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The terms *indigenous rights* and *post-apartheid* raise a number of questions in the context of southern Africa. The situation with rights is straightforward enough: we know that South Africa has been grossly deficient in upholding those (at least until 1994); but what about indigenous rights? What exactly does *indigenous* mean in the South African context? And how do we gloss *post-Apartheid* in South Africa, since the laws are no longer on the books but the structural violence instituted by apartheid still affects the lives of millions of people?

To start untangling the conundrums, I will begin from the premise that a complex terrain of struggle exists today at many levels in South Africa and its former satellites. The primary contradiction is, of course, the three-hundred-year struggle of African peoples against expropriation, racism, oppression, and underdevelopment under the European colonialists. But within that broad canvas are woven the strands of many smaller struggles by local groupings in specific historical circumstances.

One of the most interesting of these strands is the issue of Khoisan history and identity: how these have been constructed by Khoi and San themselves and by others in colonial and modern South Africa, and how the present government and emerging civil society of South Africa is searching for new approaches to a very old issue. So this is a story—actually, several stories—about the politics of identity in the era of apartheid and about the reconstruction of identities and the realignment of forces in the post-apartheid period.

If we draw a line north to south from the Zambezi River to the Indian Ocean, bisecting the subcontinent into two equal portions (see map 2.1), we find that—both precolonially and today—90 percent of the population lives in the eastern half of the subcontinent and only 10 per-
cent in the west. With the exception of Cape Town and its surrounding districts, the western half of southern Africa consists largely of the Karoo and the Kalahari, two vast, starkly beautiful, and sparsely populated semideserts. Precolonially, this north-south line marked a major ethnocultural division: between the Bantu-speaking peoples in the eastern half and the far less numerous Khoisan peoples in the west. The term *Khoisan* is a neologism, coined in the twentieth century and used to describe two related peoples: the pastoral Khoi, or “Hottentots,” and the hunting and gathering San, or “Bushmen.”

There is a series of complex links between San and Khoi, but the focus here is on the links between the historic Khoisan and their twentieth-century descendants, the deracinated and proletarianized people called Coloureds in South Africa’s racialized terminology. The Khoi and especially the San are known to us largely through an ethnographic discourse, while the Coloured appear primarily in the sociological and political treatises on Apartheid. This chapter explores these
links between ancestors and descendants and between ethnographic and sociological discourses.

Khoisan peoples form a linguistically and physically distinct population within Africa. Their archaeological associations have significant time depths linked to Later Stone Age hunting and gathering cultures that are millennia old. They formerly occupied the whole of southern Africa, both east and west. Their legacy can be found in magnificent rock art the length and breadth of the subcontinent. Sometime in the first millennium B.C., some of these people obtained sheep, goats, and later cattle, while others continued to hunt and gather—the origin of the distinction between the pastoral Khoi and the foraging San. The two categories are far from watertight, and the historical relations between them are complex. For the moment, we will focus our attention on the people known as San or Bushmen.

With the entrance of Bantu-speaking peoples with domestic sheep and pottery, and later iron and cattle, as early as the first century A.D., the character of southern African populations changed further (Nurse and Jenkins 1977). But even during the last two millennia, the Bushmen have been the exclusive occupants of significant portions of southern Africa, living as autonomous hunter-gatherers in parts of the Karoo, Kalahari, and Namib deserts (Solway and Lee 1990). For much of this period there is evidence of trade relations between the San peoples and their non-San neighbors (Phillipson 1985; Wilmsen 1989; Wilmsen and Denbow 1990). To the southwest they interacted with the related Khoi (Hottentot) pastoralists, from whom they differentiated linguistically sometime before the first millennium A.D.; in fact, well over half of all the San today speak Khoi languages (Silberbauer 1981; Tanaka 1989). In the east and southeast, Khoisan peoples coexisted with, intermarried with, and were eventually assimilated to the powerful Bantu-speaking chiefdoms that now form the bulk of South Africa’s population. The standard explanation for the numerous click sounds found in modern Zulu, Swazi, and Xhosa is the linguistic influence of click speakers, assumed to be female, intermarrying with Bantu speakers and passing on the clicks to their offspring.¹

The colonial period—initiated in 1652 with the arrival of Jan van Riebeeck at the Cape of Good Hope—placed enormous pressures on Khoisan inside the Cape Colony and the later Boer republics. Bushman peoples played a major role in the colonial history of South Africa. They met the early explorers at the Cape, guided them into the interior, and later fought tenaciously to preserve their land in the face of European expansion (Wright 1971; Marks 1972; Elphick 1977).
As graphically described in a famous article by Shula Marks (1972), the San of the western Cape were hounded by waves of white settlers and were driven further and further north into the desert. In retaliation, they raided the invaders’ cattle, provoking further armed assaults by the notorious Boer “Commandos” of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. By the twentieth century, the living, breathing San people had become largely a matter of memory overlaid with a thickening accretion of myth.

Ironically, it was only after the San ceased to be a military threat that San art, myth, and folklore became part of the cultural imagination of the region’s peoples, both black and white. Bushman themes are inscribed in the South African historical and literary canon, in the works of such writers as W. H. I. Bleek and Lucy Lloyd (1911), Eugène Marais (1969), J. M. Stow (1905), George McCall Theal (1888–93, 1915–26), and Laurens van der Post (1958, 1961). And today Bushman themes provide a seemingly inexhaustible source of inspiration for South African artists, poets, and writers ranging from the internationally known Pippa Skotnes to anonymous black artists peddling their wares on the streets of Cape Town.²

Beyond South Africa’s borders, leather-clad hunter-gatherers identifying themselves as Bushmen persisted into the twentieth century; many had a very different and far less traumatic experience at the hands of the imperialists. But within South Africa, what happened to the San people themselves, as distinguished from their mythologized legacy? The conventional wisdom is that as a result of the horrors of the Commando period, the Bushman people were exterminated in South Africa proper. But this is not strictly true. The South African historian Nigel Penn (1999) and the Swiss-Hungarian anthropologist Miklos Szalay (1995) have documented what we have long known to be the case: that many of the Coloured of today must have had Bushman ancestors. Szalay notes that while thousands of San were exterminated,

[t]he documentary evidence suggests that a much higher percentage of San . . . have been incorporated into colonial society. “Bushmen” who had lived on the farm for an extended period were . . . no longer called such. They were considered “Hottentots,” and appear, as do their descendants, in the documents as “Hottentots.” The “Bushmen” after their incorporation into the colony as “Hottentots” and later “Coloureds,” were no longer visible to the casual observer. (109)
Where are all these people, and can any of the present-day Coloureds trace their heritage? The historical transitions from San to Hottentot and from Hottentot to Coloured represent one of the most intriguing examples of ethnic transformation and the emergence of new identities in southern Africa. Yet the issue of San and Khoi historical memory has barely been addressed. We shall return to this point later on.

To the question of the changing San identities can be added the equally intriguing question of exactly who is indigenous in the South African context. Examination of the South African example highlights some of the ambiguities inherent in the concept of “indigenous.” In settler societies such as Canada, the United States, and Australia, the question of “indigenism” is relatively straightforward, because the line between indigenous and nonindigenous is clear. Since virtually all the nonaboriginal peoples of North America are post-1492 immigrants from Europe, Africa, and elsewhere, it is possible (in theory) to draw sharp conceptual boundaries around who can be considered indigenous. Latin America has a long scholarly and political tradition of indigenismo, but African discourse is quite different again. As Murumbi (1994) has pointed out, the black peoples of Africa, whether hunter-gatherers, herders, farmers, or city dwellers, can all claim great antiquity on the continent. Thus, any distinctions between indigenous and nonindigenous must necessarily be invidious ones. The government of Botswana, for example, home to over half of all the Bushman peoples of Africa, refused to participate in the UN-declared Year of the Indigenous People (1993), on the grounds that in their country, everyone was indigenous.

The Botswana government’s objections reveal a hidden subtext in the use of the term indigenous by Western media and intellectuals. In this usage, it refers not just to people who have lived in place for a long time, but specifically to encapsulated minorities, who are ethnically (and often linguistically) distinct from the surrounding population and who carry on an economic adaptation— invariably based on simpler technology—that further marginalizes them (cf. Perry 1996). What indigenous people do have is what migrants and the children of migrants (i.e., most of the rest of us) feel they lack: a sense of belonging, a sense of rootedness in place. It is this longing to belong that has become one of the most valued ideological commodities in the era of late capitalism. This perspective enables us to explore the fate and fortunes of some of the people in the region, such as the San/Bushmen, who might lay claim to a more specialized and restricted sense of indigenicity.
The changing nomenclature over the last thirty years reflects some of these issues. In the late 1960s, the term *Bushmen*, long considered pejorative, was replaced in scholarly circles by the seemingly more neutral indigenous term *San*, introduced by Monica Wilson and Leonard Thompson in their *Oxford History of South Africa* (1968). But *San* was not without its detractors. Meaning “aborigines or settlers proper” in the Khoi language (Hahn 1881), it also had the connotation of “worthless vagabond”—a view of San people that is, incidentally, still prevalent among contemporary rural Coloureds (Robin Oakley, personal communication, 1995). In 1989 a group of literate “San” (Namibian Ju/'hoansi) expressed a preference for the term *Bushmen* over *San*, and scholars and activists reintroduced *Bushmen* in solidarity (Biesele 1990; Hitchcock 1996). In 1996, however, the same Ju/'hoansi decided, upon reflection, that *Bushmen* carried too great a historical burden; they opted for rehabilitating *San*, a move welcomed by many scholars who had continued to use that word. Other terms have regional usage. For instance, in Botswana, the various groups of San—elegantly analyzed by Pnina Motzafi-Haller (1994)—refer to themselves collectively as Basarwa, the Setswana term for San. The late John Hardbattle, part Nharo and founder of the advocacy group Kgeikani Kweni (First People of the Kalahari), introduced the Nharo term *N/oakwe* (*Washington Post*, January 16, 1996). For an excellent general discussion of the political uses of ethnic labels, see Isaacs 1989.

**Khoisan Peoples as Discourse**

In writing about Khoisan peoples today, one has to deal with a century of discourses, some rooted in European and African notions of “difference” and race, others springing from European ideas of the “natural man,” and all of these closely bound up with discourses to rationalize European colonialism and imperialism (Wolf 1982; Gordon 1992; Skotnes 1996). These ideologically saturated discourses form an implicit background of unstated assumptions, predispositions, and prejudices. European settlers of the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries in the main regarded the Khoisan with thinly veiled contempt, as incorrigible bandits speaking scarcely intelligible tongues. The South African Bushmen, along with the “Hottentots,” were positioned on the bottom rung of the *scala natura* of humanity, serving as a text for ruminations on who may or may not be part of the human family (Moodie 1976; Thompson 1985; Gordon 1992). A more nuanced view of the hunter-gatherers was expressed by their agricultural and pastoral neighbors, who, while according them an inferior social position, nev-
ertheless intermarried with them and regarded them with a mixture of paternalism and respect (the latter in deference to their poisoned arrows).\textsuperscript{4}

White South African attitudes in this century have undergone an almost complete reversal, from fear and loathing to uncritical admiration; witness the idealization of "the Bushman" as the embodiment of noble virtues in the writings of Laurens van der Post (1958, 1961). Conservationists, indigenous rights advocates, and ethnographers have written about them in largely positive ways (Miller 1993; Kent 1996). The gods may have been crazy, but the producers knew exactly what they were doing when the late Jamie Uys brought N!au, the Bushman, iconic status in two enormously successful commercial films, casting him in the role of "Urmensch" in a vision of pristine Africa.\textsuperscript{5} The Euro-South African public continues to see in the Bushmen images of the good and simple life lived close to nature.

Ironically, however, the African elite of Botswana now have come to see the "Basarwa" as quite the opposite: a social problem, a feckless underclass standing in the way of progress. In a striking and curious inversion, these contemporary African elite views mirror closely the condescension of the white settlers of the nineteenth century.

Contemporary anthropological scholarship has, of course, interrogated and discarded much of the racist baggage that burdened nineteenth-century discourse, but new debates over competing orthodoxies invariably echo older controversies. Archaeologists and historians have focused on the encounter between resident hunter-gatherers and incoming farmers and herders during the last two millennia. This has been one of the key themes in African history and oral traditions (Kopytoff 1987; Smith 1992). Some have read the evidence as showing that the foragers were subordinated, as early as 800 A.D., to powerful Iron Age newcomers (Schrire 1984; Wilmsen 1989; Wilmsen and Denbow 1990). Others, myself included, have argued that the evidence supports a far more pluralistic view of San prehistory: the early subordination of some and the autonomous persistence of others, with still others lying in between (Solway and Lee 1990; Yellen and Brooks 1990; Lee and Guenther 1991, 1993, 1995).

The San/Bushman Today: Nations within Nations?

Whatever the historical facts, the situation for San peoples early in the third millennium is not encouraging. Since San people have been invoked in so many anthropological discussions over the years, a brief survey may be useful in order to give a sense of their current status and
to introduce the players in the arena of identity politics (Biesele et al. 1989).

Namibia’s thirty-eight thousand San are found on white farms, in urban areas, in former government-sponsored settlements such as the famous Tjum!kui located in Bushmanland, and in small communities where people make their living through a mixture of foraging, herding, and rural industries (Marshall 1976; Marshall and Ritchie 1984; Biesele 1990; Gordon 1992; Hitchcock 1992, 1996). The Nyae Nyae-Farmers Cooperative is a successful grassroots organization that has grown up around the communities that were subjects of the Marshall family’s famous ethnographic and film studies (Marshall 1976, 1999).

The !Kung San populations in Angola and Namibia were heavily affected by the protracted warfare waged first by the Portuguese and later the South Africans against the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola (MPLA) and the South West Africa People’s Organization (SWAPO). Moreover, a number of San in Namibia, Zimbabwe, and Botswana were dispossessed as a result of the establishment of game reserves and national parks (Gordon 1992; Hitchcock 1987, 1993, 1996). Ranching, agriculture, dams, and road projects have also had significant impacts on the well-being of San populations (Wily 1979, 1994; Gordon 1992; Hitchcock 1996; Hitchcock and Holm 1993). Many have become dependent on the state for support via welfare payments and drought-relief programs (Mogwe 1992; Hitchcock and Holm 1993).

The Republic of Botswana is unusual in Africa in that it has had a program aimed directly at assisting its Bushman, or Basarwa, minority (Hitchcock and Holm 1993). In spite of the government’s Remote Area Development Program, the socioeconomic status of the fifty thousand Bushmen and other rural people has declined considerably in recent years. They are regarded by other Africans as ethnically distinct and socially inferior, and their current underclass position is compounded by disabilities of race. Thus, the internal politics of the Botswana Basarwa have come to resemble very much a politics of the oppressed (Hitchcock and Holm 1993; Hitchcock 1996).

The Botswana government is pursuing a policy of assimilation (“villagization”) (Wily 1979; Hitchcock and Holm 1993). As one government official said, “We must absorb all of these people” into the body politic of the nation of Botswana” (Robert Hitchcock, personal communication, 1994). But many, if not most, of the Basarwa of Botswana are resisting assimilationist pressures, seeking at least a degree of cultural and political autonomy. As one member of the northeastern San
group, the Kua, told the anthropologist Robert Hitchcock, “We are different from the Tswana majority, and we have the right to be different.” They would like land of their own and, as another put it, “to be left alone so that we can live the way we wish.” John Hardbattle’s group First People of the Kalahari is but one of a dozen advocacy groups and nongovernmental organizations working on behalf of Botswana Basarwa and Namibian San (Lee, Hitchcock, and Biesele 2002).

Khoisan Marginality: Historical Perspectives

Despite encouraging signs of political mobilization, most observers would agree that the social and economic situation of the contemporary San is desperate. But what of the past? Is their present plight a recent phenomenon preceded by a longer history of autonomous foraging? Or were the Bushmen, as some argue, long subordinated to more powerful outsiders?  

In other words, do those San now seeking to throw off the burden of ethnic discrimination have to overcome merely some decades of domination, or is there a far deeper history of oppression? This is an issue debated in the pages of *Current Anthropology* and known as the Great Kalahari Debate (Wilmsen 1989; Barnard 1992b; Lee 1992b; Kuper 1992).

In *Land Filled with Flies* (1989), Edwin Wilmsen presented a twofold thesis: first, that the Dobe-area Ju/'hoansi had experienced a millennium of subordination at the hands of Iron Age outsiders and incorporation into an Iron Age pastoral economy; and second, that this subordination was followed by their early and devastating collapse under the pressure of merchant capital. This now-famous “revisionist” argument has had a lot of appeal among Western scholars trying to come to grips with globalization in the new world order, but it came as a complete surprise to the Ju/'hoansi themselves.

Letting the subaltern speak is one of the prime directives of the postcolonial and post-structuralist agenda espoused by the Kalahari revisionists. Had they bothered to listen to Ju voices, they would have found an interesting story: in area after area, Ju/'hoan oral traditions tell of a long history of autonomous hunting and gathering without agriculture or domesticated animals, and they insist that neither blacks nor whites appeared in the interior until the latter part of the nineteenth century.

In oral historical accounts, from both Namibia and Botswana, the Ju/'hoansi articulated a strong sense of their own history as hunter-
gatherers who, though by no means isolated, lived largely independently on their wild food resources and carried on long-distance trade with farming peoples on their periphery. By themselves, these Ju/'hoan accounts can be considered only as an interesting cultural construction. However, archaeological research by Alison Brooks and John Yellen (1988, 1990), Andrew Smith and myself (1997), and Karim Sadr (1997) confirms the Ju story. We failed to turn up any evidence of domesticated animals or non-Bushman occupation of the Dobe–Nyae Nyae areas before the twentieth century.

The Ju/'hoan view of their own autonomy is also strongly corroborated by the accounts of Western explorers in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries—observers such as Schinz (1891), Passarge (1904, 1907), and Müller (1912). The German geographer Siegfried Passarge, for example, was emphatic on both San autonomy and their noninvolvement in the pastoral economy. Of the powerful and well-organized “Buschmanreich” of the mid-nineteenth-century Ghanzi San, he wrote:
They were a hunting people par excellence. All social and political relations, all rights and laws, their entire political organization was based on the hunt. (1907, 119)

Elsewhere he noted:

The honour of the chief was hereditary in those days and the Bushmen were totally independent. The Batuana did not dare set foot into their region and the Hottentots only entered it on raids. (1907, 115)

The oral histories mentioned above, never previously published, and the corresponding explorers' accounts are set out in Smith and Lee 1997 and Lee 2002. The larger historical issues are addressed in a growing critical literature (Barnard 1992b; Lee and Guenther 1993, 1995; Lee 1992a; Guenther 1993–94; Kent 1996). What the revisionists do is seriously underestimate the sheer diversity of historical circumstances of the Khoisan peoples in the precolonial period.

San autonomy is not a figment of the romantic imagination. While there were wretched San peoples in the nineteenth century living in abject poverty, there were also independent cattleholding San and a number of very successful groups who lived by the hunt and maintained a proud independence (Kent 1996). For example, the Namibian historian Frieda-Nela Williams (1991) describes the relations between the eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Ovambo kingdoms of northern Namibia and the Bushmen—whom they called the Khwankala—as equitable and friendly. They traded on the basis of equality, not as masters and servants. In at least two kingdoms, traditions have it that the royal line was founded upon marriages between Ovambo men and hunter-gatherer women.

But what of the San in South Africa itself? Does historiography offer support for the revisionist thesis of long subordination and early collapse? Certainly, in colonial South Africa the pressure on foraging peoples was vastly greater than in the Kalahari, as thousands of Boer trekkers and Khoi freebooters moved into the interior. Shula Marks's classic article "Khoisan Resistance to the Dutch in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries" (1972) documented the military resistance by the San peoples to Boer expansion. And then there is John Wright's famous study "Bushman Raiders of the Drakensberg" (1971), which shows how resilient the San people had been in the face of increasing pressure by both European and other African forces on the Natal frontier from the 1840s to the 1870s.
Khoisan Marginality: Three Stories

That was then. This is now. Despite the heroic stands of the nineteenth century, San/Bushman peoples were ruthlessly hounded in colonial South Africa, and those who did survive merged imperceptibly into the generalized mass of rural Coloured. By 1950, the dawn of the apartheid era, San people were virtually extinct inside South Africa except for a few isolated remnants. Or so we thought.

The fall of Apartheid and the coming to power of Nelson Mandela and the African National Congress (ANC) triggered a remarkable phenomenon: people claiming the Khoisan mantle appeared suddenly and proliferated rapidly, each claiming to be the authentic voice of one or another indigenous Khoisan people. I would like to relate three stories that together illustrate the state of indigenicity in contemporary South Africa.

**Khoisan Histories I: ≠Khomani Bushmen**

The first story concerns a band of fifty to sixty ≠Khomani, or N/huki, Bushmen who up until the 1970s lived around the gates of the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park in the extreme north of the Cape Province. In periodic surveys of Bushman peoples through the 1950s and 1960s, they were usually trotted out as the only surviving representatives within South Africa proper (with the possible exception of an even smaller group at Lake Chrissie in the eastern Transvaal). The Gemsbok Park San are famous in another way. A Life magazine photographer did a photo shoot there in 1948, and several of these photos—including a famous over-the-shoulder shot of a Bushman showing his son how to spear a gemsbok—found their way into the 1950s best-selling photo book *The Family of Man*.

However, the ≠Khomani had an “unfortunate” custom: they liked to actually hunt and eat the animals they lived with, not just pose with them for photographs! This earned them the ire of the powers that be. In 1976, the South African game department chased the last of the ≠Khomani away from Gemsbok Park. The ≠Khomani became simply one of the hundreds of displaced peoples cast adrift in South Africa by the workings of apartheid-era statutes. For years they lived dispersed on white farms in the northern Cape, eking out a living doing odd jobs, raising a few goats, and making use of veld foods. In this respect, they were no different from millions of other rural black South Africans.

The truly postmodern history of the ≠Khomani begins in 1991, and here I draw on the recent study by Hylton White *In the Tradition of the...*
Forefathers: Bushman Traditionality at Kagga Kamma (1995), which chronicles the saga of Dawid Kruiper and his group. When the !Khomani were evicted as squatters from yet another farm in 1991, their plight came to the attention of the local press. The South African public’s appetite for things Bushman was fed by the account of the sorry state of these, the “last surviving,” etc., etc., within the Republic.

A farmer and entrepreneur named Pieter de Waal then opened a theme park and resort at Kagga Kamma, in the beautiful Cedarberg Mountains north of Cape Town. He gathered Kruiper’s people together and brought them to Kagga Kamma, where they became the centerpiece attractions at the “Bushman theme park” (White 1995). Its pamphlet conveys the flavor of the place:

Imagine yourself . . . in the company of . . . unbelievably, several families of stone-age Bushmen. . . . A unique experience for visitors is the privilege to step into the world of the authentic Bushmen. Here they let you share in their age-old skills of hunting and firelighting, and in the beauty of their handicrafts, dancing and story-telling. (White 1995, 11)

The world of the “authentic Bushmen” in the Kagga Kamma camp today consists of San dressing in “traditional” clothing and presenting themselves before a daily stream of tourists. They make and sell crafts and perform dances, for which they receive modest wages and rations.8

Far from being a cynical sellout, the leader of the group, Dawid Kruiper, is a thoughtful and reflective man, trying to come to grips with the world turned upside down. Reflecting on his present circumstances, Kruiper is quoted by White as saying:

I am a child of nature. I want people to see me and know who I am. The only way our tradition and way of life can survive is to live in the memory of those who see us. (17)

And elsewhere, he is at pains to set himself apart from the corruptions of “civilization”:

Today I have to wear deodorant, but I do not know it. I can find plants that smell nicer. . . . Here I have to put on clothes because there are dangerous things here. But in the Kalahari I can throw away my clothes and wear the /ai [loincloth]. (19)

The Kagga Kamma people are attempting to reinvent themselves as “authentic” carriers of an age-old tradition. Living on the white farms of the northern Cape, the !Khomani were long known as Bastars, the
endearing local term for Coloured people, but Dawid Kruiper resists inclusion in the Bastar category:

The largest difference between a Bushman and a Bastar is that a Bushman wants to keep his Bushman tradition, but not a Bastar. He just wants to be a white man. I am a person of nature, who bears the knowledge: I do not want to westernize. . . . I have my own language, an Englishman has his own language, but where is the Bastar language? He speaks Jan van Riebeeck’s language. (19)

Dawid Kruiper emerges from Hylton White’s sensitive account as a tragic figure, almost a character in a Fugard play. One is struck by his convoluted argument that his people can survive only by being visible to the Western gaze, a kind of self-imposed or reverse orientalism that reveals the authenticating power that the West can exert over the colonized. White (1995) also addresses the white South African public’s appetite for “authentic Africa,” and how the two imaginaries came together in the incongruous circumstances of Kagga Kamma.

The Kagga Kamma story continues to unfold. Legislation passed by the ANC government attempted to redress Apartheid wrongs by restoring to Africans land lost during the period from 1913 to 1990. In August 1995, Roger Chennells, a Stellenbosch lawyer, filed a land claim with the Minister of Land Affairs on behalf of the Kagga Kamma people and other Bushman farm laborers of the northern Cape, in the name of an entity called the Land Claim Committee of the Southern Kalahari Bushmen. The committee is claiming large sections of the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park, but the move is being challenged in court by the National Parks Board on various grounds.

On October 9, 1995, it was reported by the South African Broadcasting Corporation that Derek Hanekom, the Minister of Lands of South Africa, and Anthony Hall-Martin of the Parks Board met with thirty of the two hundred ≠Khomani Bushmen who live in the vicinity of the Kalahari Gemsbok National Park. The point was made by Minister Hanekom that there was a possibility that the Bushmen could be given the right to co-manage the park with the Parks Board. The rights of the Bushmen were thus seen as important by government officials, which in itself is a tacit recognition of the Bushmen’s significance in the contemporary politics of South Africa. In 1997 the Southern Kalahari Bushmen Committee were awarded two abandoned farms in the Gemsbok Park area (Chennells 2002). In March 1999, Thabo Mbehi was photographed embracing Dawid Kruiper at the handing-over ceremony. Negotiations have continued through early 2002 to grant San
further ecotourism concessions in and near what is now called “The Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park.”

**Khoisan Histories II: Schmidtsdrift**

The second of our stories has an even more postmodern twist. One of modern South Africa’s most tragic chapters is the Apartheid regime’s ultimately unsuccessful attempt to preserve Namibia as a neocolony. In the course of the conflict, from 1966 to 1989, thousands of Namibian peasant farmers, herders, and hunters were recruited into the South African Defence Forces (SADF). Arguably the most heavily militarized of Namibia’s ethnic groups were the San people of Nyae Nyae and the Angolan border areas. In its efforts to fight SWAPO, the South African war machine had absorbed, at its peak, up to eight thousand of the estimated thirty-eight thousand Namibian San, making them one of the most heavily militarized peoples in Africa. The propaganda images of the savage and cunning fighters of Bushman commando units purveyed by the psywar branch of the SADF were very popular with the “guns and ammo” crowd in the United States and were featured regularly through the 1980s in *Soldier of Fortune* magazine.

But after the UN-brokered peace process and the independence of Namibia in 1989 under SWAPO, South Africa was faced with the problem of what to do with these thousands of Bushman soldiers and their dependents. In a memorable and chilling scene from John Marshall’s classic 1980 film *N!ai: The Story of a !Kung Woman*, the South African commander of 31 Battalion, “the Bushman Battalion,” is asked how long he was planning to stay in Namibia. He pauses and then replies, “The rest of my life.” And when he is gently asked what would happen to the Bushmen if South Africa should lose the war, he replies, “I hadn’t thought of that. I suppose if we go, the Bushmen will go with us” (Marshall 1980; Volkman 1985).

When the South Africans did leave in 1990, most of the Nyae Nyae people portrayed in the film were repatriated to their home territories. Others were settled elsewhere in Namibia. However, many soldiers had spent the last thirty years first in Portuguese units, then in South African ones, and they had nowhere to “go home” to. The commanding officer’s prophecy was fulfilled when many of these Vasekela and !Kung people elected to travel south with the departing South Africans. Until recently, more than forty-five hundred former soldiers and their families had resided at Schmidtsdrift, an army base near Kimberley (Uys 1994; Steyn 1994). Even under the Apartheid regime their status was ambiguous, but with the coming to power of the Man-
delga government in April 1994, it has become even more problematic. Because they had fought against the allies of the present government, their continued presence in post-Apartheid South Africa is an unpleasant reminder of the evils of Apartheid, and because of their cultural and linguistic distinctiveness, neither the black nor the white communities have been willing to absorb them. They remained housed on the Schmidtsdrift base in a temporary military bivouac years after their arrival.

A twist on the Kagga Kamma story is the land claim suit that has been launched in connection with Schmidtsdrift. However, here the roles are reversed. It is the Batlaping, a Tswana-speaking group, who are suing and the Bushmen who are threatened with removal. After generations of residence, the Batlaping were evicted from the area in 1968 when the original Schmidtsdrift army base was set up as a staging point for troops heading to the front in Namibia. The Batlaping claim on the area is thus much stronger than that of former mercenaries and their families who were caught up in the South African war machine, and in early 1997, their claim to Schmidtsdrift was accepted by the courts.
Like Bushmen elsewhere, the Schmidtsdrift people have mobilized; in the mid-1990s they formed the !Xuu and Khwe Trust, with over half of the trust board made up of Bushmen drawn from the Schmidtsdrift population. The trust’s activities consist of advocacy efforts and community development projects, including a craftmakers’ cooperative, an arts project, an art center, and a living museum. Working in acrylics and oils, some of the artists are achieving international recognition for their powerful depictions of “traditional” scenes and the horrors of war. By 2002 the Schmidtsdrift colony had been relocated to abandoned farms elsewhere in the Northern Cape.

Khoisan Histories III: Neo-Khoisan Identities

The third story about Khoisan identities begins not in South Africa, but at a conference on Khoisan studies that was convened near Munich, Germany, in July 1994. Present were the usual assortment of linguists, historians, and anthropologists, and the tone of the meeting was suitably scholarly. The issue of Bushmen in South Africa and the broader question of Khoisan identities gained immediate relevancy when the atmosphere of probity and gravity was jarred on the opening day. Prof. Henry Bredekamp, a historian from the former Coloured University of the Western Cape (UWC), rose to address the meeting, with deep conviction. The gist of his speech was as follows:

This meeting has a great deal of significance for me because I am a person of Khoisan heritage. There are millions of South Africans like me who trace their ancestry back to the Khoi and the San peoples. These are our histories, our languages you are discussing. Under Apartheid we lost much of our culture. Now we want to work closely with you in recovering our past and our traditions.11

Bredekamp’s intervention energized the meeting, and before it dispersed, the participants agreed to hold the next Khoisan studies meeting at the UWC in 1997 (discussed later in this essay). The speech gave a new lease on life to the field of Khoisan studies and the study of African hunter-gatherers; an entire new constituency was awakening to the importance of recording the traditions and ways of life of the small cultures of Africa, against the day when they might be rediscovered.

Thirty years ago, the great African philosopher-revolutionary Amilcar Cabral wrote that the task before the African people was not only achieving independence but also recapturing history, a history taken
from the African peoples by the colonialists (Cabral 1974). These views were echoed in the writings of Steve Biko, the founder of the Black Consciousness movement in South Africa. A year after the Munich meeting, I was invited to the UWC, by Henry Bredekamp, where I noted in an address that recovering history appeared to be one of the most important cultural processes underway in post-Apartheid South Africa. In fact, it is one of the most significant social movements worldwide in the early twenty-first century. Everywhere, it seems, minority peoples are rediscovering aspects of themselves that had long been suppressed. Recapturing history has become a major movement in literature, history, and anthropology: the study of colonial discourse, post-coloniality, and the attempts by subaltern peoples to liberate their consciousness from colonialism and its legacies (for the South African context, see, e.g., Smith 1988).

It goes without saying that the history of the so-called nonwhites of South Africa is not a unitary one; diverse historical streams are represented within it. Thus, recapturing histories is not simply a question of reviving old ethnicities. It is also about acknowledging the birth of new ones—ethnicities like those of the people in the UWC Coloured student body, whose roots could be traced to not only Khoi and San, but also Dutch, Malay, Xhosa, British, and other sources drawn from three continents (du Plessis 1972; Mayson [1861] 1963; Marais 1937; for a relevant discussion, see García Canelini 1995).

Nonetheless, links to Khoi and San are among the most salient, although most neglected, components of these personal and family histories. Up to 2.5 million Coloured South Africans would identify themselves as Khoi or San, but until recently the opportunity for these peoples to explore their roots has been compromised and thwarted by the distortions of Apartheid (Ross 1976, 1993; Schapera 1930).

As Robert Gordon in The Bushman Myth (1992) has noted, previous representations of the Khoisan peoples had been saturated with racist colonial discourse. Khoi and San were presented as the castoffs of creation, a doctrine tailor-made to justify oppression and dispossession. For centuries, the masses of South African people labeled "Coloured" have struggled with the problem of identity, situated halfway between the white oppressors, with whom they shared language and religion, and the black majority, toward whom they felt a mixture of fear and ambivalence (Moodie 1976; Thompson 1985). The term Coloured itself is an example of a Foucauldian "dividing practice," only coming into prominence as recently as the beginning of the twentieth century as the Cape's small middle class of nonwhite/non-Africans sought to carve
out a bureaucratic and legal space by emphasizing their degree of "difference" from the category "native" (Goldin 1992).

With the heightening of the struggle against Apartheid, a new era opened in Coloured identity politics. One can trace the Khoisan revival ultimately to the Black Consciousness movement of the 1970s, led by the charismatic Steve Biko (1978, 1979). Black Consciousness had part of its genesis among Coloured students and intellectuals in the Cape Town area. And the anthropological world, in developing an anthropology of liberation, has been intensely interested in what was and is happening in South Africa. It is of particular interest how people of Khoisan heritage have espoused this powerful set of ideas and reidentified themselves with their ancestors and with the millions of their countrywomen and countrymen who were fighting oppression (Pityana et al. 1992).

Of course, wherever we turn in exploring ethnicity and identity politics, new complexities emerge. In the first post-Apartheid election characterized by full suffrage (1994), the Western Cape, dominated by Coloured voters, was the only province that voted the National Party back into power, with the ANC a distant second. Coloured politics in South Africa now has many diverse currents, including right as well as left tendencies. In addition to support for the "reformed" National Party and the ANC, there are, in no particular order, the left-separatist Pan-Africanist Congress, the fascist Kleurling Weerstandbeweging (Coloured Resistance Movement)—which is closely modeled after Ernst Terreblanche's far-right Afrikaner Weerstandbeweging (Afrikaner Resistance Movement)—Islamic fundamentalists, and various cultural nationalist tendencies. There is also the "workerist" left grouping centered around the Coloured intellectual and former Robben Island inmate Neville Alexander. Another prominent Coloured political figure of Trotskyist persuasion recently had his name legally changed from Benny Alexander to Khoisan X. The fact remains, however, that the "Khoisan roots" question is only one of a number of different crosscurrents affecting Coloured identity politics today.

For those who do wish to identify with the Khoisan past, there is no lack of examples to choose from. The works of Frieda-Nela Williams (1991), John Wright (1971), and Shula Marks (1972) offer historical examples of the resilience and pragmatism, the ability to project power, and the desire of the Khoisan peoples to survive in the face of overwhelming odds. These stories could form the bases of a popular history of the Khoisan peoples, and in fact such projects are already underway at the UWC.
The existence of this hidden history, hitherto suppressed by colonial discourse and Apartheid ideology, suggests a number of new directions for anthropologists in South Africa and abroad. An expanded anthropology, by celebrating the birth of new ethnicities and not just mourning the passing of the old, embraces new possibilities for research on the politics of identity. The southern African cases offer parallels to what is happening in other parts of the world (cf. Durning 1992; Lee 1992a; and Hitchcock 1993, 1994). At the UWC, analysts of identity politics are attempting to understand how a nonwhite, nonblack proletarianized community juggles ethnicity, traditionality, race, class, and internal divisions in an ongoing attempt to find their place in a racialized society. One can observe similarities here to the dilemmas of, for example, Native Americans in the U.S. South, caught between black, white, and native identities.\(^{12}\)

Indigenism is emerging as a significant political discourse in the postcolonial world. In Australia and North America, perhaps the most significant development of the last two decades has been the indigenous peoples' speaking to the rest of us in their own voices. In Canada the Innu, the Lubicon, the Teme-Augama, and others (as shown in Richardson 1989) speak to the Canadian public through the medium of plays, novels, documentary films, and pop music. Rock performers such as Yothu Yindi from Australia's Arnhem Land, Kashtin from the Labrador Innu, and the Inuit pop star Susan Aglukark have had enormous appeal through their music. Increasingly, indigenous peoples are making political alliances with environmentalists, feminists, youth groups, and peoples of color (Burger 1990; Durning 1992; Hitchcock 1993, 1994; Miller 1993). Clearly, the cultural renaissance underway in a number of indigenous communities has generated considerable interest in a "traditional" ethos and worldview, governance, subsistence, arts, crafts, ethnobotany, and healing; for these and other spheres of knowledge, the elders and the extant anthropological texts are the main sources of information. So if it is happening in Australia and Canada, why not in southern Africa, too?

If we can situate the problem within the intellectual currents of the present, Coloured identity in South Africa could be seen as an artifact of "modernity," a product of the great processes by which commodity capitalism dissolved all previous human ties: in Marx's memorable phrase, "all that is solid melts into air" (Berman 1983). A major point of distinction made by blacks in South Africa is that whatever they have lost, they still have their Xhosa, Tswana, or Zulu traditions. The Coloureds, however, are a people who have lost theirs (a sentiment we
saw echoed by Dawid Kruiper). Thus, black South Africans, despite their inferior social and legal position under Apartheid, could still feel a sense of superiority over the Coloured, given the latter’s truncated and deracinated heritage.

So if Apartheid is a particular product of modernity, what is signified by the ethnic revival following Apartheid’s collapse? I would liken it to the breaking of a dam, the unleashing of long-suppressed yearnings of a deeply emotional nature: the need for a sense of belonging to the land. Others may see this revival in more instrumental terms, as a use of authenticity to gain purchase for staking claims on the political landscape. Whatever one’s conclusion on this score, the final fall of the political structures of Apartheid (though not its economic inequities) has opened up significant political and intellectual space.

A Khoisan Renaissance?

On the cultural front, there are intriguing signs that a Khoisan renaissance of a sort is already underway. In April 1996 the artist and art historian Pippa Skotnes opened the controversial exhibit “Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen” at the National Gallery in Cape Town, covering the horrors of genocide against the nineteenth-century Bushmen (Skotnes 1996). A parallel exhibit at the South African Museum brought together for the first time examples of Bushman rock art in museum collections with the work of contemporary Bushman artists from Schmidtsdrift, the Kuru artist group in Botswana, and other artists. At the opening of “Miscast,” a remarkable forum was held bringing together leaders of Bushman groups from Namibia and Botswana with representatives of half a dozen Khoisan/Coloured political groupings within South Africa that had sprung up since 1994—groups with names such as the Khoisan Representative Council, the Griqua National Conference, the Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA), and the South African San Institute (SASI).

Kiewiet /Angn!ao, chairman of the Nyae Nyae Farmers Cooperative of Namibia—the group working with John Marshall and Megan Biesele—gave the keynote address. He spoke eloquently (in Ju’/hoansi with simultaneous translation) of his people’s aspirations to make their way in the world while preserving their culture and values. According to Dr. Megan Biesele, who was present, members of the largely urban audience were visibly moved, some to tears. One blond, blue-eyed Afrikaner member of the audience told the meeting that “we have all been impoverished by the ignorance and denial of the Khoisan,” while
another, also white, arose to publicly acknowledge her long-suppressed Khoisan heritage—an announcement followed by more tears from audience members (Biesele, personal communication April 1996). The event was an epiphany for more than one Coloured academic; for these scholars, the core curriculum of Franz Fanon, Steve Biko, Amilcar Cabral, Paulo Freire, and Joe Slovo took on a deeper and more personal meaning.

The organizing committee for the 1997 Khoisan studies conference at the UWC continued the process begun at the 1996 forum by inviting San and Khoi political activists from South Africa, Botswana, and Namibia to meet with student and civic groups in the Cape Town area for more extended discussions and the planning of collaborative research. In July 1997, the long-awaited conference “Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage” convened in Cape Town. Unlike at previous conferences on Khoisan issues, here the academics and policymakers were outnumbered by members of the existing Khoisan communities and many representatives of the Cape Town “nonwhite” intelligentsia. Present were Griquas from the eastern Cape, Damaras from central Namibia, Basarwa students from the University of Botswana, and representatives of a dozen remote Kalahari communities brought together by WIMSA (which is based in Windhoek).

The opening ceremonies (conducted largely in Afrikaans) featured a succession of choirs from Griqua, Nama, and other Khoisan congregations from around the Cape Province. Then, eleven members of Coloured communities in the western Cape were introduced to a packed auditorium as the present chiefs of eleven of the original Khoi clans encountered by Jan van Riebeeck at the Cape in the 1650s. Some of these clans had been virtually wiped out by the early eighteenth century. The chiefs’ appearance in imaginative regalia based loosely on seventeenth- and eighteenth-century accounts, accompanied by impassioned speeches about “reclaiming our heritage,” was enthusiastically received by the partisan audience. Culture heroes were celebrated, such as the seventeenth-century Khoi chief Achimoa—the “King of Robben Island,” who became the island’s first political prisoner when he was exiled there after an abortive rebellion. And poetry written for the occasion was recited, such as this offering from the Plakkekamp (Squatters’ Camp) Poetry Collective:

Khoisan, rise from the vast valleys of Africa,
Khoisan, this was once in your hand,
This could be, once more, your promised land.
By contrast, the San presence at the conference was less visible. Not having had the educational opportunities or the sense of their own histories enjoyed by the Khoi delegates, the San people from Botswana and Namibia gave less polished presentations. Their subject matter was not focused on heritage and identity but instead emphasized land, hunting and grazing rights, and the ongoing discrimination they experience at the hands of their fellow citizens in Botswana and Namibia. By the end of the conference, it was clear that there were two quite different kinds of stakeholders represented. One group, largely San with some Khoi, had claims to cultural legitimacy that were impeccable, but their political leverage and media savvy were weak. The other group, largely Khoi (and Neo-Khoi), had political and media clout but, by reason of land and language loss, had claims to legitimacy that were far more tenuous.

Each of these two constituencies has, in effect, what the other lacks. However, hopes that they will combine their strengths and make common cause may be premature at this point, given the vast differences in
the historical experiences between, say, Khoi communities in the post-Apartheid northern Cape and San peoples scattered though northern Namibia and Botswana, who have been integrated into the regional political economy far more recently.

Nevertheless, within their respective constituencies, much can be done. In the Coloured community, there are exciting possibilities for collecting the oral traditions of the old people. Constituting the living history of the nation is an extremely well established branch of research in, for example, Aboriginal Australia, but it has barely begun in the Khoisan areas of South Africa. There is a need for scholars to walk over the land with rural elders, a need for studies of place-names; accounts of sacred sites, battles, and other historical events need to be memorialized. Studies are needed of Khoi and San words that have remained in the language, of their meanings and significance. And there is still much to be mined from existing archival sources, such as the Bleek and Lloyd collection (1911; cf. Deacon and Dowson 1996). The San people of South Africa, Namibia, and Botswana continue to expand their political actions on a number of fronts: land and language rights, health issues, and governmentality. A recent guest-edited issue of Cultural Survival Quarterly contains over twenty-five articles about the current political situation of the San (Lee, Hitchcock, and Biesele 2002).

The San people and their supporters see in the educated Capetonians a legion of potential allies. Urban educated people—the students at the UWC, for example—who feel a sense of kinship with their Khoisan roots could make connections with the living representatives of that tradition, people like the Ju/'hoansi of Namibia and Botswana. Urban students from the Cape Town area might seek them out to find a sense of communitas with those of similar cultural background, but the northern Ju/'hoansi need the strengths of the Cape Town students—literacy, technical, and business skills—at least as much as the Capetonians need them. Initiatives in this direction have already been taken in Botswana by the Basarwa Research Committee (BRC), a group of faculty and students (including some who are themselves Basarwa) at the University of Botswana. The BRC, aided by overseas support from Norway and elsewhere, has been instrumental in placing Basarwa human rights and land issues squarely on the national agenda (Saugestad 2002).

In South Africa, recent developments indicate the degree to which Khoisan issues have been foregrounded on the political and cultural agenda. On the national political front, the ANC government formed
a ministerial committee in 1998 to study the "Bushman problem" and to make recommendations. Consisting of bureaucrats and academics reviewing pending land claims, this ministerial committee flies in academic "experts" as well as bringing local-level leaders to Pretoria for major meetings. Cynics may say that all this is a political game that the government is playing to capture the Khoisan agenda and woo the Coloured vote. To this I would answer: more power to them! Would it be preferable to see the Khoisan agenda captured by the National Party and the far-right KWB and turned into the kind of right-wing nativism that now dominates the politics of the Zulu-based Inkatha Freedom Party?

The Khoisan peoples of southern Africa are numerically small, but in terms of African history and civilization, they loom large. Today, Khoisan in urban, rural, and remote areas are struggling on diverse fronts to retain, revive, or reinvent distinct identities while grappling with the still-virulent legacy of Apartheid and colonialism.

Where sheer survival is not an issue, encapsulated and marginalized peoples are turning their attention to the reestablishment of their historical roots, joining the worldwide social movement of indigenous minorities not only in South Africa, but also in Canada, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Russia, and elsewhere (Burger 1990; Durning 1992). And such a revival is not just an issue for one people or one nation: the cultural diversity, both old and new, that is represented by the former hunting and herding Khoisan peoples of southern Africa is part of the heritage of all humanity. It is important that members of these societies themselves be drawn into the task of valorizing and preserving their own cultural heritage. Ultimately, it is they who will carry forward this work.

Notes

The research on which this essay is based was carried out on brief field trips between 1993 and 2001. I wish to thank the University of Toronto travel fund for financial support. Part of this essay was written while I was a Visiting Scholar at Australian National University in 1995. Earlier versions have been read at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Northeastern University, Hunter College, and the City University of New York Graduate Center. The following were extremely helpful in aspects of the research: in Namibia and South Africa, /Ontah Boo, Henry Bredekamp, Janette Deacon, Nlai Kumsa, Kxau Royal /Oloo, /Ui Keyter /Oma, John Sharp, Andrew Smith, and Denny Smith; and in Australia, Graham Connah, Nic Peterson, and Joanna Casey. S. Nombuso Dlamini read the entire manuscript and offered detailed sugges-
Rights and Identity in Post-Apartheid Southern Africa

1. S. Nombuso Dlamini has collected Zulu oral traditions in the Drakensberg area relating how Bushmen were involved in the Shakan wars of conquest and incorporated into the Zulu kingdom as cattle keepers. Some San men even married Zulu women. These oral traditions have it that the San boys imparted the click sounds to Zulu boys during the long days they spent herding together (personal communication, April 1996).

2. The image of the San in South African literature, culture, and art is explored in a special issue of Critical Arts: A Journal of Cultural Studies, entitled “Recuperating the San” and published by the University of Natal, Durban (Tomaselli 1995).

3. Of course, “indigenous” can be a highly contested category even in the United States and Canada. In the case of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina (and many similar examples), the question of who is and is not an “Indian” is often the subject of vigorous debate.

4. Some Ovambo kingdoms record their dynasties as being founded on the marriage of Ovambo men and hunter-gatherer women. On Zulu intermarriage, see n. 1.

5. The Gods Must Be Crazy and The Gods Must Be Crazy II have been the highest-grossing non-Hollywood films in history. For a revealing account of the background to the films, see Davis 1996, 81–94. See also Peter Davis and Daniel Riesenfeld’s documentary film In Darkest Hollywood (1996) for a refreshing critique of Uys and of the cinema’s South Africa.

6. Before that question can be addressed, we have to consider a prior one: what is the relationship between historic “Khoi” pastoralists and “San” hunter-gatherers? Were they even separate peoples, or were the San in the Cape merely impoverished Khoi who had lost their cattle and sheep? Similarly, could San people adopt cattle husbandry and immediately “raise themselves up”? Richard Elphick (1977) made the argument for the fluidity and interchangeability between Khoi and San in the Cape area, and it has been influential (Schrire 1984). Whatever the situation in the Cape—and the archaeological evidence is complex—there were certainly many Bushman groups outside the Cape without a history of herding (Lee 1965, 1979; Smith 1992).

7. The translations of this quotation and the following one are by Mathias Guenther.

8. The New York Times ran a feature story on them on January 18, 1996. As a result of this publicity, it became known that the Bushmen’s wages were subpar even by South African standards. The group was able to agitate successfully for a doubling of wages and an improvement in working conditions (Daley 1996).

9. I am grateful to Jerome Levi and Bartholomew Dean for drawing this line of analysis to my attention (personal communication, 1997).

10. An indication of the degree to which the Western media have grabbed
on to the Kalahari Bushman story is the fact that the obituary of Dawid Kruiper's ninety-six-year-old father, Regopstan, ran in the "Passages" section of *Time* on March 13, 1996 (International Edition).

11. These remarks are taken from the author's notes.

12. In certain respects, the ambiguities of their situation resembled that of the Lumbee Indians of North Carolina, so it seemed appropriate to present my hosts at UWC with a copy of Gerald Sider's *Lumbee Indian Histories* (1993).

13. The WIMSA delegations' attendance and participation was made possible by a grant from the Wenner-Gren Foundation of New York, with support from Axel Toma and other WIMSA staff, to overcome the complex logistical problems of bringing the WIMSA delegates together.
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