Indigenous peoples in Africa and their rights have been the focus of much deliberation and debate in recent years.\footnote{1} These discussions have taken place in academic institutions and journals in Africa, Europe and North America, as well as within the European Union, the World Bank and the United Nations.

A major area of dissent has been whether the concept of “indigenousness”, and hence of specific “indigenous” rights, could be used in an African context. Most African governments have until now maintained that all their citizens are indigenous or, alternatively, argued that there is no such thing as an indigenous group in their country. Some researchers and social scientists have stressed that the problems faced by certain ethnic minorities have more to do with poverty than cultural differences and the problems they face should therefore be alleviated by welfare and development measures (see Saugestad, this volume).

There is no single, agreed-upon definition of the term “indigenous peoples” but, as Saugestad mentions in her Overview (this volume), the four most often invoked elements are: (1) a priority in time; (2) the voluntary perpetuation of cultural distinctiveness; (3) an experience of subjugation, marginalisation and dispossession; (4) and self-identification. Often, the term indigenous is used to refer to those individuals and groups who are descendants of the original populations (that is, the “first nations”) residing in a country. In the case of Africa this raises particular problems. Africa is the continent with the longest history of human occupation, and it contains the greatest range of human genetic and cultural diversity. In many cases, it is difficult to determine antecedence since a variety of populations have moved into and out of local areas over time. There have been complex interactions between “first peoples” and newcomers, often with the result that the former groups are marginalized. In no country in Africa are indigenous peoples in control even at local government level, and far less in positions of power at national level.

However, an important criterion for “indigenousness” is the identification by people themselves of their distinct cultural identity. Most people prefer to reserve for themselves the right to determine who is and is not a member of their group. There exist in Africa a number of
population groups who define themselves - and are defined by others - as “indigenous” i.e. they feel that they are culturally distinct from their neighbors and the dominant ethnic groups and, as a result, share a common experience that includes dispossession of land and natural resources, impoverishment, discrimination and human rights abuses.

An important number of the people, who in an African context, define themselves as indigenous, live in southern Africa and while some countries in the region, such as South Africa, have taken important steps toward recognizing their rights, others have abrogated these rights, with members of indigenous groups being discriminated against, dispossessed of their ancestral lands and deprived of their rights to resources.

This book aims to look at some of the complex issues relating to the situation of these indigenous peoples. It examines their human rights in the broad sense, taking into consideration their civil and political rights, their social, economic and cultural rights, as well as their rights to development, participation, a healthy environment and peace. More specifically it deals with land rights, gender issues, natural resource management, education and with some of the efforts being made by indigenous groups and their supporters to defend and promote these rights.

Attention is focused primarily on six countries, where ethnic groups, who historically have been characterized as indigenous, still live.

These populations used to be called Bushmen and, in the case of Botswana, Basarwa, while others were known as Nama or Hottentot (Schapera 1930, 1933). Today, they are usually generically known as San and Khoe respectively but use of the names they give themselves is becoming ever more prevalent. Khoe and San peoples are found in Angola, Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe (Barnard 1992; Suzman 2001a). There are also other groups who claim indigenous status such as, for example, the Himba of Namibia and the Vadema of Zimbabwe (see the chapters by Daniels, Harring and Akpan et al.).

In all six of these southern African countries, the San and Khoe are numerical minorities, though there are regions within the boundaries of the states where they outnumber other groups. There are also smaller indigenous groups, like the Ju’hoansi of north-western Botswana and north-eastern Namibia, who overlap national borders. The transboundary nature of many indigenous peoples puts them in a special position vis-à-vis nation-states, many of whom are concerned about their sovereignty and security and are attempting to prevent movements of people and goods across their borders. Zambia is a case in point since its government does not recognize the San living in the country as being Zambian citizens but sees them primarily as refugees or immigrants from Angola, as noted by Akpan et al. (this volume).
The claims of indigenous peoples in southern Africa are relatively similar to those of indigenous peoples in other parts of the world: they wish to have their human rights respected; they want ownership and control over their own land and natural resources; and they want the right to participate through their own institutions in the political process at the nation-state, regional and international levels. However, as this book documents, they live in a region where discrimination and human rights abuses have been rife and where they are still dominated by a mainstream society that deals with them “injudiciously and with impunity at the three levels of the individual, the community and the state” to quote Mazonde (this volume).

The Issue of Identity

As noted by several authors, indigenous peoples in southern Africa are highly diverse. They range from small communities of foragers (hunters and gatherers) to sedentary agro-pastoralists and peri-urban factory workers in the industrial economies of southern African states. The vast majority have diversified economic systems, combining small-scale agriculture and livestock production with natural resource procurement and business activities.

However, a common feature is that they have been, and still are, viewed as representing “a form of primitivity” (Taylor, this volume) that must be overcome to give way to development. In the past, with the expansion of agro-pastoral populations and, later on, explorers, hunters, miners, settlers and others, there were instances where they were simply murdered, tortured or enslaved (see Saugestad, this volume; Skotnes 1996:17-21). In other cases, San and Khoe groups were either displaced by cattle farms that were established and allocated primarily to white farmers or they were incorporated as farm hands and domestic workers. This situation of dispossession and marginalisation continues to this day. As Taylor (this volume) remarks, “the removal of San from the Central Kalahari Game Reserve can essentially be understood as a civilising project towards the segment of Botswana’s population considered to be the most ‘backward’.” As a result, an increasing number of San and Khoe end up as ‘hangers-on’ around towns and villages and many today live in townships where they depend on handouts and cash obtained through odd jobs (see the chapters by Harring, Taylor, and Hitchcock, Johnson and Haney).

During this process, many Khoesan people have given up their customs and traditions and have been more or less assimilated into the dominant society although most of them remain at the bottom of the social ladder. In the case of Botswana, as Mazonde (this volume) un-
derlines, this is to a large extent the result of deliberate government policies seeking to integrate the San into the culture of mainstream Botswana, notably through the formal education system.

Some Khoesan people, on the other hand, wish to continue to practise their culture and hold tightly to their beliefs, values and customary practices. Sensing that language is a crucial element of cultural identification, indigenous groups in southern Africa are today struggling to retain or revive their mother-tongue languages. So far, only Namibia - and South Africa to a lesser extent - ensure mother-tongue and culturally appropriate education for the first three years of school for San and other minorities. While this is commendable, it can also be argued, as Hays does in her chapter on education, that formal classroom-based education has many detrimental consequences for the San and their identity. Instead, she advocates for the need, “To look carefully at what education is, what it means to peoples like the Ju/'hoansi, and what options are actually available to them.” And to give them the right to refuse or accept these options.

**Land Rights in Southern Africa**

Indigenous identity is intimately related to land. Indigenous peoples view land not only as an economic resource but also as one that has social, political and spiritual dimensions. Taylor (this volume) notes, “To have a small tract of land gives people a sense of standing in the wider social economy that landless San cannot achieve” and quotes Roy Sesana, a San leader from Botswana, who said, “Our human rights are our land. They cannot do anything for us if they take us off our land.” Yet, being taken off their land is exactly the fate that many - if not most - indigenous peoples have faced in southern Africa.

Traditionally, southern African societies managed their land on a communal - or group - basis. Under this tenure system, land could not be bought or sold and individuals were only allocated land rights insofar as they were members of a group or, in some cases, through provision by a tribal authority (e.g. a chief, a clan elder). Individuals and groups could also obtain land by moving into an unutilized area and establishing themselves. Conquest was another way of acquiring land but, more often than not, this happened at the expense of indigenous groups.

In some cases, people had to demonstrate continued usage of their land in order to maintain their rights of access. This was not easy in the case of hunting and gathering societies, and one way to mark their landscapes was to leave behind traces of their campsites.

Segments of African societies were associated with discrete areas. This was the case, for example, of the Ju/'hoan San of Namibia and
Botswana, whose ancestral territory was divided into a number of smaller units known as n!oresi. Each n!ore (sing.), or land and resource unit, had people with long-standing rights to that area - also known as n!ore kxausi - whom outsiders had to approach if they wished to camp or use the resources. Rights were handed down from one generation to the next, and people were generally aware of who had what rights to specific areas. The territories could also be subdivided further, depending on the types of resources available in them; those places that were rich in certain kinds of nut-bearing vines, for example, were considered to be gathering areas of segments of communities. Sacred areas or ones that were important ideologically (e.g. burial or ritual places where, for example, initiation rites were held) were often set aside specifically for groups rather than individuals.

Most of these traditions are still alive among contemporary indigenous peoples. The Himba case discussed by Daniels and Harring (this volume) provides a good illustration of this situation: because they consider the Epupa Falls on the Cunene River sacred and because many of their ancestors are buried in areas close to the river, the Himba of Namibia and Angola have struggled for years to stop the building of a dam at Epupa. Claiming “Heritage Rights”, i.e. rights to culturally and ideologically significant property such as sacred sites, places on the landscape that are viewed by local peoples as important, is increasingly becoming a new aspect of the indigenous peoples’ struggle for cultural recognition (see Chennells and du Toit for relevant examples from South Africa).

With colonization, land became an important commodity and the privatization of land was seen as a key approach to the agricultural and economic development of the European colonies in southern Africa. Turning tribal or communal land into private leasehold or freehold (private) land would provide, it was argued, individuals with the incentive to invest more labor and capital and, at the same time, to manage and conserve resources. An examination of the land-holding structure in southern Africa after the establishment of colonial governments is revealing (see Table 1): in none of the southern African states did the colonial governments leave even half of the land to the Africans, who made up the majority of the population.

Instead, much of the land was given to European immigrants or private companies. This commercialization of land resulted in a dramatic increase in landlessness for indigenous peoples as Taylor (this volume) shows with an example from western Botswana where the rights of the San were obliterated by the creation of freehold land and the cession of the Ghanzi Ridge to Cecil John Rhodes at the end of the 19th century.

The land rights situation of indigenous peoples in southern Africa did not improve with the arrival of independence. In Namibia, for in-
stance, Harring notes that only 10% of the Namibian San retain “com-
munal land rights” in a region that is one of the poorest and most re-
rente in the country, and the Nama and Damara are still relegated to
the “homelands” that the apartheid regime created in the 1960s and
early 1970s in a barren, overgrazed desert.

In virtually all of the countries in southern Africa, indigenous groups
have had to face new dispossessions and development-related reloca-
tions, often as the result of post-colonial policies based on the same
arguments as those used by the colonial governments. In independ-
ent Botswana, for instance, the idea of providing incentives in order
to thereby ensure economic development was at the core of the Trib-
al Grazing Land Policy (TGLP), a land reform and livestock develop-
ment program introduced in Botswana in the mid-1970s. It is also be-
hind the more recent National Agricultural Development Policy dat-
ing from 1991 (see Taylor, this volume, for a discussion of some of
the impacts of these two programs).

An important exception is South Africa, where the ‡Khomani San
and the Richtersveld Nama have been able to get their land claims
recognized (see the chapters by Chennels and du Toit and by Chan).
Clearly, with the end of apartheid\(^2\) in South Africa, some progress has
been made in recognizing indigenous peoples’ rights.

### Water Rights in Southern Africa

Water rights are intimately related to land rights. Southern Africa is in
general a water-scarce region, and a large numbers of southern Afri-
cans have difficulty in obtaining sufficient water to meet their needs.
This is particularly true for the peoples of the central and south-eastern
Kalahari such as the G\(\text{\textasciitilde i}\)ui, G\(\text{\textasciitilde a}\)ana, and !Xoo San, some of whom have
to resort to the use of sip-wells\(^3\) in order to obtain moisture from the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Percent of African Population</th>
<th>African Lands as Percentage of Total Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.
sands when there is no surface water available. When, in 2002, the Botswana government decided to stop delivery of water (as well as other services) to the residents of the CKGR, it therefore amounted to de facto forcing the residents to relocate outside the reserve (see Taylor, this volume), and prompted the spokespersons for the people of the Central Kalahari to argue that “water is a human right”\(^4\).

Over the past decades, and in step with the land privatization process, indigenous peoples have seen their access to water resources greatly restricted, with grave consequences for their livelihood.

As with land, water resources in southern African societies were traditionally associated with social units (families, bands or clans). Under customary law, open surface waters such as rivers and springs were free to be used by anyone. In grazing districts, on the other hand, use of surface water was supposed to be confined to the tribal groups or wards that were granted access to those areas. Individuals belonging to other wards who drove cattle through the grazing areas were allowed to water their animals only after seeking permission from a local overseer (Schapera 1943) and people who watered their herds in another group’s grazing area ran the risk of having their animals confiscated. In times of stress, however, many people in southern Africa, including San, followed the rule that individuals in dire need of water for themselves or their animals should be granted access to it.

Changes in water technology in the late 19th and early 20th centuries brought about major shifts in patterns of user rights over water resources. The digging of wells with the aid of dynamite and, later, the drilling of boreholes, led to a shift away from communal access to water resources to a system in which private ownership predominated. Those individuals with the resources to have boreholes dug were able to gain de facto rights not only over the water but over the grazing land surrounding the water point as well, and they could deny other people access to that water and nearby grazing. Borehole drilling in drier areas of southern Africa (e.g. the Kalahari Desert, the Namib Desert) facilitated the expansion of the number of livestock that could be kept by ensuring that water was available year-round. But the rising number of livestock and the reduction of their mobility contributed to a process of overgrazing and environmental degradation. As a consequence, both chiefs and the colonial administrations began to call for the privatization of land in order to counteract what they saw as problems of communal land and water access. The impact of this policy, which has been continued and further developed by the governments of post-colonial Botswana, is described by Taylor in his chapter on Land Rights, where he also remarks that few San have the capital to sink a borehole.

But restrictions on indigenous peoples’ access to water can also take other forms. As Mazonde and Hitchcock note in their chapters, water
resources in the RAD settlements that were originally meant for the domestic use of the San have, in many cases, been appropriated by dominant groups who use them for watering their cattle.

**Conservation Policies and Indigenous Rights**

There is reason to believe that the process of land dispossession will continue. Land, which in the past was often viewed as an unlimited natural resource, is becoming a scarce and valuable commodity. In some parts of southern Africa, there is intense competition for land and other natural resources, especially in those places where there are high demands due to population growth, agricultural intensification, urbanization, industrialization and environmental degradation (see Akpan et al., this volume). However, it is conservation concerns that have created some of the heaviest demands on land and it is the creation of national parks and game reserves all over southern Africa that has dispossessed the largest number of indigenous peoples. As Hitchcock (this volume) remarks, most of the people required to leave their homes and resettle have been hunter-gatherers and part-time foragers and data indicates that many of them consider themselves worse off than was the case before they were relocated.

As a rule, resettlement is a complicated process, and only in a few cases has there been relatively large amounts of compensation paid to people for the losses of their homes and other assets, one case being that of the residents of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve (see the chapters by Hitchcock and Taylor, this volume). However, the main conclusion to be drawn from the discussions in this volume is that resettlement projects - with or without compensation - in general have failed to restore the livelihoods of people affected. In a number of cases they have even made people worse off, one reason being that planners tend to focus attention on loss of residence (i.e. homes) rather than on loss of access to means of production, especially land, grazing resources and the wild resources on which people depend for subsistence and income. As shown in the chapters dealing with Botswana, this has also been the case with the ambitious Remote Area Development Program (RAD), which was aimed in part at mitigating the impact of the Tribal Grazing Land Program. Instead of promoting development, moving to settlements has created dependency, deteriorated people’s livelihoods and seriously undermined the status of indigenous women.

A less recognized aspect of forced relocation out of conservation areas is the way it has all too often exacerbated problems of poverty and environmental degradation, and has created situations of social conflict.
and violence. In the course of state efforts to promote conservation, national conservation legislation has placed legal restrictions on hunting, fishing and the gathering of certain wild resources (see the discussion on this issue in the chapters by Hitchcock and by Hitchcock, Johnson and Haney). Such legislation has not only reduced local people’s access to natural resources but also resulted in individuals and sometimes whole communities being arrested, jailed and, in some cases, tortured or even killed for having allegedly been poaching or for being in areas where wildlife department personnel, police or the military were engaged in anti-poaching operations. Security rights, which include the rights to freedom from torture, execution and imprisonment, have thus become a major concern for indigenous peoples. In this respect it is interesting to note that the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment has been signed by most southern African countries, with only two countries in the region, Angola and Zimbabwe, failing to do so.

Only Botswana and Namibia have allowed local people to hunt and gather for subsistence purposes. As noted by Hitchcock in his chapter on community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), a special game license for hunting by subsistence-oriented households was introduced in Botswana in 1979. It did not, however, prevent people from being harassed and even arrested as suspected “poachers” by game scouts. It was abrogated early in the new millennium. Today, only community trusts receive hunting quotas and only for a certain period each year. The trusts may choose to either use these quotas for their own hunting purposes or sell them to safari operators. In Namibia, the Ju’hoan San in Tsumkwe District East are allowed to hunt specified animals as long as they use traditional weapons and techniques (pursuit hunting on foot with bows and arrows and spears).

For many indigenous peoples, denial of the right to hunt and gather is not only a restriction placed on their subsistence rights, it is also a restriction on their cultural rights. Indigenous peoples realize full well the need for conservation of wildlife, plants and other resources. At the same time, they feel that they should be able to live according to their traditions if they so wish and to exploit resources as long as they do so sustainably.

There have been efforts made in recent years to combine conservation and economic development. As described in several chapters (see Daniels, Pakleppa, Mazonde, Taylor, Akpan et al. and Hitchcock), community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) projects are today implemented in most southern African countries. The results so far have been mixed: some projects have brought great benefits to the indigenous communities, others have failed or been appropriated by dominant groups within the community. As Hitchcock remarks, the
projects are not easy to implement. They need to be monitored closely, diverse interests in the communities should be taken into account and transparency as well as a more participatory approach is recommended in order to ensure greater chances of success. CBNRM projects, however, represent an important attempt to meet the interests of indigenous groups and have the potential to contribute to greater welfare for at least some of the indigenous communities.

The Future of Indigenous Peoples in Southern Africa

With the exception of Zambia (1964) and Botswana (1966), independence came to the other four southern African countries - Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe and South Africa - after prolonged armed liberation struggles, which were often followed by inter and intra-group struggles which, in the case of Angola, lasted for well over 25 years. As discussed in Akpan et al. (this volume), indigenous people in these countries have been exposed to mass killings, torture and detentions without trial, and have witnessed massive human rights violations that could be described as either physical or cultural genocide or both. The proliferation of land mines in a country like Angola has turned huge blocks of agricultural, grazing and foraging land into no-go areas for years to come. Many indigenous people have been forced from their homes, been internally displaced or have crossed international borders and become refugees. All of the countries in southern Africa have had to cope with refugees, establishing large camps such as, for instance, in Dukwe (Botswana) and Osire (Namibia). As documented by Pakleppa (this volume), the establishment of refugee camps can indirectly impact on local indigenous groups and threaten their well-being. But not all refugees are protected under national legislation and given assistance. Instead they are sometimes considered to be illegal immigrants without any rights, as in the case of the San in Zambia (see Akpan et al.).

Today, and with but a few local exceptions, the region is free of armed conflicts. Democracy is developing and countries like Namibia, Botswana and South Africa have progressive constitutions based on equality of rights (see Daniels, Chennells and du Toit and Mazonde, this volume). These countries are relatively prosperous, with diversified economies and a welfare system that meets basic social needs. All six southern African countries considered in this book have signed the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (see Table 2) and, as noted previously, only two, Angola and Zimbabwe, have failed to sign the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>10 Apr 92</td>
<td>10 Apr 92</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>08 Dec 00</td>
<td>22 Mar 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>25 Feb 95</td>
<td>28 Feb 95</td>
<td>11 Dec 82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>03 Oct 94</td>
<td>10 Mar 99</td>
<td>09 Jan 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>10 Jul 84</td>
<td>10 Jul 84</td>
<td>05 Mar 72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Not signed</td>
<td>13 Aug 91</td>
<td>13 Aug 91</td>
<td>12 Jun 91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.
Status of Ratifications for Human Rights Charters, Conventions and Covenants

Source: OHCHR 2004
Yet, as this book documents, the indigenous peoples of southern Africa - with only some exceptions - enjoy few of the rights enshrined in the constitutions of the countries in which they live and which, in most cases, are enjoyed by their fellow citizens, i.e. the right to retain their own cultural identity and be respected, the right to land and to water, the right to subsist and benefit from the natural resources that surround them, and the right to be heard and take part in the decisions that directly affect their lives.

It is interesting to note, in this regard, that none of the six countries have signed Convention No.169 of the International Labor Organization concerning Indigenous and Tribal Peoples in Independent Countries. In other words, none of the southern African governments have subscribed to the only international human rights instrument that deals directly with the rights of indigenous peoples.

As several authors (e.g. Saugestad, Mazonde) underline, one of the misunderstandings of southern African governments with regard to indigenous peoples’ rights is the idea that protecting the rights of indigenous peoples necessarily means that a government would be giving special rights to one group over another. Indigenous peoples are quick to point out that they are seeking equitable treatment, not special treatment. They want the same rights as other groups: the right to be protected from arbitrary arrest and mistreatment, the right to organize and take part in the political process, and the right to benefit equally from development projects.

A second misunderstanding with regard to the indigenous peoples’ rights movement in southern Africa is the idea that it will lead to ethnic conflict because of the promotion of what some government officials describe as “tribalism”. Virtually all indigenous groups are in favor of multiculturalism. They do not want independence but rather autonomy to make their own decisions at the local or regional level.

An important draw-back for the San and the Khoe is that their leadership structures are not recognized by the dominant groups. And where the San have elected chiefs to represent them, as in Namibia (see Daniels, this volume), the government still reserves the right to recognize them formally. But, as shown by Pakleppa, even recognized San leaders do not easily get themselves heard and respected by the authorities.

Because of this, the indigenous groups of southern Africa are seeking to organize and to lobby in defence of their human rights. In doing so, they are employing a variety of innovative strategies that range from use of the Internet and media to conflict resolution and negotiation techniques. One recent development has been the creation of a San Council in South Africa (September 2001) and, more recently, in Namibia in March 2004 (see Saugestad). They have also resorted to le-
gal means to obtain recognition of land and resource rights not only in South Africa, as already mentioned, but also in Botswana where a group of San and Bakgalagadi whose land access rights in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve were extinguished by the Botswana government (see the chapters by Saugestad; Hitchcock, Johnson and Haney; and Taylor) have taken the government to court in order to reclaim their land and resource rights.

Indigenous representatives have, since the 1990s, taken part in international fora on indigenous issues held by academic institutions and indigenous peoples’ human rights and advocacy organizations, and they have attended the meetings of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Populations (WGIP) in order to seek support for respect of their human rights and their land and resource rights. In the light of the international development on specific areas of rights, such as Intellectual Property Rights and Biological Property Rights, they have started to include these rights in their claims for recognition and respect. They have sought to have governments, international organizations and multinational corporations recognize their intellectual property rights and compensate them for the exploitation of culturally significant knowledge (see Chennells and du Toit, this volume). They have also made efforts to have the bodies, body parts and cultural property of individuals who had been taken to Europe for display or analysis returned. The two best-known cases of these repatriation efforts are those of El Negro and Saartje Baartman.

While the indigenous movement is still in its infancy in southern Africa, steps are being taken toward establishing Africa-wide indigenous peoples’ networks and promoting indigenous peoples’ rights at the continental and regional levels, one example being the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee (IPACC).

As this book attempts to demonstrate, indigenous peoples in southern Africa are making some progress in their efforts to promote human rights and social justice. However, as Mazonde rightly remarks, real progress will first be achieved when a change in attitude has been initiated among the “blacks”. It is therefore a significant landmark that the African Commission on Human and Peoples’ Rights adopted and circulated a report on indigenous peoples and communities in November 2003 and, subsequently, set up a Working Group with a mandate to examine the concept of indigenous people, to study the implications of the African Charter on the human rights and well-being of indigenous communities, and to consider recommendations for the monitoring and protection of the rights of indigenous communities (Saugestad, this volume). It is therefore important that indigenous groups and their supporters are vocal about the discrimination they are coping with, and that they and their supporters put pressure on their govern-
ments to commit themselves - not only on paper but in deeds - to the elimination of all forms of racial discrimination. While they still have a long way to go, the indigenous peoples of southern Africa are convinced that their rights will be recognized and that they will be able to enjoy the fruits of development, democracy and social justice.

Notes

1 See Kuper (2003) and the discussions following his article in the section entitled “The Return of the Native”, Current Anthropology 45(1):261-267, 2004; the discussions on African indigenous peoples in the journals American Anthropologist (e.g. Hodgson 2002), Indigenous Affairs, in the annual reports of the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs entitled The Indigenous World, and reports by Survival International and the Minority Rights Group. For additional information, see Barnard and Kenrick (2001) and Kenrick and Lewis (2004).

2 The term apartheid means “apartness” of separate development in Afrikaans. The apartheid period in South Africa lasted from 1948 (election of the Nationalist Party) until 1994, when a democratic election was held in South Africa and the African National Congress (ANC) and its leader, Nelson Mandela, came to power.

3 Sip-wells are hand-dug wells in sandy places in the Kalahari Desert where San and other local people suck water out of the ground using their mouths as a kind of vacuum. These are highly labor-intensive water facilities; it sometimes takes a woman 5-8 hours to get sufficient water to meet her family’s daily water needs.

4 This was noted by Roy Sesana, one of the leaders of First People of the Kalahari (FPK), in discussions with the media concerning the relocation of people out of the Central Kalahari Game Reserve in 2002.

5 Refugees are those persons who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, are outside the country of their nationality.

6 One example has been the conference on indigenous peoples of eastern, central and southern Africa held in Arusha, Tanzania (1999) and organized by the International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA) and the Pastoralist Indigenous Non-Government Organizations Forum (PINGOs Forum), Tanzania.

7 El Negro, a southern African man whose body was stolen from his grave in the early 19th century, was for decades on display in a small museum in Banyoles, Spain. His remains were returned to Botswana in 2000. Saartje Baartman, also known as the “Hottentot Venus”, was exhibited, while alive, in France and England in 1810-1815. After her death, her skeleton, preserved genitals and brain were placed on display in the Musée de l’Homme in Paris, France. Her remains were repatriated to South Africa in 2002, after protracted and complex negotiations between South Africa and France (Parsons 2002; Davies 2003).

8 OIPA - the Organization of Indigenous Peoples of Africa - is another regional umbrella organization, with headquarters in Tanzania.