xi, rather than ‘his skills’ (quite apart from the obvious Negation of denying Xi a name) speaks to the Appropriation weltanschuuang of the dominant culture by assuming Xi is the property of Afrikaaner ecology researcher, Andrew Steyn and also that Xi has no option but to comply with Hinds’ request. This film representation of the relational dynamic is reminiscent of the adoption of two San children by Mma Ramotswe in The No. 1 Ladies’ Detective Agency series (McCall Smith, 1998 –) where the children are loved but must comply with the agenda of the dominant culture.

Peter Davis (1996) critiques The Gods Must Be Crazy as a travelogue, descended from the nineteenth century exploration literature tradition, from which ‘in the comfort of cinema seats we are shown exotic landscapes, strange peoples and dangerous animals’ (82). Superficial interpretations of this film appear to be celebrating the Indigenous, traditional knowledge of the ‘Bushmen’ in the spirit of Spurr’s trope of Idealization, as the narrative introduces: ‘Where any other person would die of thirst in a few days, they live quite contentedly in this desert ... they know where to dig for roots and bugs and tubers and which berries and pods are good to eat. And of course they know what to do about water’. More enlightened
deconstruction, however, peels away the rhetoric to expose the underlying assumptions.

Set in Botswana, this film’s plot is allegorical, an inverted metaphor for the power imbalance of the white South African army which violently subverted its black countrymen during the Soweto Massacre:

Who are these ‘gods’ who are crazy? They are the technologically advanced whites whose very garbage is a source of wonder to the Third World ... This might have been a desirable state of affairs for white South Africans, but it was far from the reality of the masses demanding their rightful share of the South African pie (Davis 1996: 87).

Nevertheless, the film is commonly interpreted as literal within tourist circles and complies with my definition of tourism text articulated in Chapter Two of this thesis in its status as mandatory viewing prior to visiting Botswana and the demonstrated credulity of tourists with regard to its drawing of the San.

In The Gods Must Be Crazy, M’pudi speaks a San language. The narrative voice tacitly assumes there is only one San language whereas in fact in the Kalahari region ‘as many as ten are mutually unintelligible [but] lumped undifferentially by Setswana under a single term, Sesarwa – the language of Bushmen’ (Wilsen, 2002: 830). Afrikaans ecologist Steyn asks M’pudi: ‘You speak Bushman?’ and miraculously, M’pudi speaks precisely Xi’s dialect. M’pudi genuinely loves the San and credits them for saving his life in the desert years before. But his affectionate tone is one of Aestheticization, referring to Xi as the ‘little Bushman’; and Xi’s people generally as the ‘sweetest little buggers’. Infantilisation is also manifest in the fact that the film
presumes to ‘translate’ the San people’s thoughts in the manner of parents believing they can accurately decode their babies’ or toddlers’ thoughts pre-speech, as well as San interpretations of strange phenomena, both natural: ‘sometimes they hear a thundering sound when there are no clouds in the sky and they assume the gods have eaten too much again and their tummies are rumbling up there’ – and man-made: ‘Xi saw a most amazing animal approaching. Its legs went round and round instead of up and down ... There was another god. He had a fire inside him and the smoke came out through his mouth and nostrils’. Such interpretations draw the San as innocents, justifying their exclusion from the political domain. Salazar (2009) notes the intervention of Survival International, among other lobby groups, condemning such ‘ridiculing of minority cultures’ by the movie industry, citing several offerings featuring the Maasai, which, like The Gods Must be Crazy, ‘play on the line of exoticism and innocence’ (55).

The ‘humour’ of this film is insulting, in that the realities it so easily dismisses through slapstick are deeply tragic. The film shows several examples of the interface with white man’s world causing the Bushmen harm, but each is downplayed through the use of vaudeville, specifically undercranking, creating the illusion of high speed and including the ubiquitous Coke bottle twice falling from the sky, hitting a child on the head, its appropriation as a weapon in family spats, as well as Xi accidentally driving the land-rover at high speed in reverse and being chased by a lion when forced to track a cougar for a safari group, all these people scurrying across the landscape ... colliding with comic pratfalls, constitute a distorted microcosm of the clash of peoples, customs and ideologies ... the never-never land that the architects of
apartheid would have us believe in, where their intentions are for the good of everyone (Davis, 1996: 85).

The ‘comic’ reversal of the tall Tswana man running with his hands up away from Xi when Xi momentarily picks up ‘a strange stick’ (a rifle) is ironic when analysed in the light of the San’s relocation and position in modern Botswana, but was clearly not meant to be read as such. The San has been established for the viewer as posing no social or political threat, so the scene is merely a comedic device. The use of slapstick as comedy is very effective in these scenes as the audience laughs with Schadenfreude at the protagonist, not with him, just as one would at a clown in the circus, a dehumanised butt of the joke. The comedy in this particular scene is derived superficially from the incongruity of Xi’s diminutive size in relation to the long rifle and, more profoundly, from his subordinate position in the dynamic between characters. Xi’s pervasive demeanour of bewilderment and wonderment in his encounters with the ‘civilised’ world is evident through facial expression and body language. Kinesics here are culturally derived codes which operate a complementary narrative to the action and dialogue, an ‘indexical, metonymic system of meaning’ (Monaco 2000: 175).

Paul Weinberg (1997) is scathing about a more recent addition to the genre of film depicting the San:

The latest of these offerings is being shot in a private nature reserve ... made by an international company ... [and is] about an alien dropping out of space and landing in a traditional Bushman settlement ... the script is in English ... Filming goes on for two days, with various Bushmen drawn in to play their roles. After two days of no pay and no food ... the group’s leader calls a strike (20-21).
Weinberg goes on to mention the many Aestheticized moving images of the Bushmen appropriated for Western consumption inspired by the success of The Gods Must be Crazy. Other feature films and numerous advertisements made in recent years have, Weinberg claims, ‘drawn on traditional San culture as an exotic backdrop to their story lines. In the world of celluloid, Bushmen are always dressed in skins, carrying bows and arrows and dancing around fires’ (15). I note one Australian television advertisement features a San clan as the imaginary aesthetic promoting ‘Explorer’ socks with the tagline: ‘[g]et ready to go anywhere’. In the B&T newsletter (www.bandt.com.au, accessed 20 August, 2010) heralding the advertisement’s launch, ‘real Kalahari tribesmen’ are drawn as ‘comrades’ to the intrepid tourist, who wears only a loincloth and his socks. The San also wear loincloths and are accompanied in a hunt and around the campfire by the stranger. The title of the newsletter’s taster asserts that the socks ‘transport consumers to another world’. By being represented disingenuously, the San are effectively commodified (Appropriation) and Aestheticized in a manner integral to the adventure package, while the San’s victimhood is suggested through their compliance since the construction of their image is a fabrication. Spurr’s concept of Insubstantialization is operating in the experience’s inscribing as other-worldly; a kind of dreamscape or parallel reality. Language is not an issue, the obligatory ‘sense of adventure’ is universal and the tourist nods along while the San are ‘speaking their native tongue’, here again drawing the San as children in this scene’s evocation of a parent feigning understanding of their child’s speech.

The innocence (ignorance?) of tourists in the 21st century is based on such depictions, fostering an Idealization that whitewashes the realities of dispossession and the struggles for recognition in a
modern society. The following (not all sequential) excerpts are taken from Lekoa’s 2007 documentary:

Tourist: They hardly suffer from funny diseases like heart attack ... because of the type of food they eat.

Tourist: There is actually so much that we can learn from these people, you know. You realise that these people can stay for some time without food because they have their own traditions. And there is apparently great wealth of knowledge of all the different substances and their properties, poisonous, non-poisonous ... but there should be a balance between development and preserving culture.

Classification occurs at the point in the narrative where the voice-over describes protagonist Xi conversing easily with the monkey who steals the Coke bottle. Where there is no successful dialogue between Xi and other human characters in the film (apart from M’pudi, whose translation of San language is Western and literalist – as he says to Steyn: ‘I understand the words, but what they mean?’ – providing limited understanding of Xi’s predicament) there is apparently no such misunderstanding between Xi and the monkey, to whom Xi vigorously argues a case for the evil status of the Coke bottle until the monkey relents and throws it down, reminiscent of an early colonial (1627) description of the San’s click language as ‘rather apishly than articulately sounded’ (cited in Chidester 1996). Discourse Classification, then, places Xi on an evolutionary scale closer to the animals than to other humans, as does the observation of Robert Gordon (1992) that ‘[w]hite South Africans believed that land was available for the asking in an area they dubbed ‘Bushman land and baboon country’ ‘(cited in Gall, 2001:57) and, as with the characteristic meshing of Spurr’s categories, such Classification dovetails with Negation and Debasement.
Lekoa’s documentary (2007) contains interviews with tourists, tourist operators and one San guide employed by a tourist lodge near Kaudwane, Botswana. The camera also follows the guide as he demonstrates traditional bush survival skills for the tourists. Two Canadian tourists comment (below) on their first exposure to the San people via the film The Gods Must be Crazy, noting with some shame their earlier cultural Aestheticization through rhetoric they now reinscribe as manifest Debasement and Negation:

Researcher: When you first saw [The Gods Must be Crazy] on TV and now you are seeing the reality here, can you say they are similar?

Tourist 1: No, not at all, that’s why I think one should pay attention to tourism and things like that. When I first saw it on TV I was just laughing as anyone, innocently. But now with the impression that I have now, if I see that movie again I will be very critical ... I will criticize it a lot because now with the background that I have, I think that movie was not something promoting San culture. It was not something that the San people could be proud of, it was taking them for idiots basically and saying that they are not connected with the modern world and that I think is something completely wrong.

Tourist 2: I only saw the movie when I was very young, at that time I lived in a small village in Canada, so I hadn’t even seen African people ever in my life so it was sort of wow! there are other places that exist ... now that I’m older and can look at it more critically I agree ... that it portrays the San people as childlike which they aren’t. They are grown people and they have their understandings.

Manfred Rolfes, (2009) calls up [MacCannell’s] ‘staged authenticity’, the construction of ‘reality’ and authenticity’ for tourists by the operators, so to foreground culture and ethnicity as the observational schema, while ‘poverty is pushed into the background’ (20). In this way, the ‘poverty is semantically charged
as a cultural tour’ (19). Rolfes gives the example of township tours in South Africa where the context inextricably links history, traditions and ethnicity [read: black population] with poverty, so to further relativise socio-economic differences as essentially cultural. Weinberg (1997), having interviewed Kgau’/’hana, the star of The Gods Must be Crazy movies recounts his shock on first meeting the film’s central character whose lifestyle and appearance was ‘not quite the image I was expecting from a film star who has made his producers millions of rands … he says he was paid just R5000 for the second [claiming] ‘the film makers ripped me off’ (15).

This appears to be based on the convenient Negation underlying most forms of Appropriation, that is also explicitly expressed by the film’s narrator: ‘[t]he one characteristic that really makes the Bushmen different from all other races on earth is the fact that they have no sense of ownership at all. Where they live, there’s really nothing you can own, only trees and grass and animals’. M’pudi, Andrew Stein’s assistant and the film’s unofficial San advocate, apparently also accepts the myth of the San needing nothing, evident at the point where, once all the drama is over and Xi’s period of ‘parole’ is completed, Andrew Steyn hands Xi money as payment for his work:

M’pudi: He can’t use that stuff
Steyn: I have to
M’pudi: Bushmen don’t know about money
Steyn: Well, what else can I give him?
M’pudi: There’s nothing here he can use. Bushmen don’t need things.
Steyn: He’s got to take the money. It’s the law …
M’pudi: I’m going to miss the little bugger.

As Xi walks off, the money floats away on the breeze, upholding Hitchcock and Brandenburgh’s observation that [o]ften the tourists give them little in the way of recompense. As one tourist put it, ‘What
good is it to give Bushmen money? They don’t understand its value. Besides, there is no place to spend it out here anyway’ (1990: n.p). This is endorsed by Davis (1996): ‘In his simple wisdom, the Bushman rejects what white society has to offer, symbolised by the discarded Coca-Cola bottle … the Bushmen do not covet the white standard of living and so can never be rivals for it’ (87). Davis’s ironic reference to the Bushman’s ‘simple wisdom’, to the notion that they ‘do not covet’ is consciously deployed as ironic critique of the film’s infantilising narrative tone, along with a satirical comment on the assumption that those considered ‘lesser’ do not, in any case, aspire to an affluent lifestyle or position of power. Essentialising is a manifestation of this, along with condescension from public institutions.

The law to which Steyn refers in the previous interchange is, of course, ‘Tswana law, founded on and faithful to the British system of jurisprudence, a case of cultural Affirmation showing again the manner in which Spurr’s tropes (and their manifestations in reality) can inter-relate. The court scene where Xi, not understanding the concept of ownership, is accused of killing a goat from a herd, found guilty and subsequently incarcerated, serves as a metaphor for the futility of the San case over their eviction from the CKGR. M’pudi’s thwarted role as interpreter and tacit advocate for Xi in court can be metaphorised as the interventions of Survival International and other bodies on the San’s behalf. Xi’s refusal of food while in a cell can be read as a passive and ultimately ineffectual attempt at Resistance, a situation which can only be rectified by Steyn and M’pudi releasing him for their own purposes, lest, as M’pudi predicts: ‘he’s gonna die, for sure’.

Relative sizing in the film serves to symbolically Negate the San, in general terms with Xi’s people’s diminutive stature against the
immensity of the Kalahari. At the point in the film where Steyn and M’pudi in a well-meaning form of Appropriation, have Xi released from jail, the injured Bushman is lifted onto the vehicle’s bonnet effortlessly, giving a sense of his weightlessness, which, alongside his incapacitation (at the hands of a Tswana landowner) is a further metaphor for his people’s disenfranchisement.

Wearing (2001) asserts that the positioning of tourism within a capitalist framework and its associated relations of power usually means that local communities do not have control over their representation, their culture having been commodified by promoters external to the community. Marketers are careful to present only aspects of culture that would appeal to tourists and to whitewash that which is too difficult for tourists to process into their pre-existing concept of the reality. Australian Aboriginal spokesperson Geoff Clark (1993) explains this sugar-coating phenomenon in an Australian context: ‘we’re walking a fine line between exposing the real history of this country and trying to please the taste buds, I suppose, or the curiosities of tourists’ (cited in Simpson: 127).

In keeping with Spurr’s trope of Idealization, the stark contrast between the image and reality in this film is highlighted by Le Roux and White (2004) where, the authors posit, the film-maker feeds into the myth that a group with no internal conflict, living in complete harmony with nature actually exists: ‘[t]he popularity of … The Gods Must Be Crazy has fuelled and once more exposed this fascination, and also serves to illustrate the problems with the romanticised myth. The implication of this film is that the slightest contact with modernity … wreaks havoc upon the fragile society of the San’ (72). Le Roux and White assert that the San have long been thought to be
incapable of change, bringing about an agenda of protectionist segregation from other groups, and justifying their representational exploitation: ‘[a]lthough The Gods Must Be Crazy was one of the biggest box office successes of the past century, none of its revenues came back to the San, apart from the remuneration for the main actor, who died destitute in 2003’ (ibid).

In the film, Steyn’s research assistant M’pudi has great respect for the ancient skills of Xi’s people, evident at the point in the film where he pronounces Xi ecologically better informed than Steyn, yet the film promotes the misconception that the San still live the way they did for millennia and are not part of the modern era. The ignorance of tourists in the 21st century is based on such depictions, fostering an Idealization that whitewashes the realities of dispossession and the struggles for recognition in a modern society. San intelligence is also endorsed in The Gods Must be Crazy where the prison officer agrees to release Xi into the custody of ecologist Steyn and his assistant M’pudi, but the officer, in an example of Negation, doubts Xi can be of any use, since he has no experience or qualifications, an assessment that is roundly rejected:

M’pudi: He got qualifications! [to Steyn] He could teach you things about plants and animals.

Steyn: Yes! We want to employ him as an ecological expert!

The above can also be read as a case of Appropriation, since Steyn intends to appropriate Xi’s expertise to his own research purposes. Lekoa’s documentary shows tourists on the ‘San walk’ who are not averse to articulating their ignorance. One tourist says, when (San guide) Size creates fire using two sticks, ‘[t]here are many cultures that start fires with sticks. I have never seen it before. I thought it was
a kind of legend’. Spurr’s trope of Idealization comes into play, where a group is no threat, so the dominant culture can afford to use glowing rhetoric about the strengths of the Other, since it is now only of historical interest – apart from situations where it is carefully contained and contrived for tourists, as the ingenuously Idealized comments of the tourists in Lekoa’s documentary attest: ‘[y]es [but] it should be alive also. It’s not good enough to have it in the history books. It survived for 20 000 years so it would be a shame to have it not survive the modern world’ (Thomas, 2015).

As Davis (1996) observes with regard to the film The Gods Must Be Crazy (fitting with Spurr’s trope of Naturalization in the ‘natural’ superiority it assumes) it was the scientist’s idea to tranquilize the guerillas, and the scientist’s drug (a ‘superior totem’) used on the sleeping kidnappers, administered by Xi who, ‘a child in size, can mingle easily with the captured black children ... [who did not use his own soporific drug because] that would have made it Bushman magic and not White Man’s magic’ (87). Certainly there is the condescending infantilisation subcategory I identify within Spurr’s Aestheticization trope, evident in the hostage scene of the film where Andrew Steyn, M’pudi and Xi, looking down from a hilltop see, through the telescope, schoolchildren and their (white South African) teacher herded by kidnappers. Xi has a look through the telescope and M’pudi comments to Andrew Steyn: ‘He wants to know how all those people got in there’. Then, when the plan to tranquilise the kidnappers is concocted, Xi is disguised as a child and shown how to administer the soporific, whereupon Steyn instructs M’pudi: ‘[t]ell him he must dip the needle each time’, simultaneously exhibiting ignorance of the fact that ancient San hunting techniques used precisely this technique to tranquilise animals, alongside an assumption of white scientific superiority. Xi
demonstrates remarkable innovation and stealth in the implementation of his mission and M’pudi comments, ‘Yeah, he’s clever’.

The trope of Naturalization also comes into play where a group is thought to be naturally beyond the realities of the ‘centre’ culture. Reference has been made to tourists’ perceptions that ‘[San] hardly suffer from funny diseases ... because of the type of food they eat’. In contrast, the reality is expressed by John Hardbattle, founder of the First People of the Kalahari (FPK) organisation, who, as Kiema (2010) acknowledges

felt that our traditional practice of sharing had been eroded, that our cultural links and networks had been affected, that alcohol abuse among us had become entrenched to the point it was almost considered as ‘culture’, often accompanied by theft, something previously unknown to us. He told us that we had become a landless underclass, prone to disease (91).

An example of apparently gratuitous Eroticization is to be noted during the commentary early in the film The Gods Must be Crazy (1980) where the camera, in sharp focus close-up, dwells for several seconds on a single file of San bottoms. In my long experience of sharing this film with school classes, this particular scene, as with the slapstick scenes previously cited, elicits great hilarity among students and has, in consequence, given me pause. The notion of Eroticization in travel discourse is often infused with machismo, argues Noy (2007, in Pritchard et al) with the same overtones of conquest. The semiotics deployed are typically aligned to war, competitive sports and patriarchy. Noy cites the backpacker narrative of travelling from one town to another (as though they are targets), as a ‘militaristic fusion ... possible because different spaces and discourses share the function of masculinizing men, evincing
the abilities and skills of able and privileged male bodies to act competently: to cover distances and to overcome obstacles' (52). The voice-over commentary in The Gods Must be Crazy is certainly infused with the undertones of conquest, the ‘virgin’, untouched landscape and innocent people penetrated by the more powerful, even destructive, colonialists, the tone allowing for the poignancy of this, while concurrently stressing the inevitability of the subjugation, analogous to the bittersweet emotions of a father ‘giving away’ his daughter as a bride.

Such constructions, assert Pritchard and Morgan (2007) are ‘clearly imaginings of Eden which can themselves be found in a range of biblical, Islamic and ancient mythologies, Renaissance explorations and 18th century fantasies of neoclassical Arcadia’ (cited in Pritchard et al: 164). The authors attribute the Pacific’s mythic status, ubiquitously replicated today for travellers, principally to Gauguin and Stevenson, both of whom create a libidinous, indolent and childlike people for the Western imaginary.

Even when there is Resistance, it is effectively tacit, in light of the San’s economic imperative for survival. Renee Sylvain (2005) notes the globalisation agenda at work in the Eroticization domain, where San women on the border of Botswana were offered money to perform. She cites one woman as saying: ‘the work was not good for me. If you dance there you are not wearing any clothes. We are wearing the !gu, like we were wearing in the old time. But we didn’t get any money [and no food]’. (363) The fact that the woman mentioned her forced near-nakedness at all attests to the contrivance of the performance for tourist consumption and the Eroticization evidently demanded within the commodity with no respect for the women’s discomfort.
The utopian scenes of the San lifestyle in the Kalahari to which Xi returns in a triumphant denouement, having discarded the ‘evil’ bottle, constitute a feel-good fabrication which the research cited in this thesis exposes as being prevalent and which tourist blogs and Lekoa’s 2007 documentary, among other sources, reveal as being widely accepted a priori. In the above representations, then, Negation is clearly at play in the easy dismissal of San rights by way of madcap comedy, infantilisation, as well as a systemic assimilationist policy denying, even under the guise of altruism, any future of traditional knowledge and cultural uniqueness outside a representational framework. The geographic proximity of the world suggested to be hitherto outside the San’s experience is shown in this film to be fast encroaching, so there is a sense that Xi’s desert nirvana approaches its imminent demise, the assumption of inevitability simultaneously justifying government policies and enhancing ‘doomed race’ Aestheticization /Idealization of the San in the tourist imaginary.

This chapter is replete with exemplars of San representations in visual imagery, both still and moving. These images are found in glossy publications, some produced by airlines, some by safari companies and art/craft outlets, for tourist information in-country. Some representation is art and craft produced by the San themselves, predominantly complying with tourist-driven parameters (read: imagery based on ancient rock art) of NGOs which provide art workshops and materials, thus, effectively owning the art. In moving imagery, an academic research documentary speaks to the naivete of many tourists even today who still presuppose the hunter-gatherer tribal existence depicted in an internationally popular comedic film, decades after its release.
In Chapters Three and Four, a range of literary and visual tourism texts representing the Botswana San have been analysed against the first eleven tropes of colonialist rhetoric identified by Spurr (1993). The following chapter shows textual evidence of the San’s progress towards autonomy via self-representation, predominantly critiqued within the framework of Spurr’s final trope: Resistance.
Chapter Five
‘Nothing about us without us’*: San resistance through self-representation.

If I am not for myself, who will be for me? 
And if I am only for myself, what am I? 
And if not now, when?
(Rabbi Hillel the Elder, 1st century BCE).

My coverage of literary and visual representations of the San in the previous chapters have revealed an historical legacy manifest in socio-political marginalisation today, perpetuated and exacerbated by the representation of the San by others, particularly the tourism industry. This chapter highlights moves towards self-determination which are gathering momentum among the Botswana San. This goal is being achieved through self-representations in the arts, an increasing number of San owned and operated tourist enterprises, underscored by a diminishing dependence on external agency. As Chebanne and Monaka (2005) assert, the maintenance of live and dynamic San cultures is achieved more effectively by communities themselves, on their own terms and through their own means. This can only occur when identity, belief and arts are recognised systemically. These developments are gradually having an impact upon the tourist industry, through the dissemination of San generated information and projects, leading to a more enlightened outsider understanding of the San’s potential in modern Botswana. The rhetoric of the tourist industry in Botswana with relation to the San is being challenged in small but effective ways by members of San communities.

*“Nothing About Us Without Us!” (Latin: “Nihil de nobis, sine nobis”) is a saying originating from democratic movements in central Europe and which has been appropriated as motto by several organisations representing marginalised groups, including Khwedom Council in Botswana. It conveys the notion that no policy should be established without the participation and endorsement of members of the group(s) affected by that policy.
An acknowledgement and celebration of Resistance to the dominant paradigm in Botswana by way of self-representation lies at the heart of this chapter. At this point, then, it is necessary to consult the last of Spurr’s twelve tropes as the basis for a discrete chapter; structurally separated in this thesis from the other eleven tropes (and their manifestations in San representation). Spurr cites Heidegger’s (1980) recognition that discourse, despite having enormous negative potential in colonial contexts, can also serve to undermine and expose power which consequently ‘renders it fragile and makes it possible to thwart it’ (in Spurr, 1998: 184). In defining Resistance, Spurr calls upon Foucault’s concept of openness to new forms of representation, resisting the ‘ideological closure’ of the colonial (and in Botswana’s case, neo-colonial) framework. Spurr also cites Kristeva’s ‘decentering of discourse’, and this idea is articulated in Spurr’s catalogue by way of Derrida’s (1976) notion of Resistance as an “opening” into the indeterminate space where new meaning has yet to be decided and from which established meaning already belongs to “a past epoch”. (195). Stephen Slemon (1990) observes that both universally and historically ‘the most important forms of resistance to any forms of social power will be produced from communities that are most immediately and visibly subordinated by that power structure’ (37). This phenomenon is shown to be tangibly evident in the Botswana San case.

An investigation of representations of dispossessed peoples by the tourist industry indicating the level of exploitative and patronising imagery can be shown to be overturned to become self-representation for socio-political as well as commercial purposes. The marked differences in tourist representations between those produced of the Kalahari San and those produced by the San themselves provide potential for positive change in the San’s level
of autonomy in Botswana. While I acknowledge that the San are but one of many disempowered ethnic groups in Africa, their geographical isolation, susceptibility to prejudice and their enormous value to the tourist industry (ostensibly) in situ and (allegedly) as they are make them vulnerable to marginalisation and its effects. So unless tourists and others can ‘penetrate the ... transcripts of both subordinates and elites, a reading of the social evidence will almost always represent a confirmation of the status quo in hegemonic terms’ (Scott, 1990: 90).

**Resistance theory**

Resistance, for the purpose of this thesis, is defined more particularly than the term’s deployment within traditional postcolonial parameters. It is narrowed to a site of de-colonisation, where the departure of the old colonial regime has effectively reinstated the pre-colonial centre, under the dominance of which an ethnic minority (periphery) struggles for recognition. Unlike conventional anti-colonial Resistance, the San’s moves towards self-determination in Botswana are not founded on a desire to displace or overthrow the established order, rather to have representation in the body-politic and official acknowledgement of ethnic uniqueness, on the basis of which rightful, proportional access to land and resources would be unquestioned. This extends the notion of decolonisation’s process into a postcolonial setting; its ‘ongoing dialectic between hegemonic centrist systems and peripheral subversion of them’ (Tiffin, 1987: 23). Also, in light of the San’s historical marginalisation in the region, and the Tswana’s restored Affirmation of its own dominance, the San’s Resistance in modern times is limited to subtle and imaginative forms due to the dominant elite’s hostility towards more assertive subversions or challenges. This limitation necessitates that which Susan Thomson (writing of the
Rwandan context, similar to that of Botswana in its insistence on national unity and ethnic homogeneity) calls ‘whispering truth to power’ (2011, my italics) through a variety of imaginative media. There is fear of retribution blocking dissidence, despite the country’s democratic rhetoric and its international reputation as ‘the African miracle’ (Samatar, 1999). Scott (1990) explains the distinction between (respectively) covert and overt forms of Resistance thus:

Any public refusal, in the teeth of power, to produce the words, gestures, and other signs of normative compliance is typically construed – and typically intended – as an act of defiance. Here the crucial distinction is between a practical failure to comply and a declared refusal to comply. The former does not necessarily breach the normative order of domination; the latter almost always does (203).

Building on Scott’s work, Vinthagen and Johansson (2013) understand everyday forms of Resistance as ‘a matter of scattered and regular resistance with a potential to undermine power without being understood as resistance (or without the actors being detected)’ (37).

So, at this point I provide an overview of some theoretical approaches to covert Resistance that I deem applicable to the Botswana San situation; Resistances that are so masterfully veiled they are barely recognisable as political. These include artisitic forms, representation and research as Resistance. I then contextualise this broad definition to tourism before moving on to specific strategies for generating self-determination adopted by some San. But first, by way of disclaimer at this point, in critiquing Africanist and Indianist discourses (terms sometimes deployed synonymously for ‘Orientalism’) as exemplars of Western imperialism and colonialism, it is incumbent upon me to re-state my position.
I acknowledge that, like Edward Said, I speak for the subaltern in my ‘capacity as a shareholder in a fund of culture/power whose global bankability — whose effectivity, that is — comes from its Western ... authorization’ (Korang, n.d: 32). Unlike Said, though, I do not believe that the subaltern (the San in this case) ‘cannot represent themselves; they must be represented’, which is the Marxian foundation of his treatise in Orientalism (1978: xiii), whereby he produces the subaltern as ‘wordless and powerless, reduced to communicative, sociohistorical and existential impotence by the overwhelming potency of a seemingly seamless Orientalist discourse and power’ (Korang n.d: 32). Kwaku Larbi Korang does concede, though, that self-representations are ‘always somewhat one-sided and therefore always somewhat hazardous’ given that we are all, as humans, hybrid beings, and as individuals, subject to myriad influences and affiliations:

[w]e might ask what this human interwovenness has thrown up: in the way of power-political relations, in the play of cultural authority and hegemony, in the composition of affect and communal belonging—all elements, we do well to remind ourselves, that fall complexly between, within, and across peoples and groups (ibid: 26).

Hybridity is a concept used in a variety of ways. Gareth Griffiths (1994) alerts his readers to the way the notion of hybridity is deployed by dominant elites to destabilise perceptions of ethnic authenticity; a strategy to discredit subordinates who do not uphold the official transcript and/or who agitate for their rights. It makes much of inter-tribal disputations by way of justifying a regime’s refusal to grant claims to land, royalties or representation. In this way, he sees authenticity – as does McCannell (1999) and Graburn (1999) – as a constructed myth perpetuated by institutions to undermine a
subaltern group’s common cause through, for instance, quoting San directly as examples of oppositional ‘authentic speech’. This kind of disputational definition of hybridity is cited by government with reference to those San who have returned to the CKGR against those who stay in the resettlement villages rather than face probable re-eviction or worse. Thus, solidarity is an ideal, but where this is not possible in any direct challenge, an incremental ‘chipping away’ is a viable Resistance option. Such everyday, subtle forms of Resistance are to be found in other parts of Africa with a similar assimilationist agenda and hostility towards dissent.

The post-genocide regime in Rwanda, for example, is characterised by an elite which keeps the peasants politically and socially disenfranchised and whose notion of ‘national unity’ is, like Botswana, built on an assumption of ethnic sameness. Through her research among Rwandan peasants, Thomson (2011) notes three key elements that their everyday Resistance needs in order to be effective and these are all at work in various configurations in the Botswana San context:

persistence, prudence and individual effort ... a lack of awareness on behalf of the ... state [so as to] counteract or frustrate the mechanisms of the policy of national unity and reconciliation, not overtly to defeat or overthrow it as more conventional understandings of resistance would imply, [and] benefit to the resister. This gain may be long-term’ (446-447).

In terms of the typology of Resistance itemised further on in this chapter, generally the informal self-representations shown here could be labeled examples of ‘anti-politics’ (Katsiaficas, 1997) whereby ‘autonomous anarchists ... do not act on abstract principles, distant goals or on behalf of large-scale collectives, but
based on their own desires and values by trying to implement change locally, informally and directly (Vinthagen and Johansson, 2013: 9). This is that which Mihelich and Storrs (2003) call ‘embedded resistance’ where marginalised groups ‘influence the nature of the hegemonic structure as they broaden their roles by working within the system … not motivated by a consciously articulated resistance’ (419).

I include participation in all artistic media when citing Aman Sium’s and Eric Ritskes’ (2013) assertion that stories ‘in Indigenous epistemologies are disruptive, sustaining, knowledge producing, and theory-in-action … decolonization in its most natural form (II). Sium and Ritske see storytelling as a ‘site and tool for survival’ (V) within the frames of colonialism and of modern capitalism, the latter being the ‘seige’ context under which the San on Botswana find themselves. Wilsmen (2002) notes a notion of hegemony that sees subaltern groups, far from consenting to elite domination, finding solidarity in the struggle, wherein ‘words, images, symbols, forms and institutions … confront and/or resist their domination [and] are shaped by the domination itself’ and also where the oppressed ‘claim a selection of actual or asserted historical events as their exclusive cultural property’ (841). These are exactly, I posit, the motives and methodologies of the San represented in this chapter. Ngugi Wa Thiong’o (1986) uses the term ‘mapping’ to describe the colonial practice (or in Botswana’s case, the neo-colonial) of controlling ‘the national story, which characters are introduced and how they are constructed’. To counter this, Indigenous storytelling must also be a remapping project, one that challenges the sacrosanct claims of colonial borders and the hierarchies imposed on either side of the living divide. Stories become mediums to unmake colonial borders. They help us
restore the Indigenous names and relationships rooted in land (55).

Iseke (2013) also sees the political potential of subversive and imaginative artistic Resistance to ‘disrupt the assumptions that land is a possession, and can be owned, and that it is merely the place to make history’ (47). Storytelling and artistic representation as Indigenous epistemology can underpin research as well, along with other methodologies.

Research into Indigenous issues by the people themselves can be conducted as a form of Resistance. I use the word research circumspectly here in accordance with Absolon and Willett’s (2005) observation about the colonial ‘baggage’ the very word carries, an impediment encompassing the English language in which it is predominantly conducted: ‘[i]f we are to gather and share knowledge in an Indigenous way, we must find new words to liberate and decolonise our processes for doing so’ (114). This, as Cole (2002, in Brown and Strega, eds. 2005) recognises, also extends to the formatting and presentation of research, contending that paragraphs and chapters, grammar and punctuation are irrelevant within Indigenous communicative, temporal and spatial parameters. As such, writing for meaning rather than according to academic conventions, and drawing truth from experience rather than from the evidence of experts is of greater validity. Margaret Kovachs (2005) concurs that Indigenous research does not necessarily fit into an established Western category, although it can certainly draw from critical and interpretive theories. Kovachs (2005) identifies some premises of Indigenous research:

(a) experience as a legitimate way of knowing; (b) Indigenous methods, such as storytelling, as a legitimate way of sharing knowledge; (c) receptivity and relationship between researcher
and participants as a natural part of the research ‘methodology’; and (d) collectivity as a way of knowing that assumes reciprocity to the community (cited in Brown and Strega, eds., 2005: 28).

The concept of research as a learning circle is helpful to describe an Indigenous methodology whereby information is shared, connections are made, capacity enhanced. Learning circles facilitate the process of remembering (not only of facts and experiences, but sensory, emotional and physical memory as well) which forms a collective consciousness: ‘[t]hrough the remembering process … the community is brought into reconnecting’ (Nabigon, Hagey, Webster and Mackay, 1998: 114).

Art as storyboard and the cultural pride engendered through new platforms for centralised and televised performance and exhibition in Botswana (detailed further into this chapter) suggest the inevitability of authentic research into San issues by San themselves, based on a growing collective consciousness. Such popular, non-elite cultural forms of subversion are powerful by way of their capacity to carry meanings that ‘potentially undercut if not contradict their official interpretation’ (Scott, 1990). Scott specifies the way text (including dance, visual art and ritual) is adopted by the subaltern for their own ends; amended and updated as ‘new cultural practices and artifacts to meet their felt needs’ (157).

Subordinate groups also create such texts a riposte to an official narrative – in Botswana’s case, one of ethnic homogeneity that is simultaneously, expediently and paradoxically entwined with one of San primordialism – that is inherently insulting. The artistry of such Resistances are what Homi Bhabha calls ‘moments of civil disobedience within the discipline of civility’ (1985: 181).
Bhabha’s ascription of ambivalence connotes a hybridity; a phenomenon demonstrably present in the new San art and other Resistance strategies offered further into this chapter. Such a textual discourse is transformative but necessarily covert in its amended mimicry of the traditional forms that officially and theoretically defined it hitherto.

The Botswana San’s self-representations give truth to Scott’s (1990) observation that such expression, by virtue of its polyvalent symbolism and metaphor lends itself to disguise. By the subtle use of codes, one can insinuate into a ritual, a pattern of dress, a song, a story, meanings that are accessible to one intended audience and opaque to another audience the actors wish to exclude. Alternatively, the excluded audience may grasp the seditious message but find it difficult to react because that sedition is clothed in terms that also can lay claim to a perfectly innocent construction (Scott 157-158).

Resistance can be helped or hindered by tourists and tourist operators. Post-tourism is a meta-analysis of tourism practices, a term coined – not uncontroversially – by John Urry and articulated also by Smith and Robinson (2006): ‘the development of a (cultural) tourism industry … necessitates the acceptance of responsibility in terms of interpretation and representation of events’ (7).

Calás & Smircich (1999) posit that at the heart of postcolonial theory lies the imperative to ‘[open] up new productive spaces for others to ‘speak back’ – spaces that would include [members of the culture in question and] experts from other cultures who hold unique knowledges, but have been silenced so far’ (cited in Smith and Robinson, (eds), 2006: 138). Local Indigenous knowledge, passed on through an intimate relationship with the land and passed on by way of oral tradition (largely dismissed in formal education as
experienced by San children, previously mentioned in Chapter One) is often deemed overly subjective, not to be trusted, unscientific.

Despite Tim Brennan’s assertion in *Salman Rushdie and the Third World* (1989) that any Resistance texts emanating from the developing World are necessarily doubly-emplaced, demonstrating a ‘Third World Cosmopolitan’ ambivalence between two modes of communicating, the lack of such texts would render Resistance fairly ineffectual. Ethnographers have been studying the dynamics of power within representation for some time and wonder if there is a way of representing disenfranchised peoples that does not involve a power imbalance. One suggested strategy is polyphonic representation which is opening up to a ‘plurality of voices’ (Spurr: 188). Xavier Albó (1995) writes of ‘borrowed identities’ and the necessity to ‘find roads that lead us to a common project’ to provide the basis for a national culture. Identity is articulated by present state structures but also by older ties that cross or challenge boundaries: ‘[p]erhaps all of our peoples are ... new peoples in transformation’ (19). Brennan argues that cosmopolitan writers

[manipulate] imperial imagery and local legend as a means of politicizing ‘current events’ and a declaration of cultural ‘hybridity’ – a hybridity claimed to offer certain advantages in negotiating the collisions of language, race, and art in a world of disparate peoples comprising a single, if not exactly unified, world (cited in Beverley, Oviedo, and Aronna (eds) 1995: 2).

Kaplan (1996) sees the bigger picture inherent in this, in which such texts as Brennan mentions are undeniably complicit in a supply and demand dynamic: ‘[i]t is a map of the social relations of cultural production and reception ... the dissemination through publishing,
telecommunications, and entertainment industries of products whose conditions of production can be analyzed and made more meaningful" (124). This culture of commodification is, of course, a universal modern reality but the extent to which production, reception and dissemination are self-generated and self-determining is at issue here.

**Target audience: Defining political tourists**

In tourism, *Resistance* can take the form of solidarity and agency, whether or not a particular group itself is aware of its benefit. The origin of this in the tourism domain is scepticism; that which Edward M. Bruner (2001) labels the ‘questioning gaze’ to describe doubts tourists may have about the authenticity or accuracy of that which they are witnessing. Bruner contends that tourists are increasingly exercising their agency to question and interpret messages from service providers in the industry. A specific form of socially responsible tourism, based on social justice that acknowledges exploited peoples, is often the result (Wearing, 2001). Socially responsible tourism is a response to the recognition that even where local ownership of sustainable tourism developments is in effect there is always a risk of local elites monopolising the benefits of tourism ventures. This is upheld by Altman and Finlayson (2003) who note that in Australian ecotourism contexts: ‘Aboriginal producers frequently received only a minor share of the final retail price, reflecting the remoteness of these producers from the market, and associated problems, and the operation of standard pricing practice in the arts’ (80).

Moynah (2008: 9) asserts that political tourism has ‘as a tacit objective a breaking down of the impediments to the acts of affiliation and commitment’ that characterise traditional tourism
practices, thereby perpetuating inequality. Wearing’s 2001 research into volunteer tourism concludes that the experience develops participants’ self-identity, ‘bringing about sustainable development in communities as well as being instrumental in leaving the participants feeling empowered that they can make a difference’ (53). Scheyvens (2002) cites Wenham and Wenham’s description of so-called ‘justice tourists’ as venturing out ‘in the knowledge that he/she is not an agent of oppression but is attempting to participate in the liberation process’ (104). Trevor Sofield (2003) also identifies themes of empowerment, two of which are potentially brought about by tourists: ‘the redistribution of power’, and ‘to enable or make possible’ (100). According to Scheyvens (2002), the integrity of tourists’ motives is significant. He writes of ‘revolutionary tourism’ as that which seeks to foster social change into the future. Understandably, since Western tourists are perceived as having the most power and influence, there is the inherent danger of harm to Indigenous communities via the spreading of Western culture. But as Said (1981) recognises, ‘there is no interpretation, understanding, and then knowledge where there is no interest’ (157). In the tourism arena, Meehan (2002) describes ‘the development of a (cultural) tourism industry ... [that] necessitates the acceptance of responsibility in terms of interpretation and representation of events’ (7). This is especially salient within the larger socio-political frame, since ‘the processes of commodification, rather than being a side issue, are ... central to the whole basis of tourism ... tourism is one aspect of the global processes of commodification rather than a separate self-contained system’ (cited in Smith and Robinson 2006: 178).
Resistance strategies
Lessening a reliance on NGOs

You think that these outsiders will always help you, well, one of these days they will be gone and there will only be us, and we own you, and will own you to the end of time, and you will not achieve what you want (Geoffrey Oteng, Botswana Assistant Minister for Local Government, Lands and Housing, 1993).

Through her research with a San Village Schools Project in Namibia, Jennifer Hays (2007) points out that academics and activists are not largely contributing to the betterment of conditions for the San, so that their intellectual criticism of NGOs and capacity-building organisations is ‘often naïve and misinformed and can sometimes be very destructive’ (33) since while such organisations are admittedly flawed, they are at least proactively doing something. However, she concedes that ‘while the vast majority of the individuals representing these NGOs and government bodies [in southern Africa] clearly had a profound interest in doing the best thing for San communities, they were also, overwhelmingly, not San’ (30). They also, according to Zibani Maundeni (2004) are largely ineffectual in bringing about real change for minority groups. Hence, there is a necessity to move away from dependency towards autonomy.

Maundeni notes that post independence, the Botswana government has ranked its development objectives, giving higher priority to economic advancement than to human rights, resting on the laurels of a comparatively good human rights record (in African terms) ‘except for the Basarwa or San [and other minorities] who constitute 10 percent of the population’ (72). Maundeni goes on to
chronicle NGO concern that turned into cooperation due to state coercion:

Botswana has institutionalised the participation of NGOs through joint councils, thus constraining their autonomy and compromising their moralising effect on the society (72) ... The dominance of the state in national councils and the absence of veto powers by civil society explains why the Botswana state has been able to carry out some harsh public policies on marginal groups, such as the forced relocation of the San from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (75).

Understandably, in the light of this, Nthomang (2004) writes of the necessity to rethink San dependency on the government’s Remote Area Development Programme (RADP) and his recommendations for alternative approaches could be extrapolated to include reliance on NGOs. He suggests pre-conditions for the elimination of San dependency including consultation with all stakeholders, an holistic extension of Hays’ and Siergruhn’s (2001) proposition for San education. Another precondition is that culturally appropriate training and development assistance is provided ‘without entrenching a welfare-dependent relationship’ (22). Nthomang’s ideal is a Community Development approach, linking international, national and local indigenous peoples in solidarity, promoting Indigenous knowledge in policy and program activities and local development projects.

Survival International, apart from advocating legally on behalf of the San, produces literature and programs that raise awareness of the plight of the San. One such is a short film of an appeal by Australian Aboriginal writer Doris Pilkington Garimara (2009) the author and central character of Follow the Rabbit Proof Fence (2002), an autobiography subsequently reinterpreted into the
award-winning film *Rabbit Proof Fence* (2002). Garimara speaks of the parallels between the colonial dispossession of Australian Indigenous people and the San’s experience in Botswana and calls on the international community to become involved. As Kiema (2010) concedes, the San’s is a global problem, one requiring similar sufferers to acknowledge a common cause: ‘[i]t was the British themselves who proclaimed Tć’amnqoo a game reserve … We all know very well that other indigenous (sic) people the world over had lost their lands when they became game reserves, freehold lands and state lands of any kind’ (80). While Garimara is undeniably in a position to speak authoritatively on Appropriation, Debasement, Negation and Resistance through self-representation, San reliance on endorsement from culturally parallel voices, NGOs and other groups to overturn this situation is not the long-term solution. It is not always possible, however, to confront government policy in-country.

Kenneth Good (2003) is cynical of Ditshwanelo’s (The Botswana Centre for Human Rights) apparent lack of support for SI. He maintains that assertiveness is necessary to counter government corruption and racial intolerance. He finds Ditshwanelo’s dissociation from SI’s campaign perplexing, wondering why the centre felt the need to adopt ‘the thinking of the government on the desirability of quietism and deference. [The director] is aware that the country suffers from its culture of passivity, but then contributes to it gratuitously herself’ (33). Ditshwanelo, reliant as it is on government funding, is in a delicate position, and treads a fine line between championing minority advocacy and staying in favour with the government. Some local San organisations agree that SI has used methods that are ‘not the Botswana way’, but others say that international pressure is the only way to make the government listen. Sidsel Saugestad (2011) acknowledges a place for several
types of activism, and at local, national and international levels, working simultaneously but not if they antagonise or neutralise each other. In a spirit of hope for the future of San recognition and rights, she cites the example in her own homeland of an unsuccessful protest against a dam built on Saami reindeer-herding territories where ‘the massive mobilisation of public opinion led to a number of government initiatives that in the following years significantly changed the position of the Saami indigenous (sic) minority within Norwegian law and constitution’ (59).

The CKGR Coalition’s press statement of December 2006, encouraged by the fact that judges presiding over the Court did not see the issue as a ‘closed book’, suggests that there is scope and possibility for negotiation between the Government of Botswana and the parties acting on behalf of the San ‘to ensure participatory processes that deliver a sustainable solution’ (1). The five organisations that make up the Coalition include the Botswana Council of Non-Governmental Organisations (BOCONGO), the Botswana Council of Churches (BCC), Ditshwanelo – the Botswana Centre for Human Rights, the Kuru Family of Organizations (KFO) and the Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa – Botswana Chapter (WIMSA).

According to a joint press statement from the Government of Botswana, the CKGR Residents’ Committee and the CKGR Non-Governmental Organization’s Coalition on the Central Kalahari Game Reserve Consultation Process, community consultation meetings were held with the Minister of Environment, Wildlife and Tourism. The statement notes that ‘[a]ll the parties are committed to transparency, integrity and trust with regard to the process, and to holding all discussions without prejudice. President Khama urged the residents of CKGR to form a forum which will hold talks with
government for negotiated resolutions. However, the talks have been progressing at an ‘agonising slow speed, averaging one year between each meeting to plan new meetings, [which] has caused increasing frustration’ (Saugestad, 2011: 51). Roy Sesana of the FPK and San spokesman in the 2006 court case, refused to be a part of the CKGR Coalition as he did not trust some of the organisations which he described as ‘like vultures when a giraffe has fallen’.

Duffy’s ecotourism ideal has it that ‘such ventures … ensure that the host communities retain all the revenues … and that local people have complete control over the pace and direction of ecotourism development, including choosing the ways in which they interact with ecotourists’ (99). Of course, as Kuela Kiema (2010) asserts, those such as himself who left the CKGR due to government obstruction, are in discord with those who return to the CKGR to survive with no government assistance. This lack of a common voice is problematic in establishing genuine autonomy, an issue of perceived loyalty, solidarity and authenticity evident also in the South African San context.

As Steven Robins (2001) asserts, ‘[t]his ideal is gradually being realised in South Africa, although again, not without some internal (that is, between San clans themselves) conflict over the issue of authenticity: ‘[o]nly a few months after the signing of the land agreement, [two journalists] reported in the Cape Times that ‘fake bushmen’ were being employed at the internationally renowned ‘bushman’ tourist village at Kagga Kamma Nature Reserve’ (836). Robins reports the fact that journalists accused the … management of ‘passing off non-bushmen as the ‘genuine article’ for the gratification of tourists’ (1/7/1999). A schism between ‘western’ and ‘traditional’ Bushmen at the new San resettlement … was noted with the clan now in a position to establish their own tourism initiatives.
Thus, the concept of the hegemonic ‘tourist gaze’ can be turned on its head, according to Cheong and Miller (2000) who, extrapolating from Focault’s assertion that power is omnipresent in every relationship, claim that it is at least theoretically possible that locals can control the areas accessible to tourists, undermining the traditional dynamic of the stakeholders: hosts, brokers and visitors (376). Self-representation, inevitably, is an extension of newfound socio-political autonomy, as Roland Barthes (2000) notes:

*[f]or once Photography (sic) had restored me to myself but soon afterward I was to find this same photograph on the cover of a pamphlet; by the artifice of printing, I no longer had anything but a horrible disinternalized countenance, as sinister and repellant as the image the author wanted to give of my language*. Barthes goes on to assert emphatically, ‘it is my political right to be a subject which I must protect (216).

To this end, one of the strategies proposed in the publication *Who is going to drive?* (Stewart and Hays, eds., 2010) is to ‘develop support strategies that encourage San to be proud of their culture, to speak out for themselves and to stand up’ (17). As Amogelang Mosimaneakgosi relates in this booklet, ‘I did camouflage who I was when I was younger. I no longer camouflage: I am proud of who I am … we need to fight our own battles. We sit back and expect people to fight our own battles’ (9). Thus, self-empowerment, eschewing dependency and building capacity through solidarity is the only way to pave the way for self-representation and the relative autonomy that guarantees. Professor Kenneth Good is hopeful for the future of Botswana, despite his experiences: ‘[a]t the moment Botswana is an autocracy. But that’s not tenable in the long term. The ruling party has split, there is a new opposition party, the Botswana Movement for Democracy and opposition unity is being realized.
Another opposition party, The Botswana Congress Party, has drawn up a Position Paper on the Relocation of Communities in the CKGR (2006). The BCP is founded according to the principles of the Democracy and Development Program (DDP) and United nations instruments such as the ILO Convention No.169 and the relevant elements of the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD). A fieldtrip with delegates interviewing key stakeholders, observers such as Ditshwanelo, San Research Centre, BOCONGO, among other bodies was carried out in September 2006. Social, cultural and economic impacts on those relocated were ascertained. The purpose of the compilation was to develop a party policy on the BDP’s relocations of the Gana and Gwi peoples from the CKGR. The party’s ‘Proposed Way Forward’ on the issue of relocated San holds that

*Any future resolution of the problems of relocation must be informed by International instruments such as the African Charter of Human and People’s rights …
*The government must accept that the Basarwa are an indigenous people of Botswana. As such issues of land and cultural rights must be respected.
* the government and the Basarwa should go back to the negotiation table …
* …the pre-location status quo must remain in force …the government effectively reneged on their promises and … forced people out of the CKGR.
*The Basarwa should neither be treated as flora and fauna nor forcefully assimilated or integrated into mainstream Botswana.
* ... there should be deliberate and concerted effort
to rebuild confidence and trust in future consultation
processes (Botswana Congress Party, 2006).

Any official changes to the status and rights of the San in Botswana
in the short- to medium term is unlikely, since the Botswana
Democratic Party’s hold on national politics is apparently strong,
despite a diminishing majority. Bothomilwe, Sebudubudu and
Maripe (2011) assert that the country fails the test of a democratic
regime as conceptualised in the modern era’ in its lack of popular
participation in issues and they cite Good who wryly defines
Botswana democracy as existing only ‘if one has nothing serious to
say’ (346).

In a tangible example of undemocratic practice, Chebanne (2006)
writes of the ‘promised land’ that is ‘not attractive’ to relocated San,
moved against their will from the CKGR and he concludes that the
territoriality model of Boran (2001) and Reaume (2003) should be
applied in Botswana, given that this ‘points to land as the main
resource to achieve indigenous (sic) communities’ language and
culture promotion. It is their language and culture that can
empower them to be confident and to effectively engage in
development wherever they may be found’ (143). Chebanne
asserts that the Botswana government’s ‘generalized policies which
effectively suppress or assimilate autochthonous groups’ work
against San self-definition, a fundamental precursor to self-
determination. In tourism terms, Chebanne’s ideal – ‘[t]he creation
and maintenance of live and dynamic cultures are better exercised
by the ethnic communities themselves, according to their own terms
and means’ – would certainly be something to aspire to, and which
the current representations for tourists of the San, do not allow.
Kiema (2010) requires, as one proactive measure, a reinscribing of the San’s history:

[w]e want the history syllabus to explain why we are the only citizens of Botswana targeted for RADP-sponsored relocations ... It is quite wrong to attribute our history merely to the movement of animals and resource depletion while turning a blind eye to the social and political conflicts that have emanated from our interactions with other groups (77).

At the time of writing, this is an ideal still unrealised of school texts or syllabus documents in Botswana public education. It is to be hoped that government policy will some day endorse into policy and publication budgets a new representation in educational material, reflecting growing understandings of the San place as members of the 21st century.

Artistic self-representation for sale to tourists

Rock-art experts J. David Lewis-Williams and Thomas Dowson (1999) assert that San art, having been long ‘dormant’ is an area ‘waiting to exercise a challenging and unifying influence on southern African society’ in which ‘the struggle for emancipation from demeaning and politically crippling stereotypes is being contested’ (386). Brown (1999) partly attributes international recognition of San art to KFO’s centre in D’Kar, as does Qaedhao Moses, formerly of Ghanzi, whose award-winning artwork has sold in Los Angeles and Australia and who now runs a gallery specialising in San art as part of the Thapong artists’ cooperative in Gaborone. Moses secured an apprenticeship offered by KFO and claims that through his career he can ‘preserve the Basarwa’s culture and tell their story to the world’ (The Voice, 12/06/09: 6). However, while acknowledging the help of KFO in teaching him artistic techniques, Moses is resistant to the requirement that the San creating art under the auspices of KFO only depict scenes based on the ancient
rock art in their work, rather than art reflecting the San’s modern situation, including the growing prevalence of AIDS in San communities, their eviction from the Kalahari and their lack of representation in government. Such realities Moses now has the freedom to paint and tourism still assures his livelihood. In this way, overturning the practice of Classification to embrace its foil in Resistance, Dennis Kwek (2003) claims that cultures are better understood when they are not viewed as simplistic dimensional binaries but in terms that do not diminish the fluid, multilayered complexities that culture encapsulates. We need to resist representationalistic simplifications by pointing to the internal plurality, dissension, and contestation over values, and the ongoing changes occurring in virtually all cultures (in Prasad: 140).

Figure 20 shows one of Moses' artistic representations of the scourge of AIDS among his people, the top image the footprints representing forward motion or the hope of the San eventually cheating the epidemic. The red dots represent the antiretroviral tablets, the green symbolising the roots eaten traditionally by the San, the intertwining of the two metaphorically advocating an amalgam of modern medicine with ancient wisdom to treat AIDS, since, as Moses asserts, older San especially do not understand modern medical interventions and are resistant to it.
The Thapong Art Centre and Museum in Gaborone where Qaedhao Moses has a workshop is an example of ‘new museology’ as resistance and renewal, involving the tourist enterprise. Moira Simpson (2001) researches the community-based museum model, becoming more prevalent since the 1970s, proudly self-determinist, with ethnic groups, wishing to preserve and share their cultural heritage and counterbalance the ways in which mainstream institutions represented their cultures ... display, teaching and research of their cultures for the benefit of members of their own communities as well as other members of the public ... a venue in which they can take control of the representation of their cultures, provide a cultural centre for the promotion of traditional and contemporary arts ... a range of community activities otherwise unavailable [especially] in deprived inner city neighbourhoods (73).
Figure 21 above clearly depicts the scourge of HIV among the San which, significantly, Moses associates with the colonial and post-colonial authority, in both law enforcement and religious manifestations. Chronologically, from the bottom of the canvas, the lives of the San are being influenced by the church and the police, then the HIV virus asserts its prominence in the true centre. The two central images depict the sickness taking hold and finally killing the San, followed by the higher images of mass burials. The blue background shows the typically cloudless Botswana sky. Scott (1990) reads this kind of inversion, with the authority figures positioned at the bottom of the painting, as creating ‘an imaginative breathing space in which the normal categories of
order and hierarchy are less than completely inevitable’ (168). Representing the San as modern peoples, susceptible to the same effects as any other group. Moses is determined also to go beyond the drawing of the San as victim to denote San potential as anticipated in Figure 22.

Other examples of San self-representation that have been purchased, accessed and appreciated by tourists include graphic art, literature, photograph, communiqués and film. Moses in Thapong Gallery, Gaborone and Thamae Kaashe from D’Kar are insisting on creating depictions of the San in modern times, such as the lino-prints below. A group of young San artists under Moses’ tutelage is learning artistic techniques and also to create images that juxtapose traditional imagery alongside scenes of the San in modern contexts. With some convincing, tourists visiting Thapong art co-operative to purchase his work are, albeit very gradually, coming to accept this new drawing of the San, rather than it being ‘indigestible to the outside collector’ as Guenther (2006: 181) asserts. In this way, the relationship between ‘struggle and action’ is manifest – ‘resistance in constant communication – whereby acts ‘born of intentions circle back ... to influence consciousness and hence subsequent intentions and acts’ (Scott, 1985). Even if these subsequent actions may be unimaginable in the current socio-political context, this is a ‘material world’ where the practitioners of Resistance such as Moses and his charges can ‘conceive of a line of action that is at the moment either impractical or impossible (ibid: 38).

The image reproduced below by Q. Moses (Figure 22), was inspired by the last Olympic Games and depicts optimism, with the San one day representing Botswana in various Olympic sports. The imagery is
traditional in style, yet the future orientation of the subject-matter is typical of Moses' mission to project the San as capable of success in any context.

Figure 22: Metshamenko, by Q. Moses

Figure 23 (below) is by print-maker Thamae Kaashe of D'Kar, whose work also features in a San collection at the National Museum and Art Gallery in Gaborone and who was awarded Best Visual Artist in the President’s Awards, 2013. Moses has been influential in Kaashe’s style, which contains no images of desert animals or veldt foods as traditional San art does, rather scenes showing the San being proactive in modern contexts. Making such a stand is a long-term vision since it is not working in his and Kaashe’s economic interests at present. Tourists must be educated towards this new ‘take’ on the San story. Tourists still, in the main, want representations in San art of the animals they have seen in the flesh on safari in the Kalahari.

In the hybridity of the new art-form, where the modern refers back to the traditional, the San are thereby ‘embracing the new
postforaging order on their own terms … The art acts as a counter-hegemonic force’ (Guenther, 2006: 174).

Figure 23 depicts juxtapositions of a range of traditional and modern San practices: the old hunting technique of bow and dart against the new method of shooting animals from helicopters; traditional desert homes where food is cooked outside alongside the newer cement brick dwellings and indoor cooking; transport of old (donkey) and new (car) and telecommunications old (conveying a message on foot) and new (via transmission tower). This imagery could be read as a ‘ritual of reversal’ (Scott, 1985: 331) where the traditional and sanctioned text is undermined. Such ‘everyday resistance’ may seem inconsequential within a hegemonic system, yet though the artwork of Moses, Kaashe and some other San is ‘informal, often covert, and concerned largely with immediate, de
facto gains ... [an insubordination that] never ventures to contest the formal definitions of hierarchy and power ... What may be accomplished within this symbolic straightjacket is nonetheless something of a testament to human persistence and inventiveness (ibid: 33). For the government to publicise or punish such ‘insubordination’, Scott asserts, would be to admit its policy is unpopular, therefore the ‘nature of the acts themselves and the self-interested muteness of the antagonists thus conspire to create a kind of complicitous silence that all but expunges everyday forms of resistance from the historical record’ (ibid: 36). The lack of opposition to minority assertiveness (such as revisionist San art) from the dominant elite can be reinscribed officially as altruistic support, in the form of government sponsored cultural festivals and awards.

Figure 24: It Rained in the Village, by Tumediso Keolepile

Figure 24 is an image by Tumediso Keolepile, one of Moses' young San art students. The teaching and learning relationship between the two is a respectful nod to San tradition in the passing down of wisdom and skill from the older to the younger.

The three images above are symbols of hope for the eventual overturning of the Tswana elite’s control of the ‘ideological sectors’
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(1971: 209) of society; of their dominance of the symbolic means of production. Such blended traditional and modern images, often within the same piece, epitomise that which Guenther (2006) sees as a subtle subversion of an ‘economic and hegemonic hold through juxtaposing, conflation, bemusement and irony’ (181).

New museology
An encouraging cultural shift since the Second World War saw the expression of culture became synonymous with the push for civil rights and recognition, effecting ‘the political awakening of indigenous (sic) peoples and cultural minority groups in western nations’ (Simpson 2001: 7). This awakening, claims Simpson, ‘saw indigenous (sic) and minority peoples in many parts of the world forming political organizations to fight for the settlement of old treaties, the resolution of land rights issues, and equality of opportunity in all spheres of social and political life’ (11). Such a groundswell of action is reflected in representations of Indigenous peoples museums and other representative fora. The Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture, and the National Museum and Art Gallery in Botswana demonstrate the shape and form of representations, changing not only the way the San depict themselves but the way they see themselves.

By way of showing the potential of San museological representation, I include Simpson’s example of a detailed example of the ‘new museum’ paradigm in an Australian context, especially with regard to tourism: the Brambuk Living Cultural Centre ‘near Budja Budja (Hall’s Gap) in the Gariwerd, or Grampian region of Victoria. The Brambuk centre ‘was conceived in the 1970s as a means of responding to the tourist interest in Aboriginal culture with some sort of museum or cultural centre run by Aboriginal people’
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(126). A vital element of new museology is that of not shirking from articulating controversial subject-matter or tragic episodes in the history of ethnic groups and is evident in this centre. Aboriginal life of hunting and gathering prior to European settlement, the subsequent assimilation process, coercion into missions, psychological trauma resulting from the ‘stolen generation’ and the fact that land allocated returned soldiers after WW2 was not apportioned to Aboriginal soldiers are all represented in the presentation. The displays foreground the Indigenous voice: ‘[w]e became the innocent victims of an attempt to bring about cultural genocide’ (127).

Within the ‘new museum’ framework, museums carry a responsibility to the peoples represented and are caretakers of the kind of scientific and historical evidence that can further a group’s socio-political causes such as land claims and hunting and fishing rights. Moira Simpson claims that ‘Aboriginal peoples are finding that anthropological and archaeological records can provide evidence in court cases to support indigenous land claims by providing valuable information documenting tribal migration and settlement’ (259). In fact, claims Simpson, several articles of the UN Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples relate directly to museological practice, including the repatriation of ‘items taken under questionable circumstances’ (298-299). This noble ideal carries into representational accuracy also.

In the same vein, the San in Botswana are beginning to represent themselves in the museological domain. Some curators are calling on the San to write their own interpretive texts and to extend beyond the limiting historical (and traditionally conservative 14)

---

14 By ‘conservative’ here I refer to the kind of interpretation of history that privileges the dominant power (in the last century in Botswana, this is the British
narrative to encompass modern realities, even including detail that may contradict the politically accepted line. Some curators are, in fact, San who can authorise and oversee the textual material.

The image above (Figure 25) is a painting based on the photograph reproduced in Chapter Four of this thesis, of the San artist known as Dada. This painting featured in a recent exhibition at the Museum and Art Gallery of Botswana in Gaborone, sponsored by the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture. It depicts, in parody, the well-known San artist painting not a traditional scene based on ancient rock art, as San artists have been limited to creating for so long, but rather a cityscape of Gaborone, looking to the future. Dada is positioned as the creator of this scene, suggesting some San agency in the creation and future of modern Botswana.

---

followed by the Tswana), representing it in relation to dominated groups as benevolent, superior, altruistic; whose supremacy is assumed within social and political rhetoric to be preferable, unchallengeable and, in any case, inevitable.
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The use of colour and three-dimensional imagery is a metaphor for a burgeoning identity of empowerment and pride. This evolution in San artistic technique is anything but inauthentic, as many tourists erroneously believe, but rather reflective of the evolution of culture, since traditional art is static images taken from rock walls, and modern artistry is evolving, taking many forms. The San telling their own stories is also vital, rather than others doing the telling. This needs to include modern and unsavoury realities such as alcohol abuse and HIV and she regards this practice also as a metaphor for an increasingly present San voice in Botswana society. As Sium and Ritske (2013) observe, creative Resistance by way of such artistic spaces ‘must be sustained by the communities they arise from if they are to be sustainable and revolutionary. These community spaces and the cacophony of voices that rise from them challenge the colonial epistemic frame’ (III).

San artists (as well as those from other marginalised minorities) are growing in confidence to bring their work to the capital for exhibition, when until recently to travel to the capital would have seemed beyond the realm of possibility.

Another manifestation of museology in which San self-representation is gaining some public attention is that of the ‘living museum’. At this stage, however, the most evident example of this is in Namibia, in the Tsumkwu area, but this is being mooted as a possible model for the Botswana San to adopt. A wall plaque at Thumkwu, cited from the Living Culture Foundation Namibia (www.lcfn.info) defines the museum’s conceptual parameters:

A living museum is an interesting and authentic way of promoting traditional culture … a cultural school for a communal Namibian tourism business … students and
people can visit a Living Museum and thus can contribute to the preservation of traditional culture and fight poverty in Namibia.

Recently researchers from the San Research Centre (SRC) at the University of Botswana accompanied a group of San artisans from the relocation settlement village of Kaudwane on a reconnaissance mission to Tsumkwu. The object of the trip was to benchmark projects of self-empowerment. Previous projects had not been successful, such as the vegetable garden project that emanated from the government’s Poverty Eradication Program, because the San had been ‘talked at and not properly educated, so that the programs just collapsed’ (San Research Centre). In Namibia’s Nyae Nyae conservancy, which is San-owned land, a living museum operates, where villagers bring their products to display for tourists. The proceeds go directly to the owner of the product. This stands in stark contrast to the Gaborone International Trade Fair where social workers took San products and sold them, with almost no payment to the makers. Along with artefacts for sale in the main village’s curio shop, programs offered to tourists and students at Tsumkwu’s Living Museum (twenty kilometres into the bush from the village) include bush-walks, singing, games and dancing, hunting trips (one day or more) and craft-making. Professional film- and documentary-making in conjunction with the villagers is permitted conditional upon certain criteria being met. The San hold the rights to Indigenous plants in the Nyae Nyae conservancy, such as ‘devil’s claw’ which is dried, preserved and packaged, then sold to promote blood circulation and alleviate high blood pressure. Proceeds go back to community and are divided fairly (San Research Centre, 2014).
Based on the Namibian Living Museum model, the San Research Centre, in partnership with the Ditshwanelo secretariat, the CKGR Coalition committee and the Department of Wildlife and National Parks, proposed a management plan for those San who stayed in the CKGR or returned to the reserve after the evictions. The government does not encourage permanent structures in the CKGR but, bowing to lobbying in-country and international pressure, is now willing to zone certain areas of around 25 hectares for the San to embark upon projects whereby income generated can benefit the communities of Kaudwane, New Xade and other relocation settlement villages (Hiri and Mokibelo, 2012). Ecologists from the Department of Wildlife and National Parks work with the communities in stakeholder workshops to ensure that good management practices will be observed.

The vision for the Kaudwane area is that tourists would pass through the village on the way to Khutse Game Reserve. The Kaudwane campsite and curio shop are still in the development stage and obstacles such as difficulty in securing leave permits from the Land Board and Kweneng District Council and the recent vandalism of the curio shop have impeded progress. However, a few tourists are beginning to buy directly from community members and future websites will be developed as an outreach to tourists who may not otherwise know of the initiative (Hiri and Mokibelo, 2102).

The San Research Centre (SRC) suffers from limited funding, receiving welcome but meagre assistance from the University of Botswana, therefore no new projects are proposed at this time. There are, however, promising partnerships with certain South African and Namibian universities as well as a collaborative book project with the University of Umea in Sweden due in late 2014 which
draws parallels between the San situation in Botswana and Saami moves towards self-determination and acquisition of land rights in Scandinavia. Burgeoning self-representation via museum and other more collective media means that a reliance on charismatic individuals as mouthpieces for a cause, as characterises many self-determination agendas, is not altogether necessary in this context.

**Role models**

The notion of the necessity for a role model is one that is pertinent to this kind of investigation generally. Satau, (in Stewart and Hays, eds. 2010) however, believes this is not a necessity in the Botswana San context and he redefines the concept: ‘Some people have talked about role models – I don’t have a role model. Sustainable development is my role model! Or ... you can find the model of sharing’ (13). San woman Onalenna Mosweu, endorsing Satau’s sentiments, expresses the importance of non-reliance on others: ‘[w]orking hard really helped me, and I am soon to be a chartered accountant. We have to prove ourselves. I cannot change the world and what people think about me, but I can change myself. I can present myself in a way that I have the potential to conquer the world’ (15). An example of ‘world changing’ that comes from the role-model responsibility being manipulated can be personified by Roy Sesana.

Saugestad (2011) makes reference, in her paper on Indigenous rights, to Roy Sesana, First Applicant in the 2006 appeal to the High Court when the San appeal was finally heard. He personifies the role model to a point, being a self-appointed voice of his people for an international audience and, as Saugestad cites Mathias Guenther ‘creating a figure that is the embodiment of ambiguity and moral ambivalence’ (48) by playing the fool in the courtroom. Sesana’s
erratic behaviour in court epitomises the mythical ‘trickster’ which paradigm James Scott (1985) celebrates as an effective and ingenious ‘[weapon] of the weak’. Ironically, of course, such a scene stands in direct contrast to the fictional court scene in *The Gods Must Be Crazy*, where Xi has no voice at all, standing mute and uncomprehending in the dock. Sesana has a voice due to his command of English and acts as interpreter for many San. Saugestad suggests that Sesana’s mocking of the court provides ‘relief from the heavy feeling of powerlessness that the applicants must have endured in their meeting with the relentless legal machinery’ (48). His antics, though, were, and have continued to be, counterproductive in some senses and Kuela Kiema, while applauding Sesana’s courage and the general thrust of his campaign, is dubious about his methods and his motives.

Kiema asserts that Sesana, rather than establishing himself as the voice of the Kalahari San, rather designated himself ‘the saviour of the people’ (98). Further, he claims that the military response to a group of activists, including Sesana, taking water to the CKGR in 2005 when the government had closed the reserve entrance caused then chairperson of the FPK Moruti Daoxo Xukuri to stand before a group of San at New Xade and pronounce: ‘[J]ust as the Son of God died for you, I am going to die for you as well’ (111) to which the crowd responded ‘Amen’. This incident of resistance to authority led to police violence, imprisonments and media censorship (Kiema wryly comments that ‘[e]ven Roy Sesana failed to bring in his favourite sensationalist journalists’: 112). The reticence of many in allowing such comments to be made public is elaborated upon below but the comment also speaks to the necessity for a solidarity from within San ranks rather than a
continuing reliance on external agency, including that of charismatic role models.

One such example is Josephine Kerapetse, a San woman and Khwedom Council official who mobilises San women across the country to face the particular social challenges, as they are often abandoned along with the children. She encourages them to establish small businesses and to represent the San and women in particular in local government. Kerapetse also addresses problems specific to San disabled people as mandated in the Vision 2016 document. While Kerapetse is an inspiring role model, she does not stand alone, rather operates under the auspices of a San body that advocates for itself.

**San organisations**

The role of NGOs has been questioned, openly appreciated and somewhat derided via voices included in this chapter. Certainly Tlhokomelang Ngaka from Xakao, Botswana, interviewed for the booklet ‘Who is going to drive?’ attributes her academic success to the intercession of WIMSA and KFO, with whose assistance she was awarded an Indigenous scholarship in 2001 to pursue further education in conservation, later obtaining a degree: ‘[i]t is all about determination’ (11). But for all this external agency Bihela Sekere, in the same publication, advocates self-determining action and a diminished reliance on others, in favour of the San creating self-generated opportunities and maximising their own potential: ‘[p]eople on the academic side locate opportunities, but our NGOs are not using them ... the doors are open very wide at New Xade for people to come and work with teachers, but we are not going to them. Blaming others will not take us anywhere, let us work
The sentiment is upheld by Gakemotho Satau (ibid: 13) who acknowledges a wider context:

The Botswana government is faced by immense developmental challenges, especially in education. It is evident that they struggle with providing infrastructure for education just like many southern African governments – let alone looking at alternative programmes for the San and other marginalized communities. This is what the organizations like the new San Centre, KFO, WIMSA, and others should think about (13).

To this end, new organisations of capacity building such as the Khwedum Council (established in 2008) are appearing on the scene in Botswana. According to Leema Hiri of the Centre for San Studies at the University of Botswana, Khwedum Council operates shell jewellery- and basket-making cooperatives and has predominantly San members on the board.

In the last few years, certain self-representing organisations have been instituted in Botswana, most notably in the San’s case, Khwedom Council, an organisation officially established in 2008 with a mandate of empowering the San, to have their voices heard and to represent themselves. There are, according to the Council, five districts where San are found in Botswana and Khwedom has two board members representing each district. Inevitably, there is some scepticism in the Botswana community about such organisations, especially, perhaps, in light of the rhetoric of assimilation and homogeneity that pervades government policy. This sentiment was articulated in a blog in the Botswana daily, *Mmegi*:

Politics of representation!!! You know the AIDS politics? This is identity politics. Where people cash in by claiming to be representing a certain group. I
don’t mind Khwedom, only if it was formed (sic) in good faith (Lovemore Lavitsa Mouza, 2010).

All board members of Khwedom Council are San, unlike the San Research Centre and other advocacy bodies. Job Morris headed an historic first statement representing a San delegation to the United Nations in 2012 and addressed the forum with these words:

San and other Africans reject the doctrine of discovery. We have lived on the African continent for millions of years and occupied and utilized all of the habitats of the continent thousands of years before Europeans arrived. We thus call on southern African governments, SADC and the African Union and the African Commission to recognise our role as the stewards and the custodians of the earth. Land and the protection of the environment are central to our culture, our dignity and to our existence as a people ... In a world threatened by climate change, loss of biodiversity, water shortages and threats to food security for billions of people, we submit that our land use systems should be protected and supported in the legislative and policy frameworks on our continent and beyond.

The statement concluded with four clear recommendations:

*Free, prior and informed consent should be observed in relation to the lands of the San, and their values of reciprocity and equitable sharing of resources should be embedded in policy;
*Southern African governments – in particular, Botswana, South Africa and Namibia – must be encouraged to hold proper continuous dialogue and consultation with the San on issues affecting their lands and livelihoods, especially in relation to development projects, extractive industries and the commercial farming sector;
*African Governments must honour the rights of the San as embodied in the UNDRIP, particularly as these relate to our lands;
*Programmes must be launched to promote food security, support livelihoods and mitigate the impact of climate change (Address to the 11th session of the
Morris received this response on social media from Maitseo Bolaane, historian at the University of Botswana:

Dear Job Morris, I wish to congratulate you and the fellow members of your caucus for your bravery and determination in ensuring that the San voice is heard at an international gathering. The UNPFII is a very important gathering where you have made a permanent mark that will be carried through to the next generation; just think of those who did the rock paintings and carvings, how many years back? The significance and importance of rock paintings today? Rock paintings were voices of those centuries and you and other young San represent the strong voice of today.

In terms of cultural integrity, the San recognise, according to Khwedom that times are changing and that culture is dynamic. The San Youth Network works to define how identity as San can be retained in the modern world. The youth forum is a platform to discuss topical issues and make decisions about how best to utilise opportunities. Youth representatives from all five districts are invited to the meetings before returning to their districts to mobilise youth. The first consultative meeting was held in December 2013. Job Morris, a San representative on Khwedom Council, is chairperson of the San Youth Network. This arm of Khwedom aims to revive culture in a modern context and to promote pride in San culture as illustrated in the youth network’s motto: ‘Because we matter, we make change that matters’. Rather than dwelling on victimhood and a long history of marginalisation, this youth branch focuses on having a role in the development of the country, in politics, in business and other facets of society. The objectives of the San Youth Network, as laid down in the Proposal for San Youth Summit (2013)
are to engage in ‘research, consultation, debate and the sharing of
information in order to raise national and international awareness
about San identity and current reality’. This includes:

a) Building capacity and raising awareness on
issues of indigenous identity.
b) Engaging in helping or participating in policy
framework shaping.
c) Advocating and lobbying for the health, cultural,
educational, lifestyle of the San youth in
particular.
d) To protect San people’s rights and interests.
e) Strongly advocating for the policy establishment
to observe climate change.
f) Developing interesting activities to draw
attention of the San youth.
g) Capacitate on Indigenousness, UN mechanisms,
African Union and about other instruments
available.
h) Be exemplary in promoting indigeneity.

San youth are encouraged to contribute to the economy to
address challenges of poverty and lack of education. The body
inspires youth and has an objective of motivating them to make the
most of opportunities such as those offered by government in
response to Khwedom lobbying. Two such affirmative action
openings include access to higher education and employment and
allocated syndicates for farming set up in 2012 and which must run
for ten years. In some instances the affirmative action resources
need to be modified and contextualised and Khwedom council
advocates for this to occur. Khwedom council monitors progress of
certain initiatives; for example, government must demonstrate
longitudinal success of implementation of programs by, for
example, correlating the number of San children attending school
with those accessing tertiary studies and/or gaining employment.
Khwedom, by way of a positive relationship with the Ministry of Local Government, seeks to reverse the negative implications of Ian Khama’s assimilationist “we are all indigenous” statement into an imperative for government to recognise that if the San are, in fact, considered equally Batswana they must be supported by government for a time in order to realise a long-term aim of self-determination. Along with several San academics and artists, there are San personifying agency, such as Smith Moeti, originally from the CKGR, subsequently relocated to New Xade, now in local government on Ghanzi City Council, as well as Bihele Sekere, also of New Xade, (formerly cited in Chapter Three) who is now a diplomat in Botswana’s embassy in London.

A few San are generating their own income by way of Khwedom endorsed initiatives and intellectual capacity. In the relocation settlement of Hanahai the Zutshwa women are selling directly to tourists and in Ghanzi, San Thamaku Bob and Bolanda, fashion ostrich shells, make natural dyes and were invited by government to showcase their craft at a recent exhibition. The tiny San community of Xai-Xai, ten kilometres from the border with Namibia ensures ‘controlled cultural tourism for cultural preservation of Bushmen traditions, income and jobs for men and women and to develop a niche in ecotourism (Zeppel, 2006: 172) In some cases, though, ‘the goal of community management clashed with the idea of economic viability and business practices’ (Zeppel: 174), the Dqae Qare farm outside Ghanzi being a case in point. This game farm which offers cultural activities and performance for tourists, was to be transferred to the D’Kar community from The Kuru Development Trust but ‘the project and its management complexity overwhelmed local Bushmen and KDT coordinators’ (ibid). As well, the San face problems of travel and language in going to larger centres such as
Maun and Gaborone where tourists congregate. Such challenges long necessitated the ‘middle man’ as conduit between the San and tourists.

Tourists do not, as has been established in Chapter Three, visit the re-settlement villages outside the CKGR and it is only via the safari lodges that they access San products and performances. Ghanzi Trailblazer, situated ten kilometres from Ghanzi, a partnership between the Xwiskurusa Trust and a private operator, now ostensibly ensures San employees receive ‘a percentage of the profit’ for conducting cultural activities with tourists (Zeppel, 2006: 174). Not so evident to external scrutiny is the fact that San children were effectively corralled as commodities and did not attend school, prompting Khwedom to launch an investigation in March, 2013, into why children did not go to school and how the dancers were paid. There was no response from Ghanzi City Council, which was supposed to conduct its own investigation into the matter. To this day, there has been no word forthcoming. This highlights the necessity of organisations such as Khwedom which will, as far as its resources will allow, follow up on such issues on behalf of its own people.

Due to the lobbying of Khwedom Council and other advocacy bodies, as well as international pressure the government has allocated zones; cultural villages that the San administer for themselves but Khwedom concedes that finances and management will still present a challenge for some time. Other minority- comprised organisations in Botswana have identified their needs and are determined to have a voice in the body politic as well as the social stratum. One such body is the Reteng Coalition.
Reteng (‘we are here’) is a multicultural collective of four cultural voices with substantial lobbying power which affords empowerment for the San and other ethnic minorities in five distinct ways, elaborated upon (in no particular order) as follows. Most of these objectives overlap and intertwine in a practical and ethical sense. First, the Language Development program has been implemented wherein orthographies are developed. Representatives of various groups who express interest in recording language for translation work in partnership with linguists, including Lutheran bible translators. Reteng concedes that this is sometimes problematic with some representatives even though the use of English has become imperative. Also, some program proposals are ‘subject to expediency’ and have trouble being instituted into policy. This extends to San experiences in schools (one which Kiema (2010) has personally experienced and that Mokibelo (2012), among others, has extensively researched in remote areas of Botswana).

Reteng is committed to creating awareness of this issue and hopes, like Mokibelo, to have it reflected in teacher training. There is still some obstructionism from government, which correlates, in this instance with the tourism agenda.

Reteng’s Language Development program has made efforts in the Molapo region of the CKGR, the home of San spokesman Roy Sesana, who actively claims his right to live in the reserve. Sesana’s First People of the Kalahari (FPK) is an affiliate of Reteng and agrees in principle to language development in that region but a lack of funds and resources has meant only minimal advances in this endeavour to date.
The Language Development program upholds that view of language which Ngũgi Wa Thiong’o (1981) describes as the ‘collective memory bank of people’s experience in history’ (15). Ngũgi, who insists upon writing in his mother-tongue, Gikuyu, rather than in English wherever possible, asserts the power of language to carry culture which ‘embodies those moral, ethical and aesthetic values … through which they come to view themselves and their place in the universe’ (16).

Reteng made a recent proposal to government to have the news bulletin read in some minority languages, as a tangible acknowledgement of ethnic diversity in-country. There was sufficient opposition to this idea in parliament that it never eventuated. Baitotli’s view is that if such a transmission interested tourists, it would have become reality. Not to be discouraged, Reteng ratifies the UNESCO Mother Tongue Day and in keeping with this, the Botswana Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture organises a National Languages Day every February. An offshoot of this initiative is a 2014 ‘Our Languages, Our Pride’ document, a joint publication of Reteng, the Department of Youth, Sport and Culture and a group of academics from the University of Botswana.

Secondly, pride in cultural tradition is fostered by way of Reteng’s direct endorsement of regional festivals and the production of artefacts as well as organising a biennial national festival held in Gaborone in July. The national festival is supported by the Department of Youth, Sport and Culture. These platforms provide a valuable opportunity for ‘cultural resurgence’ of peoples who have for centuries been systemically debased. This pride inevitably promotes empowerment, whereby these groups can eventually hold their own festivals to generate their own income. In this way,
Vinthagen and Johansson’s ‘intersectional relation to power’ (2103) is evident. This festival showcases cuisines, several artforms and cultural practices. Groups apply as individual bodies for government funding, after having competed in various auditions at the regional level in order to qualify. There is not a great deal of material benefit as there is a certain amount allocated to each of the four groups for each festival. The benefit is derived from the ‘platform’ it affords the groups. This exposure creates ‘building blocks’ and leads to, for example, recording contracts for music performed that is evidently popular. Some onlookers, such as Bolaane (2014) are cautious about lauding the festival uncritically, noting the fact that other initiatives, such as the proposal for a minority-languages radio program have not been endorsed by government; only Setswana and English are afforded airtime in Botswana. Bolaane cites Reteng’s insistence that ‘the President’s position must be backed up by key actions and reforms. Appreciating cultural heritage of certain people does not necessarily mean the recognition of their political rights’ (50). Such a myth of national unity, projected as celebration of culture is also evident in Edward M. Bruner’s (2001) research into touristic experience and representation of the Maasai in Kenya.

Bruner cites the example of Boma, a government museum of the performing arts which seeks to present traditional Maasai life and culture as traditional, with text describing, for example, architecture ‘as built by ancestors’ and dance ‘for the preservation of Kenya Cultural Heritage’ (Boma, 2000 cited in Bruner, 2001, my italics). The word preservation, Bruner, posits ‘implies that traditional ways no longer exist, that they are in danger of disappearing, that they belonged to the ancestors’ (887).
But as a form of Resistance, official concessions for this kind of self-representation must be, as Scott (1990) recognises, ‘insisted upon from below’ otherwise it is not clear ‘why dominant groups would want to encourage anything that didn’t entirely reify or naturalize the existing social distinctions they benefit from’ (168). This necessity for socio-cultural benefits coming to the subaltern group (via realistic self-representations) alongside economic benefit is noted by Kate Finlay and Shanade Barnabas (2012). Their research in the #Khomani San community in South Africa saw locals ‘playing primitive’ in order to meet the expectations of visitors, a practice which ultimately inhibits community development. Finlay and Barnabas assert that although theoretically the community is in control, ‘their cultural representation remains nostalgic’ (p. 148). Vinthagen and Johansson note a phenomenon common to everyday forms of Resistance where the subaltern appears to be endorsing the hegemonic status quo through their participation; being so

enmeshed in the power relations/discourse, seemingly more so than open resistance. It resists only bits and pieces of the power, and is never fully outside of the network of powers. Therefore “everyday resistance” is necessarily contradictory – both subordinate and rebellious at the same time (2013: 37).

It is to be hoped that from the vantage point of the festivals, ethnic minorities, including the San can influence policy from the ground up and hold political leadership to account so that the practice of narrative performance veiling reality is exposed: ‘the contradiction between an ideology of equality and an actuality of discrimination’ (Bruner, 2001: 900).
In the third place, research is a significant objective of Reteng; to preserve language and culture for use in academia as well as social domains. This ‘arm’ of the Reteng charter is not so formalised as yet, but each group recognised by the coalition is encouraged to record their own stories in a vision to create a more inclusive national story. This is a way of circumventing bureaucratic obstacles. To this point in a continuing process of awareness-building, Reteng is encouraged by the fact that the Ministry of Youth, Sport and Culture has been supportive of its aims, in accordance with the UNESCO initiative of preserving ‘intangible cultural heritage’.

Fourthly, Reteng is committed to Human Rights and advocacy. All Reteng’s objectives are human rights based but itemises particular issues at this point, where Reteng has lobbied government successfully in the legal domain, for an accused speaking a San or other minority language and unable to speak Setswana or English, interpreters are made available. Reteng envisages a time where, with an overarching language policy that recognises all languages spoken in-country, a coordinated process could see appeals against sentences on the grounds of arrests and sentences of minority language speakers being made in English or Setswana. In this way, language policy would inform various facets of society.

Reteng empowers traditional leaders on various aspects of gender, cultural development, HIV, human rights and governance, carrying out interviews to ascertain worldviews, values, and prior understandings, and to identify training needs in communities. Ndana and other board members of Reteng, feel thwarted by limited funding at times, so that initiatives are sometimes rendered impossible, at least in the short term. But the coalition is grateful for the occasional support of organisations with similar values, such as
the endorsement of the Raaul Institute in Sweden which supported the ‘Women for Change’ seminar. In a specifically San outreach, a Reteng and Khwedom Council workshop went into a relocation settlement of Xere, a village about ten kilometres from Reikops in the CKGR where the San chief was asked to specify initiatives that would benefit his community. The thinking behind this is that if chiefs are empowered sufficiently and dispense justice, fundamental human rights are upheld more effectively.

Finally, networking is an ongoing aim of Reteng, maintaining links with the Department of Youth, Sport and Culture, Women for Change, Ditshwanelo, BOCONGO, San Research Centre and other stakeholders. The general thrust of this objective is that communities themselves become key agents of change and where possible leaders must be engaged in becoming aware of their rights. The coalition remains committed to supporting such community-based initiatives.

It is possible to interpret government assistance (in the form of cultural festivals, Presidential awards, zoned areas and associated ecologists) with some cynicism, especially in light of Hiri and Mokibelo’s assertion (2012) that international pressure has been brought to bear on the Government of Botswana. It brings to mind Antonio Gramsci’s (1971) recognition that the hegemonic group realises the expediency of making economic-corporate sacrifices as well as symbolic ones if it is to gain compliance from subordinate groups, thereby to maintain ‘equilibria’. The economic and symbolic outcomes of these initiatives have positive potential for the San and are obviously growing in influence. The problem arises when the token is deemed sufficient by the dominant group in a ‘feelgood’ gesture which ultimately denies the more substantial
sacrifices they must make to effect social equity, particularly as regards the CKGR. Such issues as surreal in both rhetoric and promotional events are exposed through rigorous research, preferably from within; that is, not cowed by government or industry censure.

**Research with - and by the San**

Although, as Alan Barnard (2007) acknowledges, there was a move towards reflexivity in anthropology from the 1970s, giving ‘voice to the other’ (131) – an undoubtedly well-meaning phrase which nevertheless *in itself* ‘others’ the subaltern – and such narratives are now common within texts featuring the San in Botswana, including Le Roux and White’s *Voices of the San* (2004) a text oft-cited in this thesis, this does not constitute self-representation and inherent tensions, even within respectful reflexive ethnography, are evident. Academic investigation too (some cited herein, with my qualification) can unwittingly confirm the imperative for San research into their own affairs. Bolaane’s 2014 research into San employment in tourism, for example, uncritically endorses the rhetoric of philanthropy espoused by (non-San owned) Gantsi Craft and Molape Kalahari Lodge, while Zeppel (2007) apparently accepts the assertions of non-exploitation and San ownership made by Ghanzi Trailblazers; a claim countered (with evidence) by Khwedem Council.

The necessity for research *with* and autonomously *by* the San, rather than of the San as has been the case, is strongly endorsed by the University of Botswana’s San Research Centre which advocates not simply taking information but working as partners in research. In keeping with these ideals, the San Youth Capacity Building Project (SYCB) was initiated in 2005.
The fact that the University of Trømso has now largely withdrawn from its (San) research and capacity-building partnership with the University of Botswana and the latter is now the sole custodian of these research projects presents a challenge but, it is hoped, more autonomy. The San Research Centre upholds the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between the University of Botswana and the KFO for management and leadership development policy to develop San working for the organisation to the level of management and leadership. In *N#oahn Newsletter* (April 2010) Mogalakwe writes: ‘[t]his partnership has now resulted in securing funding ... for capacity-building and related issues ... This has also given way to the establishment of research teams designed to examine issues of language and education for the San in the region’ (15).

Partnerships have also been established with the University of the Free State (UFS) in South Africa and The Centre for the Advanced Studies of Africa Society (CASAS). Dennis Kwek (2003) argues for the importance of academic inclusivity as an adjunct to Resistance in the form of

a small (but hopefully increasing) number of research voices appearing from the horizons of marginality that challenge and engage with Western management thought. Such voices bring to the center of mainstream knowledge production alternative understandings that set up a location for decolonization and the development of counter-hegemonic ways of knowing and being (in Prasad, 2003: 140).

Indeed, according to a 2010 publication of the Kuru Family of Organizations (Stewart and Hays, eds.) the espoused ‘strategies for the way forward’ include the necessity to conduct research that will
‘contribute to practical initiatives aimed at meeting needs on the ground that will further goals that San individual themselves define’ (17). The compelling feature of this publication is that it contains San voices, individuals collaborating with researchers to suggest a more positive future.

One such voice is that of Bihela Sekere, who wants his people to be proactive: ‘[w]hat are we doing? It will not serve any purpose if we get degrees and don’t do anything … ‘How are you going to give back to the community?’ That is a big challenge. I will try to do it, and I am doing it now’ (5). And Xukuri Dako, in the same publication, says, ‘[w]hat we want to do is just to mobilise. I want to say to San youth: If others can manage it, why not you? Kuela [Kiema], Bihela, myself – if we can do it, others can too’ (7). The Management and Leadership Development Program (under KFO) has training San youth to be future leaders as its main objective by way of in-service workshops and trade and academic support.

Nthomang (2006) in a special issue of *PULA, Botswana Journal of African Studies* devoted to the San, also recognises a relationship between years of disempowerment with the attendant self-esteem issues, and a lack of research with the San:

[t]he expression research with the [San] was a result of the concern that there is wide misrepresentation of the Khoesan’s cultures and circumstances by academic researchers. Consequently, over the years, it became obvious that conducting research for the Khoesan did not transform their marginality in society hence the need to add another dimension to the programme. The latter focused on education and capacity building for young Khoesan so that they could in future conduct their own research. Thus, ‘with’ and not ‘for’ the Khoesan became the working framework. Yet UBTrømso recognizes and
acknowledges that in this volume not a single article is authored or co-authored by a Khoesan person. This is not by design but a reflection of centuries of marginalization (104).

Simpson quotes an Aboriginal Australian member of the committee involved in the establishment of a community-based Aboriginal research unit at the University of Adelaide who expressed this frustration: ‘[w]e are tired of being researched; we want to be in the research ourselves, to have a say in what needs to be studied’ (130). By way of Resistance to the the marginalising effect of external research, ‘the involvement of members of ethnic groups, as partners in the planning process, as advisors and as staff members, has come to be one of the major issues facing the museum profession in recent years’ (11-12).

Kuru Family of Organisations (KFO) collaborates with the San Research Centre (SRC), a centre for capacity-building and research at the University of Botswana. The name of the centre itself is has now changed; formerly the Research Centre for San Studies (semantically suggesting research of San) to San Research Centre, connoting more San autonomy (research with- and by San). According to the Research Centre’s Nhooahn Newsletter (April 2010) an identified ‘target group’ comprises San students at postgraduate level, with a small number sent to Norway or Sweden to undertake studies (including Dithunya Lekoa, whose research features in this thesis). With the example of the Saami people in Norway as inspiration and the University of Trømso’s Centre of Saami Studies, objectives have been written into the SRC charter ensuring that more San students will be represented at this academic level. The newsletter showcases five Botswana San students pursuing postgraduate studies with the assistance of financial and educational support from, among other agencies Norwegian
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Church Aid. Areas of study include Development Studies, Humanities, Human Resources Management and Political Science and Administration. The commentary reads:

[The empowerment of San youth is sent to be essential for their involvement in the development of their communities, and the future sustainability of the San development programmes across the region ... many San youths ... have been assisted and the programme continues to receive applications from candidates for sponsorship (9).]

Born in the CKGR and relocated to New Xade as a child, now holding a Bachelor of Arts, Tshisimogo Lesley Leepang tells his story in the N#oahn Newsletter (April 2010):

[After I failed English it became difficult to apply for my tertiary education, so I visited Mr Kuela Kiema who was working for the KFO ... [he] informed me that ... the Education Outreach Officer of UBTrømso was coming to share a few things with the San youths who have not made it to both senior and tertiary level ... I was advised to upgrade my [secondary] results which I did ... I used to travel to places ... including New Xade ... [and Namibia] to see how some San people in that area are living. After this trip I became even more interested in the San issues than before (11).]

The testimonies above establish that there is no doubt many members of the San community in the settlements outside the CKGR have benefitted from the assistance of the KFO and its affiliated trusts. However, as with many such NGOs, there is a lack of complete transparency and the necessity for accountability is paramount. In response, the Botswana Khwedom Council has come forward with a mandate for change, acknowledging the positive work KFO has done and committing to better accountability and collaboration between stakeholders. Both accountability and
collaboration can be most effective when held up for the scrutiny of the global community via the worldwideweb.

**Internet outreach Resistances**

Reteng Multicultural Coalition of Botswana, is encouraged by the fact that with the advent of the worldwideweb, the winners of Presidential competitions that form the culmination of the biennial cultural festival and the talent unearthed during the event are accessible to the global village and anticipates a positive future whereby ethnic minorities are proud and empowered by way of social media and information websites. Awareness-raising is of high importance also. This entry was posted from a San person who refused to relocate from the CKGR:

Some of us have gone back to our land inside the CKGR. We suffer a lot of harassment. We are too afraid to show our photographs, but here are some of the words we want to share with the outside world. I am happy here, no problem, but government is the problem that is troubling me. I am sad about what the government are doing. They ask us to go to New Xade but we don’t want to go. The government take all my children. I am lonely as I have no one to accompany me. What I want is my children to be brought back.

(www.iwant2gohome.org/quotes3.htm)

Calling upon the universality of the struggle, the soliciting of celebrity to endorse San resistance is evident with the help of Bishop Desmond Tutu, similar to the support of Pilkington Garimara, although in this case borne of San initiative and certainly of higher international status. Tutu’s standing in the world and his outspokenness on human rights issues highlights the universality of the San’s position drawn through comparisons to other contexts in this appeal to action on the same website:
The San Bushmen represent a 100,000 year-old culture that we should consider one of the world’s treasures. And while progress is necessary, it cannot be that the only way to achieve progress is to remove the San from their ancestral lands and drive their traditions away ... When a culture is destroyed in the name of progress, it is not progress, it is a loss for our world. Hundreds of thousands of years of wisdom, knowledge of nature, medicines, and ways of living together, go with them. I am concerned by reports from journalists that the San have been forcibly removed from their ancestral lands and placed in resettlement camps under unacceptable living conditions, and that those resisting resettlement have been abused, cut off from food and water, and deprived of their most basic human rights. Alcoholism, prostitution and AIDS have become issues with the San for the first time in their existence. I am concerned about reports that journalists have been cut off from the areas where the resettlement of the San is taking place ... The Botswana Government has always been for us a showcase democracy in the way that it cares for its people. I appeal to them, and the world, to find new ways to help solve these issues in a manner that respects the lovely, spiritual culture of the San Bushmen and that truly cares for all of the people of Africa, especially its oldest inhabitants.

Such ‘celebrity’ non-San endorsement as Tutu’s is powerful, but San issues aired by San themselves via social media are on the increase. Following the inaugural meeting of the San Youth Network of Khwedom Council in December 2013, representatives were interviewed for radio and newspaper and this lead to the establishment of a Facebook page for Khwedom council and its San Youth Network. The universal reach of such social networking means that Khwedom Council’s vision that the stereotyping (and attendant discrimination) of San as ‘just cattlemen’ in their own country and as primordial, infantilised, romantic commodities as perpetuated though tourist channels, will eventually be overcome.
The affordable and wide-ranging nature of social media means that lobbying is happening ‘underground’ to an extent. Khwedom Council is donor-based, as is the Research Centre for San Studies and, as a result, often not sustainable. The internet outreach is helping in this regard until such time as the economic empowerment and education of the San can support its own cause by paying a subscription to Khwedom and other San bodies. The internet is also a platform whereby people officially reclaiming their San names are encouraged and the orthography of the characteristic San click phonology can be widely conveyed.

**Orthography and naming**

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (1985) cites author Jean Rhys as suggesting that ‘so intimate a thing as personal and human identity might be determined by the politics of imperialism’ (52). However, the San are now asserting their rights to the representations of their own languages orthographically. Antjie Krog (2004) claims that ‘[d]iacritical signs [are] used … not so much for reasons of pronunciation but out of respect for the culture … [and] ‘to remind readers that they are dealing with a language which cannot easily be accommodated within a western framework’ (10). This is beginning to occur among some San in Botswana.

In 2011 Xukuri Xukuri, formerly of D’Kar, studying at the University of Botswana, insisted on the orthography and naming that most accurately represents his San heritage and applied to the Government of Botswana for a formal change of name reflecting this. Below is his correspondence to friends and colleagues:

Dear Ladies and Gentlemen, I am pleased to inform you that the government has finally authorized me to
assume my new surname, so I will be Xukuri Xukuri, this came after I applied for surname change this year around May with some concrete reasons ... Hope you will appreciate this and join me to welcome this new changes (sic) to my life because I was doing this for my own good and of course for my family members who were part of this whole process.

Reproduced with permission from Xukuri Xukuri (September 15, 2011).

Xukuri received a response the same day:

Congratulations Mr X. Xukuri for the success in your surname change. I wish other San people wishing to change their names and reclaim their identity, could do so ... I once worked with the XaiXai community of Ju//xwasi ... and it still pains me to remember how they responded when we asked them why most of them, especially the middle aged had Tswana names ... They said some people who came to register them ... could not spell their names and asked them to explain what those names meant and wrote what they thought was the Setswana translation of their names.

Another comment comes from a representative of the Naro Language Project, a mother-tongue initiative in the Ghanzi area: ‘[w]e commend you in taking pride in your Naro name, so when making a change you didn’t change to a Tswana name but you kept and even strengthened your Naro heritage: you show TWICE that you are a Naro person!’

This decision inspired several other San who had been answering to Tswana or even English names bestowed on them by employers and officials, even missionaries and NGO operatives who claimed they could not pronounce San names.
This chapter defines Resistance as it is manifest in self-representations of the Botswana San. It shows a range of Resistance types that can be deemed a ‘hidden transcript’ manifest as artistic renderings, museological practices and research parameters that are beginning to entice a more informed tourist clientele. It also identifies strategies, including re-naming, orthographic translations/parallel text and internet outreaches that are finding a foothold in Botswana in subtle, imaginative and non-confrontational forms. All these measures anticipate an increasing autonomy by way of these self-generated re-drawings.
Conclusion: ‘We make change that matters’.

This thesis, by way of textual analysis demonstrates the myriad commercial representations of the Botswana San produced without their authorisation and it argues for the inherent symbolic capacity of such imagery and rhetoric to perpetuate disenfranchisement. It also showed the antithesis of this correlation, through a San capacity to generate self-representations, a byproduct of which is pride in heritage and a rising independence.

After providing background to my particular interest in this area, I acknowledge research into San self-representation characterised by their representing themselves as hunter-gatherers for tourist purposes in the Okavango region (Taylor, 2000). I go on to foreground the research opportunity available for investigation of a link between the traditional, externally-produced drawing of the San in this way and their socio-political disempowerment, set against autonomously-produced representations wherein the San re-draw their status as modern peoples with a proud heritage.

Chapter One establishes the context, whereby the San’s place in the southern African region is positioned demonstrably along a continuum of marginalisation and exploitation from an era well before the arrival of Europeans. I situate myself as a Western, non-Indigenous researcher investigating a non-Western, Indigenous context and discussed some of the philosophical (Urry, 1990, Pratt, 1990, McCannell, 1984, Connell, 2007) and practical (Hays, 2007) dilemmas that surround that enterprise. An insight into methods and effectiveness of advocacy campaigns, particularly those of Survival International, emanating from the recent evictions from the CKGR is provided. The concepts of Indigeneity, nomenclature and
self-determination are also articulated at this point in terms of my purposes in this thesis. I also signpost the later coverage of Resistance typology, justifying the limitation of its parameters for the Botswana context.

Indigeneity is defined for use in this thesis based on my scepticism around the exclusionary political interpretations of the term (see Hall, 1989) and critiqued as ‘Fourth World’ theory (see Sylvain, 2005). I define the term to privilege the San’s ‘First Peoples’ status, endorsed by Saugestad (1997), Barnard (2006) and by organisations such as the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC, 2004) and the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA).

The nomenclature is selected advisedly; based on research into the etymology and current usage of the various names attributed to the peoples here researched. Currently, there is no ‘ideal’ collective name for the groups with whom I am concerned in this project and ‘San’ has been upheld as the least offensive and most recognisable of the options available (Kiema, 2010; Le Roux and White, 2004) since to use names for distinct language groups would complicate a project such as this one.

There are myriad definitions and manifestations of self-determination and for my purposes in this thesis I define this concept legally in terms of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights, with tourism practices particularly assumed within the definition. Affiliation with such a self-determination frameworks rejects simplified binaries of ‘them and us’ and agendas of hegemonic reversal. Rather, it favours a ‘horizontal political culture’ (see Dellacoppia, 2009: 22)
wherein autonomy can be realised from within marginalised groups, to broaden their systemic representation and rights.

The second chapter provides an overview of the already extensive research into the social and political place of the San throughout history in anthropological and, since the recent evictions, political terms, and offers a hitherto unexplored perspective on their representation; that of tourism text as agents of (dis)empowerment. I categorise the review of literature into the various representations spanning several decades of writings on the San: the San as children (for example, Hays, 2007); as victims (for example, Mmila and Janie, 2006; Mphinyane, 2006); as ‘less than’ (for example, Morapedi, 2006; Bennun, 2004); as doomed race (for example, Cook and Sarkin, 2009); as agitators for change (for example, Mogalakwe, 2010; Dow, 2005), and as hyper-real commodity (Lekoa, 2007; Groenwald, 2008). These categories are fluid, naturally occurring in a range of combinations as the literature review and later text analysis demonstrated.

Chapter Two also justifies the framework of postcolonial theory, based on an assertion that the Botswana San context manifests neo-colonial power relations, which Mishra and Hodge (2005) and Mogalakwe (2003) show to be merely replacing the old colonial order with another form of domination, or bourgeois nationalism; one established and endorsed by the departing colonial authority. I justify my use David Spurr’s *The Rhetoric of Empire* (1993) as an organisational tool since his categories of colonial thought and action, also summarised in this chapter, are all present in a range of configurations across the exemplars of tourism representation analysed.
This theoretical structure is justified as being supported by semiotics and post-tourism critique, with which I demonstrate a corollary between representation and (dis)empowerment in subsequent chapters. Semiotics and discourse analysis allow for a view of texts that ‘challeng[es] the literal’ (Chandler, 2007: 129) by deconstructing linguistic and visual elements of text that lend themselves to interpretation, always revealing interest, well-meaning or otherwise.

Tourists, as the target audience for the kinds of texts here analysed, are defined in two ways for this enterprise in Chapter Two; first as they would be shown in Chapters Three and Four and secondly as they are shown to be in Chapter Five. The first group, or ‘cultural tourists’ seek ‘vanishing worlds, endangered species’ (Holland and Huggan, 2000: 178) and ingenuously accept the rhetoric and imagery as it pertains to the San, produced and disseminated by the tourist industry. The credulousness of such tourists in the Botswana San context is evident by way of a collection of tourist blogs and Lekoa’s (2007) research. The second group is made up of ‘justice’ (or ‘political’) tourists who wish to make a difference, and/or those who are simply more enlightened because, skeptically critiquing the motives and methods of government and industry, they naturally ask more questions. Moynah (2008) describes this group as those who ‘travel and write against the grain of [their] privilege’ (6).

Chapters Three and Four present exemplars of literary and visual representations (respectively) of the San in Botswana, produced for tourist consumption and without San authorisation.

Chapter Three picks up the same representational categories (The San as children, etc) identified in the Review of Literature in Chapter Two, and applies literary texts to their distinctions. At this point I
interrogate the assumptions and prejudices (subtle and overt) inherent to the San’s literary depictions. Literary texts analysed include tourist industry publications, a fiction series, poetry and tourist blogs. The first eleven of David Spurr’s (1998) categories of a colonial weltanschauung are applied to these texts. These tropes, as with the aforementioned representational categories, often operate in an interdependent manner, overlapping at several points.

Representations include those demonstrating (apparently) benign extended Negation such as McCall Smith’s treatment of his young San characters throughout his fiction series where I read the children’s peripheral and fostered status as metaphorical of the infantilised place in the socio-political fabric of modern Botswana. The children’s Tswana names stand as one example of this Negation of their San status. Aestheticization features in the act of Precious looking at Puso while he sleeps, the gaze metaphorically showing her jurisdiction over him, allowing him no agency, despite the obvious affection in which he and his sister are held.

Blogs by tourists provide further examples of Idealization. Many unquestioningly accept the tourist industry’s primordialist representations and place the San on a spiritual and ecological ‘pedestal’ comparative to Western consumerism, superficiality and waste: ‘what have we become?’ (2009, [https://www.facebook.com/video](https://www.facebook.com/video), accessed 4/7/2013). Equally successful in a commercial sense, Affirmation of modern consumerism simultaneous with San primordialism is captured in the promotional homily of a safari company (2009) which offers: ‘[o]ld world values, modern comfort’ ([www.johnchasesafaris.com](http://www.johnchasesafaris.com), accessed 3/5/2011); the old world values’ referring to the constructed package of San cultural experiences offered to tourists.
Chapter Three also gives examples of calculated Negation in tourist publications: ‘before the [Europeans’] arrival, of course, the area was inhabited by San (Discover Botswana, 2009: 70)). Negation is also evident through for example, Laurens van der Post’s designation of ‘the Bushman’ (1958) whom he claims to love but who apparently has no name! The ‘animalistic’ suggestion of the San as a circus beast performing tricks for van der Post’s friends can extend Negation to a form of Debasement, more overtly expressed in Seretse’s historical depictions (‘I long for the good old days when Masarwa knew their place’ 2008: 23). Debasement of self due to being San is epitomised by young Puso’s feeble suicide attempt (McCall Smith: 2008). Paternalistic Eroticization is also evident in Laurens van der Post’s descriptions of his servant: ‘his smooth supple buttocks joined his supple legs’ (ibid:13); a representation still pictorially pervasive in magazines produced for tourist consumption.

Ingenuous Idealization is evident, among other verbal indicators, through the use of present tense in tourist blogs (‘It was really very very interesting to learn about how the bushmen survive in such an arid region’, 2013, my italics).

Chapter Four employs semiotic tools of analysis alongside Spurr’s first eleven tropes to demonstrate the manner in which visual text can work to undermine the San’s place in modern Botswana by effectively keeping them shackled to the past through, among other methods, Aestheticized, Naturalized and Insubstantialized depictions of San as mythical and primordial (by way of techniques such as silhouette) and as childlike by way of relative sizing, among many other symbolic modes. Representation types in this chapter include photography; arts and crafts; visuals in tourism literature; the trance dance and a
popular film that, although decades old, remains a sole reference point about the San for many tourists.

For example, in one image in a tourist magazine, hyenas’ faces and blades of grass are in sharp focus, and in a larger frame, set against the smaller, soft-focus of the San. This I read as code suggesting the San as an imaginary, in the vein of Spurr’s notion of *Insubstantialization*. The trance-dance also lends itself to interpretations of *Insubstantialization*, with the San as esoteric beings from another time, and *Idealization* by way of a perception of the San existing on an elevated spiritual plane. Conversely, the hyper-ventilation and falling that sometimes occurs within performances of the trance-dance cause some tourists distress, leading to a *Debasement* of the San as being irrational, occultish, out of control.

*Erotocization* is manifest alongside implied * Appropriation* in this chapter through the manner in which San models are depicted in high-end catalogues, predominantly for the consumption of the affluent tourist, showcasing jewellery made from ostrich-shell. In muted background the desert is relegated to a ‘hazy’ distant past suggesting the San must leave that life behind in favour of a materialistic present outside the desert; an unarticulated reality that conveniently leaves the desert available to commercial interests. The imagery and body language is sexualised in terms of pose and facial expression (or lack thereof!), the main photograph featuring a model with no expression due to only the lower part of the face showing in the image. In this way, the San women are commodified within a framework of Western values.

There is no successful communication between Xi, the San protagonist of *The Gods Must be Crazy* and other humans in the film,
yet he has no problem at all conversing with a monkey. This can be read as a case of Darwinian Classification, implying that the San are lower on the evolutionary scale than the other characters despite (as with the children in McCall Smith’s series) Xi being drawn as a sympathetic character whom the audience is positioned to love. Even M’pudi, who knows one San language, translates Xi in a literal, Western manner (also Negating San cultural diversity by essentialising across all language groups) thereby rendering reflexivity ineffective. This drawing is generally accurate as a metaphor for the San’s status in Botswana, and while it is not an intercultural dynamic endorsed by the film-makers, the film is still demonstrably read as being literally reflective of San reality by the majority of those whom it entices to visit Botswana.

In Chapter Five, less limiting and therefore more empowering representations of the San created by the San themselves are provided. I foreground the potential for San agency via self-representation, particularly in the tourism domain. The chapter shows examples of the San’s creative, non-confrontational self-representation to be a form of Spurr’s final trope: Resistance. Resistance theory as it applies to this context was overviewed in this area, by way of demonstrating the various types of Resistance that could and could not be practicably implemented in Botswana. This is further narrowed to a specifically tourism domain. In Botswana, I posit that Vinthagen and Johansson’s (2013) paraphrasing of Scott’s (1885) categories of Resistance is appropriate to the context; that is, art and other media employed by the San constitute ‘disguised discourses of dignity’ (5). By way of an imaginative reinscribing and reinterpretation of their history and culture, the San present a challenge to the hegemonic paradigm in Botswana and demonstrate the power of such text to engender self-respect and
autonomy. Political or justice tourists are a significant part of this enterprise, since they are the buyers of the new artistic representations, the audiences at performances and the receivers of internet outreaches, thereby strengthening the status of their consumption as Resistance.

This challenge is made by way of textual and performative platforms as well as the opening up of new research opportunities. Exemplars of such Resistances are manifest – or are at least gaining some traction – in living museums (Hiri and Mokibelo 2012), based on the Namibian model, commercial outlets such as Thapong Visual Arts Centre in Gaborone, and in performance at annual festivals, as well as recent San representation at a United Nations forum in 2012. More subtle forms are manifest in some San reclaiming their tribal names.

All representations are serving to incrementally raise awareness of San realities in modern Botswana, and as a result some San are overturning a long-entrenched perception of their status as ‘less than’ and finding a pride in their heritage through their own efforts, rather than with the aid of external bodies. Khwedom Council, the San Research Centre and Reteng have made significant contributions to this outcome by way of language programs, sponsorships of regional competitions and orthographic translations of text. Some San have become influential to others by way of artistic and educational achievement and mentorship.

The findings of this chapter herald an optimistic future for the San in Botswana; one in which San groups can express autonomous voices in society and government and in which they themselves decide which elements of their ancient culture they wish to incorporate into their modern identities.
Returning to David Spurr whose ‘inventory’ (184) of colonial thought and action underpins this thesis, the ethnographic authority for San texts is replacing, as Spurr cites James Clifford, the ‘older model of monologic authority where the ethnographer remains in control of the representation of the dialogue’ (188). Resistance by way of self-representation is becoming increasingly prevalent among the San in Botswana. John von Strumer (2014) calls up the argument that:

being and experience themselves are mediated more and more by the word/image – to the extent that primary experience has not just been relegated to a secondary position but forgotten entirely. The attempts to retrieve it have tended to be on the side of the wildly excessive and/or ‘programmatic – treating experience as a class of experience or as a project. Can writing itself be constituted as a field of primary experiencing? Are there ways of writing to the state that can resurrect the vitality and immediacy of lived experience in the face of the taming tendencies of the administrative order? (from an address to the Institute of Postcolonial Studies, Melbourne Australia, September, 2014).

Extending von Strummer’s ‘writing’ to encompass all representative media, I respond to his questions in the affirmative in the Botswana San context. The San have, for centuries, been subject to prejudice, exclusion and servitude at the hands of more dominant groups. I set out in my research to reveal the long-standing disconnect between the ‘official transcripts’ as regards the San and their realities in modern Botswana. To this end, I deconstructed the semantics and semiotics evident in public domain representations of the San of the Kalahari region. After establishing the San’s position historically, socially and politically, I justified my analysis within a postcolonial paradigm due to my drawing of the San relative to the dominant
regime as neo-colonial in both essence and effect. I investigated the motives and techniques of many tourism providers and the impacts that pictorial, performative and rhetorical discourses have upon tourists and the San peoples themselves. In keeping with Spurr’s (1993) placement of Resistance as the final trope of his colonialist continuum, this trope was afforded an isolated chapter in recognition of San political agitation and tangible self-representation which is beginning to engender autonomy and recognition alongside externally produced paradigms.

A final word
Since self-representation and burgeoning self-determination are the identified, celebrated, and anticipated ideals of this thesis, the final words should not be mine but rather words of pride in the past, strength in the present and hope for the future, expressed in a San voice. Assertive pride is the overwhelming tone of the following poem, and a voice of solidarity that does not advocate violence. Repetition of the couplet that closes each stanza: ‘[n]o one shall take our harvest / or sit atop our dunes’ drives home a sense of determination and Resistance against the interests of external Appropriation.

The ‘Kalahari zephyr’ in the fourth stanza can be interpreted as a reference to the three destructive clearances of San from the CKGR by government officials in 1997, 2002 and 2005. Braam Le Roux, pastor and San advocate, now deceased, was the founder, along with his wife, of the KFO and is the only non-San among those to whom Morris’s poem is dedicated, although he has long been deemed an ‘honorary San’ and his death was mourned by many in the Botswana San community. Job Morris of D’Kar dedicates his poem Sons of the Kalahari Desert* to ‘my fellow San i.e, Xukuri Xukuri,
Sons of the dunes of the Kalahari Desert,
Children of the tuber and honey,
Breed of the ancient mankind,
Children of our fathers before us,
We stand firm and never intimidated,
Whatever the argument may be,
No one shall take our harvest,
Or sit atop our dunes.

Our women shall march in honour,
Our children shall know no chain,
Our men shall march with pride and security,
This land, that is ours forever,
The invader shall be stroked with shame.
Cukuri…Braam…Kuela…John…Komtsha and Roy…
Could our fight fail?
No one shall take our harvest,
Or sit atop our dunes.

So sing and dance fellow men of the wind,
Sing when the sun goes down,
Wherever the guns may thunder,
Or cars rumble their engines to take us away,
Born of the soil and the whirlwind,
Though death itself may be feared,
No one shall take our harvest
Or sit atop our dunes.

We are the sons of the Kalahari,
of the men who hunted on the land,
We are the sons of the women,
Who walked with them hand in hand,
And we swear by the dead who bore us,
By the heroes who perished in the Kalahari zephyr,
No one shall take our harvest,
Or sit atop our dunes.

*Morris’s poem is reproduced with his permission. It was composed for- and is quoted from the program of OSISA conference, Gaborone, September, 2011.
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