

Abstract

Following Ingold's dwelling perspective, the world comes into being because an organism/person is continuously interacting with his/her environment, through bodily activity. Dwelling is contrasted with building, in which (wo)man constructs the world cognitively before (s)he can live in it. Here I use a third notion, namely lodging, to refer to a situation in which people live in an essentially foreign environment. Under the influence of a Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) programme, the environment of the Ju/'hoansi Bushmen hunter-gatherers of the Nyae Nyae Conservancy in Namibia is now changing severely towards conservation and tourism. In this paper I use various case situations to show how the environment has become ever more dominant and the people have no option but to adapt. I argue that many such changes in the environment of the Ju/'hoansi are triggered beyond their control, instead of through their interaction with their environment, in such a way that the Ju/'hoansi are more often lodging than dwelling. This reveals the transformation of the cultural understanding the people have of their environment, of their interaction with it (and with the various actors and stakeholders) and with each other.

From dwelling to lodging in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy, Namibia: The meaning of the changes brought about by conservation and tourism in the Ju/'hoansi's environment¹

Stasja Koot²

Introduction: Conservation and tourism in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy

The Ju/'hoansi Bushmen (or San) of Namibia live mainly in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy, a geographical area as well as a legal body (CBO) representing the people in this area. The Conservancy is characterized by its relative geographical isolation, significant funding from donors, the fact that the Ju/'hoansi are a relatively homogeneous group and the concept of a conservancy that, based on Community Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM), attempts to combine conservation and tourism with development. Today Nyae Nyae is the second largest conservancy in Namibia and covers approximately 9030 km², which is roughly 10% of the 90,688 km² that about 1200 Ju/'hoansi occupied in the 1950s. The low population density today – of about 2000 inhabitants – makes it a suitable environment for wildlife. The administrative centre of Tsumkwe is not a part of the Conservancy and Nyae Nyae is located off Namibia's major tourist routes (ACHPR 2008:88; NDNFN 2007).

Today tourism has become an important part of the strategy to ensure local people benefit from conservation. Development and conservation thinking has converged around themes of small-scale community-based development, environmental sustainability and the empowerment of communities, mostly driven by NGOs (Butcher 2007:22-41). One such concept is CBNRM in which communities have the right to the benefits from natural resources based on the legislation allowing regional or local bodies to benefit from protected areas and any activities taking place there. One such activity, and probably the most important, is tourism (Hitchcock 2004:205-209). CBNRM is a conservation strategy first and foremost and is largely donor-driven, attempting to reconcile global

¹ This paper was presented at the yearly conference of the Society For Applied Anthropologists, Albuquerque, NM, on the 22nd of March 2014. It is not meant for quotation because it is work in progress. Parts are based on my PhD *Dwelling in tourism: Power and myth amongst Bushmen in Southern Africa* (Koot 2013). The findings presented here are mainly based on my fieldwork for this, that took place in more places than only the Nyae Nyae Conservancy from March to September 2010.

² Stasja Koot (1974) has been working with Bushmen in Southern Africa since 1999. He is currently assigned at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS) in the Hague, which is a department of the Erasmus University Rotterdam, as a postdoctoral researcher.

agendas with community needs. While it operates at grassroots level, it is not a grassroots strategy and the financial rewards are very limited in most instances. However, CBNRM was never intended to serve as the only or even principal form of income generation for communities, but it was always envisaged that it would provide wages for some and indirect benefits for others, expanding the number of income-generating options (Suzman 2001: 137-138). Since CBNRM's focus is mostly economic and less on social and/or cultural benefits, it incorporates neoliberal economic thinking about markets (Taylor 2008:49). In Namibia many NGOs, ministries, private operators and donors tend to support CBNRM as a way to promote conservation and tourism, but community involvement is limited in the sense that most initiatives start with a decision by the government, NGOs or private actors who want to control a protected area. The extent to which communities are involved is largely within the control of these actors and participation in CBNRM plans and literature often includes a brief consultation with local communities instead of substantial involvement in decision-making (Turner 2004:162). For local people, CBNRM is often one of the few opportunities to acquire rights to natural resources, increase control over their land and gain income through tourism (Hohmann 2003:246). Donors such as USAID and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF) play an important role in the advocacy of CBNRM and conservationists state that the main aim of CBNRM is conservation and that community development and ecotourism are included as a means to this end (Sullivan 2002:160-161; cf. Butcher 2007).

The driving forces that implement policy tend to mask local differences and aspirations by communalizing rhetoric, in such a way that "[d]isplacement in these contexts becomes something more subtle than the physical eviction of peoples from their land in the name of conservation" (Sullivan 2002:159). Rural development and empowerment are confined to the protection of species that can be harmful to the local people and their economic activities. The deals are made between agencies that advise the community and tourist and hunting operators. The latter want to capitalize on wildlife, and CBNRM programmes and policy are thus influenced by the interests of conservationists, tourist and hunting operators, and tourists themselves (*Ibid.*: 165). So clearly,

[e]cotourism is often advocated as a sustainable option as it combines development with an emphasis on preserving wildlife and culture. However...it also ties the development prospects for rural communities to a 'nature first' outlook that severely limits the prospects for substantial economic development. (Butcher 2007:i)

The agenda on which communities can participate are often shaped externally by NGOs, presented to poor rural communities and based on democratic credentials as their sole option, and justified by sustainability (*ibid.*: 99), whereas NGOs are strongly influenced by donor agendas. Sian Sullivan concluded that "underneath the rhetoric, CBNRM is not the radically and qualitatively different approach to conservation that it claims to be" (2002:179). There are unrealistic and generally unvoiced expectations that African communal area residents should live with dangerous wildlife on their land, while trying to increase the populations of these species (*ibid.*: 180). CBNRM can result in a human-wildlife conflict and the costs of this are not always sufficiently covered by the benefits of tourism. Wildlife can create crop-raiding, damage to the infrastructure and even to people's personal safety (Spenceley 2008a: 180).

For Bushmen hunter-gatherers too, CBNRM is associated with social exclusion and/or discrimination within communities and trusts. Marginalized groups have fewer chances of participating than other groups in decision-making processes due to language difficulties and age, while others feel excluded because their social and economic benefits from CBNRM activities are fewer than those of fellow community members. Elites within a community do not always share the benefits equally and the views of the more marginalized community members are often ignored. The degree to which communities have control over their land and resources is limited in Southern Africa by the nature of government land legislation and conservation and the institutional capacity of CBOs is often insufficient (Hitchcock 2004:221-226). This should be seen in the light of the

historical and continuing process of encapsulation, in which indigenous groups are incorporated into larger and more powerful structures such as international organizations and of course the nation state. In this process commercialization is a key aspect in which indigenous groups have to cope with the loss of economic autonomy (Tadesse 2005:2-4) and the subordination of their local economy to outside control, today mostly into an economy driven by market forces (Lee 2005:23; Sahlins 1972:191-196).

Dwelling, building, lodging

Hunter-gatherers such as the Ju/'hoansi Bushmen in Namibia reject the ontological dichotomy between culture and nature. In their thoughts and practices there is no separation of the mind and nature where the mindful subject has to cope with a world full of physical objects. However, this does not mean that the hunter-gatherer worldview is distinctive, and that it is 'at one' with their environment compared to others that are not. Rather, in the hunter-gatherers' perception, the human condition, like that of any other creatures, is based on an active, practical and perceptual engagement with the dwelt-in world. With such an 'ontology of dwelling', this can help us better understand the nature of human existence when compared to western ontology, since the latter is based on the position that the mind is detached from the world and that before any engagement in the world, the mind has to build an intentional world in consciousness. These are not simply alternative ways of viewing the world but it is a contrast between two ways of understanding the world, in which one – the western way – is like the construction of a view, or a process of mental representation, while for the other – the hunter-gatherer way – it is not building but *dwelling*, not construction but engagement, and it is not a way of creating a view *of* the world but rather of taking up a view *in* it (Ingold 2000:40-42). Indeed, dwelling is opposed to building, in which man constructs a world *before* he lives in it, as if man and the environment are separated *a priori* entities that interact. In this approach worlds are made before they are lived in (*Ibid.*: 178-179). Ingold would explain that “[a]n approach that is genuinely ecological...is one that would ground human intention and action within the context of an ongoing and mutually constitutive engagement between people and their environments” (2000:27). The environment is alive and in it hunter-gatherers maintain relationships with these powers in order to survive. Personal relationships that were built up and maintained with various powers in the environment matter all the time (for example throughout previous hunts in history) (Ingold 2000:67). They view the world as an integrated entity and nature, in western terms, is commonly constructed mechanistically, whereas for hunter-gatherers “nature seems to be a set of agencies, simultaneously natural and human-like” (Bird-David 1992:29-30). It therefore makes sense that these people construct their material wants from their natural *and* social environment, with whom they both have a sharing relationship.

So if we consider building and dwelling as two opposite analytical worldviews, in the process of modernization a third possibility arises called 'lodging'. Originally developed by Van Beek *et al.* (forthcoming), the concept of lodging is an ecological idea in which people are confronted with a given environment or the changes within it that do not happen because of their interaction with the elements in their environment. Therefore they are not in control and have no choice but to adapt to them. The environment then automatically becomes dominant, or certain elements in it, and this way becomes an independent variable. In this paper I approach such changes in conservation and tourism that take place in the ecological and socio-political environment of the Ju/'hoansi. It is important to note that these 'environments' should not be considered as separate parts of 'the' environment. In the end, seen from the dwelling/lodging perspective, there is only one environment, and powers in this are all related. In fact, social life was always a part of ecological life and it is hard to distinguish the two (Ingold 2005:503). The hunter-gatherer perception of the environment (dwelling) as opposed to the western view of it (building) are also not absolute opposites; in reality both are present and among hunter-gatherers there are a range of perspectives. Even though such ideal types can illuminate differences, and thus clarify explanations, this runs the danger of covering up the complexities and diversities in a society (Kenrick 2002:197-198). It is therefore relevant to

keep exploring other possible perspectives as well. In addition, concepts such as nature and society are politically loaded and although dwelling is in some way being at home in the world, home is not always comfortable or pleasant and we are never alone there. This therefore also implies fields of power (Ingold 2005:503) and 'lodging' opens the way for this. Lodging then, is not essentially different than dwelling, but it adds a dimension to it that has become very relevant and more important to hunter-gatherers in modern times: that of domination and power relations. Therefore, lodging clearly relates to agency which I consider, based on Giddens (1984:9), an individual's capability to influence the course of events by his/her conduct. Agency then automatically relates to the power that an individual possesses, with which (s)he can alter the change of events by intervening in a sequence of conduct. That means in this case that agency refers to the capability and power of the Ju/'hoansi to act in CBNRM activities and influence these accordingly. Consequently, lodging is a new – modern, if you like – *type* of dwelling. Especially when discussing conservation and tourism, these ideas can also be applied to that part of the environment where human beings meet other human beings, so we often call that part the 'social environment' because any environment for any animal includes 'conspecifics' or individuals of the same species (Ingold 1992:53-54).

Lodging and conservation

The western notion of intervention in nature is similar to the idea of production: It has become an historical process in which human producers transform nature. In fact, we have created and produced our own environment (Ingold 2000:214-215). In this way, the world "is rather presented as a spectacle. They [humans] may observe it, reconstruct it, protect it, tamper it or destroy it, but they do not dwell in it" (*Ibid.*: 215). Scientists who talk about the global environment tend to see humans as being detached, as if we surround the environment, so that we are more exhabitants than inhabitants. This is because the global environment is simply too big to relate to *as* an environment (Ingold 2011:96). In the twentieth century, thinking and acting in both anthropology and conservation was based on the nature-culture dichotomy, as if they are oppositional contrasts. Today, more mutualistic frameworks are emerging, for example in participatory conservation, such as CBNRM, where local voices and indigenous perspectives are being taken into consideration, whereas there was growing attention in social theory for the cultural and political baggage that comes with imposing natural states on environments that were historically characterized by an engagement between human beings and their environment (Campbell 2005:280). However, a hunter-gatherer perception of the environment differs fundamentally from the so-called scientific environmental conservation today as it is advocated by many western NGOs that want to protect wildlife. Scientific conservation is rooted in the view of a separated nature, subordinated to the world of humanity, leading to the idea that merely by inhabiting it, (civilized) humans are bound to alter an environment from its 'natural' state, so that we may think of such environments as a wilderness, meaning that they exist in a genuine natural condition without influences from human civilization (Ingold 2000:67).

The consequences of nature conservation for hunter-gatherers are huge because land and animals are sealed off and human intervention is banned. It is no coincidence that wilderness areas are often inhabited by hunter-gatherers because they are seen as being the true inhabitants of a pristine environment. In scientific conservation, to the embarrassment of some conservationists, hunter-gatherers do not fit, except as a part of the wildlife, of the protected nature. Hunter-gatherers themselves are involved in the environment essential for their life-world and this is incompatible with the principles of scientific conservation, where detachment is a prerequisite. The way that hunter-gatherers consider themselves as custodians of their environment is very different to the scientific notion of conservation. The two should not be confused. Hunter-gatherers do not consider themselves responsible for the survival of wildlife species, but in our one world, humans are insignificant and only a small part. They need to keep up a dialogue with their environment by maintaining a balance in their relationship with its various powers and looking after it through direct

engagement with the parts of the environment (Ingold 2000:68-69; cf. Fennell 2008). From this point of view, rhetoric about hunter-gatherers as if they were the 'true conservationists' does not make sense, but this is widespread amongst stakeholders such as NGOs, government and donors as I experienced in my work with various groups of Bushmen hunter-gatherers throughout the years. Programmes such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Park-People project and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) are based on assumptions of material losses for local people due to conservation practices and therefore some benefits of conservation, such as income from tourism, should be returned to these people via development programmes for alternative livelihoods and income generation. This material substitution for losing access to one's environment means, at best, that people's environmental needs are now considered an instrumental matter, ignoring people's environmental engagements that contain social action and matters of identity and power (Campbell 2005:291). Conservation is clearly also a political activity. Phenomena such as fences blocking local people's movements, wildlife populations being a threat, authorities travelling in expensive vehicles or by plane, access restrictions, quota limits and so on are all having an impact on the political and social environment of these local populations. In interactions with officials and bureaucrats they are often unskilled, and if they do not cooperate with this new regime and the rules and regulations that come with it, they risk eviction, loss of livelihood or even criminal prosecution (Ingold 2005:506-507). Due to the modernizing character of the Bushmen's environment and the processes of conservation and tourism, I argue that today the Ju//hoansi have lost most of their dwelling activities in their current environment and what in fact happens is that they are a lot closer to lodging.

Various Bushmen today apply formal instead of traditional law, or they want to open a bank account for their monthly salary because it means they do not have to share it amongst family members. Such examples show a continuously changing life-world, which does not automatically mean that the modern takes over the traditional but simply that (immaterial) values of modernization are integrated into Bushmen communities, just as (material) rifles, cars, cement houses and electricity have been. For example, to distinguish themselves, some indigenous people compromise with the dominant groups and their ideals. In many cases they have no problem claiming to be the best ecologists in the world (Sahlins 1993:19), although this idea does not make sense when seen from the dwelling perspective as explained above. However, from an indigenous perspective in modernization, it makes sense to claim it in this new situation of lodging because it will increase one's agency in relation to the new dominating forces and actors. Whether it is true or not that (s)he really *is* 'the best ecologist' does not matter, it is *the idea* that (s)he is the best ecologist that matters here. This is a choice based on agency because "are they not just acting as proxy critics of Western society, deceiving and undoing themselves by mystifying Western values as native cultures?...[L]ocal peoples' inventions and inversions of tradition can be understood as attempts to create a differentiated cultural space" (*Ibid.*: 19-20). When we take this into account, we should be aware that, although lodging is a strong perspective to describe current changes in the environment, the fact that various powers in the Ju//hoansi's environment are dominating, this does not mean that the Ju//hoansi are powerless. They are being dominated, and always they will have a certain level of agency, although due to the domination this tends to decrease severely.

The rise of nature conservation in Nyae Nyae

The Ju//hoansi often symbolize the traditional Bushmen of the past as they are perceived in the West. They were often used to refer to the 'standard' of what 'real' hunter-gatherers are like and therefore they have received a disproportionate amount of attention from writers, film makers, photographers, academics and from civil society. All in their own way, such visitors changed something in the Ju//hoansi's environment, but Ju//hoansi perspectives remain remarkably backgrounded while mediated by the same intermediaries who retain most of the control over the studies, images and interpretations (Suzman 2001:39; Tomaselli 1999:131). Already in the middle of the nineteenth century, the Ju//hoansi came into contact with various other groups (Marshall and

Ritchie 1984:34-36) and in the 1950s around 1000 Ju//hoansi were estimated to be living in Nyae Nyae in about 37 communities (Suzman 2001:40).

In 1953 the area came under the administrative responsibility of the South African administration that wanted to transform the Bushmen into subsistence farmers or wage earners (*ibid.*: 40), attempting to 'civilize' them and they were left with no choice but "to transform deep cultural patterns in a single generation" (Marshall and Ritchie 1984:39). 'Development' meant 'to become like us', modernized and western (Sahlins 1992), adopting the standard set by South African colonists who promoted modern life by focusing on settlement, personal property and agriculture (Gordon and Douglas 2000:175-176). After the construction of a school, an administrative camp in Tsumkwe and a military camp the South African Defense Force (SADF) recruited Ju//hoansi as soldiers in 1978, which led to many of them giving up hunting and gathering and living off wages. Activists and anthropologists, such as John Marshall, Claire Ritchie and Megan Biesele, tried to encourage cattle husbandry among the Ju//hoansi. Their efforts were at least partly successful but during the war of independence in the 1980s, they met with opposition from South African wildlife officials and the SADF that wanted to restrict the Ju//hoansi to traditional hunting techniques so that they could develop a game reserve (Barnard 1992:45; Marshall and Ritchie 1984:123-157). It was already announced in 1976 that the Nyae Nyae area would become a nature conservation area in the near future but increased military activity in Bushmanland, the establishment of their first CBO the Ju/Wa Farmers' Union (the predecessor of the Nyae Nyae Conservancy) and the return of many Ju//hoansi to their traditional territories prevented this from happening (Suzman 2001:41). They were to be allowed to hunt on the reserve with bows and arrows and gather with digging sticks 'forever' but most of them would be moved outside the reserve (Lee 2005:96; Marshall and Ritchie 1984:10-11). In Nyae Nyae, they would not be allowed to keep cattle or maintain gardens, their children would be taught at school how to hunt and gather and 'hunting bands' would be organized and supervised by bush rangers. This would provide the opportunity for a special class of tourists to be flown in to overnight campsites and conservation officers, including eight Ju//hoansi, who would do nature walks for them. This was all to protect the Bushmen (Marshall and Ritchie 1984:11; Tomaselli 2005:115-116). It seems that the Ju//hoansi of Nyae Nyae were left with two options: Either living traditionally on a game reserve, an option for only a few of them, or leaving the area altogether. In a letter to the administration, the Ju//hoansi leader /Gaishay ̄Toma responded that "[a]ll Ju/wasi do not want a nature reserve...When the whites wanted to make a nature reserve...they did not tell us that no cattle, no gardens, nothing will be allowed in the reserve" (cited in Marshall and Ritchie 1984:12-13). To prevent this, many Ju//hoansi returned from Tsumkwe to their traditional lands until the 1990s, which was supported by the Ju/Wa Farmers' Union that in turn was supported by the NGO Ju/Wa (Bushman) Development Foundation. The Ju//hoansi were relatively well organized compared to other Bushmen groups and attracted donor support (Biesele 1993, 57-60; Marshall and Ritchie 1984:vii-10; Suzman 2001:42). This organization into corporate bodies at an early stage has clearly helped them to gain a certain level of power.

Becoming a conservancy

Instead of being a game reserve, the Nyae Nyae Conservancy was established after Namibian independence in the early 1990s. A communal conservancy is a geographical area as well as a legal institution dedicated to conservation, tourism and development that permits its members to share the benefits accrued from any natural resources on that land. The land is legally owned by the government but communities have rights of occupation. Within the geographical area of a conservancy, there are zones for different uses such as wildlife, wildlife hunting, wildlife viewing and agriculture. Conservancy members have management responsibilities and can reap benefits from this. For these activities, they require a defined boundary and membership, a legal constitution, a representative management committee and a plan to allow the equitable distribution of benefits so that they can recommend hunting quotas, enter into agreements with private tourist operators and develop tourist enterprises (LAC 2006:28; Spenceley 2008a:162-163; Sullivan 2002:159-164). A

conservancy for the Nyae Nyae area with tourism carried the risk of dependence for the Ju/'hoansi on funds trickling in that would be controlled by outside donors, instead of them becoming self-sufficient (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:220-221).

Today, the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia (NNDNF) is the main NGO supporting the Nyae Nyae Conservancy. In the early and mid-1990s there were a lot of expatriate staff and projects would often fall apart when these people left. Though regularly referred to as an indigenous Namibian NGO, the NNDNF staff at the time consisted mainly of white foreigners without any Ju/'hoansi working for the NGO with the intention of ultimately turning over the control of development programmes and funds to the Nyae Nyae Farmers' Cooperative (later to become the Nyae Nyae Conservancy). The NNDNF's vision in its early years was based on a few key assumptions. One of these was that the Ju/'hoansi were seen as not being ready culturally for their modern circumstances, based on western representations of them as 'Stone Age' people. In addition, the founders of the NNDNF assumed that farming and cattle were crucial for economic development. And at a political level, a representative democracy was considered the best way forward, whereas they were traditionally seen as a group without political organization extending to local kin-based groups. These assumptions clearly reflect western norms for a legitimate model of labor and for the liberal idea of political society, namely democracy (Garland 1999:83-85). Today, many Ju/'hoansi still complain about the NNDNF's dominance (cf. Van der Burg 2013). A former manager of the Conservancy said that the advising role of the NNDNF often turns into decision-making, thereby overruling the Conservancy. This was explained by the owner of a safari camp in the area as due to the Bushmen's humble and egalitarian origins, that puts them in a subordinate position and they tend to accept leadership and dominance from other groups easily. Apart from the NNDNF, many journalists, writers, academics, some private corporate sponsors, ministries and organizations as the United Nations define themselves based on the mandate of 'helping' the Ju/'hoansi on their behalf (Garland 1999:81). This is shown, for example, because many people explained that they are keen on farming as well as income-generating opportunities (cf. Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:226) but today the NNDNF or other NGOs no longer support agriculture. And although people still like to practice hunting and gathering they are restricted in that they are only allowed to hunt with spears and bows and arrows. The use of guns, horses and/or dogs is strictly forbidden. In addition, Ju/'hoansi in Nyae Nyae are worried about the impact of elephants on their water points (Hitchcock 2006:247). The stable supply of water throughout Nyae Nyae has led to an increase in the number of elephants and this is likely to continue. Their ongoing presence in the area where they only used to appear seasonally is bad for the woodland's diversity and can endanger people's lives, although they are good tourist attractions (Humphrey and Wassenaar 2009:52). Today the Tsumkwe settlement still functions as an administrative center for the area although it is located outside the borders of the Nyae Nyae Conservancy. For example, the Conservancy has its office in Tsumkwe (whereas it used to be in Baraka). Tsumkwe is mixed socially and ethnically because many non-Ju/'hoansi have moved there for government jobs. For example, the Ministry of Women's Affairs and Child Welfare built a craft center six months after a Conservancy craft shop, G!hunku, was built. In the years afterwards, a barber and a post office were started in the governments' 'craft center' and the result today is that hardly any of the people working there are Ju/'hoansi while there are no crafts being sold. Tsumkwe shows quick processes of hybridization, contrary to the Conservancy and with few exceptions most of the Ju/'hoansi working in Tsumkwe occupy low-level positions.

Although most settlements inside the Nyae Nyae Conservancy are visited regularly, there were complaints in the past and to a lesser degree still today that the people are not being heard by the Conservancy and that most decisions are made in Tsumkwe. Still, the creation of the Conservancy was described to me by a former manager of the Conservancy as being a connection with the Ju/'hoansi's traditional culture and with a focus on wildlife.

San believe that it was a God given thing to hunt and to live with animals...and they believe that Nature Conservation is taking away their rights, but when this concept [conservancy]

comes in...people start to realize that they regain the system that they believed was given by God to the people so basically people are now aware of what benefits can these animals bring.

This quote shows a clear change in perception of the Ju/'hoansi and their relationship with animals. Previously, they were the privileged custodians of their environment, whereas in this perception of the relationship today, the animal has become 'the benefits' it can provide, as a natural economic resource in the system of a conservancy. The Ju/'hoansi's relationship with animals is changing under the influence of CBNRM and in this way is being dominated by CBNRM principles and organizations. Therefore, this new relation with animals is a sign of lodging instead of dwelling.

In 1994, Elisabeth Garland arrived in the area for a three-month consultancy on tourism, believing she had been hired by the local Ju/'hoansi, although it turned out that she had been taken on by the NNDNFN expatriate staff, while the Ju/'hoansi did not know who she was or her reason for being there. The staff told her that all existing tourist ventures should be incorporated in the Farmers' Cooperative's control and individual entrepreneurs should be discouraged from beginning new projects if not working through this centralized body, so that revenue from tourism could be equally distributed to the entire population of Nyae Nyae. Tourism turned out to be the last thing on the Ju/'hoansi's mind then and Garland noticed strong segregation between the expatriate staff and the Ju/'hoansi. The latter complained about a lack of control over revenue from the projects and access to vehicles. Apparently there were many paternalistic talks among white expatriates who noted the irresponsibility of the Ju/'hoansi. Altogether, this tension led to resistance among the Ju/'hoansi, which resulted in some expatriates being fired by the Ju/'hoansi (Garland 1999:86-91; cf. Biesele and Hitchcock 2011:153-167). In addition, some villages (Kaptein se Pos and Klein Dobe) wanted their own rights in the 1990s to make contracts with whoever they wished, but the Farmers' Cooperative wanted to manage the process more equitably (Tomaselli 2005:128).

Still today, in addition to the opportunities CBNRM can bring to some, for others it can have a restricting and delaying role in relation to people's private initiatives. Some people complained of the dominance of NGOs (especially the NNDNFN) and donors and consultants. Decision making tends to take a long time and is heavily influenced by outsiders, according to one of the freelance tour guides in Tsumkwe who has worked with tourists for years and who would like to start his own campsite with activities. However, he sees that the Conservancy, as an institution, does not really understand tourism but still has the authority to give permission for individual projects and takes decisions slowly because of meetings at various levels, while those behind it are disappointed by decisions being made by the NNDNFN and the WWF. Even if permission is granted by the Conservancy, it is possible, for example, that they choose another project location, which can be demotivating for people if they have to start up something for themselves. Another example is when the former manager of the Conservancy said that he had suggested converting the buildings at Baraka, the old NNDNFN headquarters, into bungalows for tourists from Botswana, based on the idea that it is close to the main road and accessible to 2 x 4s. Then the NNDNFN advised waiting for the expert's report, the *Tourism Development Plan for Nyae Nyae & N#a-Jaqna Conservancies* (Humphrey and Wassenaar 2009; cf. Van der Burg 2013:62) where there was no recommendation as such to be found. However, the findings and recommendations were based mostly on accommodation and tour operators, government employees, NGOs, trophy hunters, anthropologists and investors. Of the forty-four respondents in Nyae Nyae and N#a Jaqna together (the N#a Jaqna Conservancy borders Nyae Nyae to the West), only 8 were local Bushmen and as far as I could retrieve only 2 Ju/'hoansi from Nyae Nyae were interviewed, both from the settlement Kremetartkop (Humphrey and Wassenaar 2009:97). It is then safe to conclude that local perceptions have been ignored for this report, whereas at the same time it seems that donors as well as NGOs tend to follow the consultants' advises. In fact, the report was even done in cooperation with the NNDNFN and the largest NGO for Bushmen in Southern Africa the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA). The NNDNFN employees explained that they encouraged the

Conservancy to follow the recommendations of this report, which was written to prepare for Millennium Challenge Account (MCA) funding. So although the Conservancy itself is often regarded by various Ju/'hoansi as dominating, board members of the Conservancy themselves in turn complained about domination by outsiders.

New meanings for tracking and hunting

Tourism has been seen as a way of valuing the Ju/'hoansi's traditional skills. Caroline Ashley explained how, due to tourism, "Ju/'hoansi tracking skills, which were dying out, are gaining *new value* for tourist-guiding in former Bushmanland [Nyae Nyae and Nꞑa Jaqna Conservancies]" (1998:331, my emphasis). In line with Ashley, it is argued here that, in the case of new values for traditional skills, we should be careful not to act as if we are talking about the same skill. The skills have gained a different meaning in a changed environment. Whereas in the past, tracking was a social phenomenon with the goal of acquiring meat, today it is still social but has become a financial resource too, in the end also as a means of acquiring food or other things. The meaning of tracking has changed considerably and tracking skills are unlikely ever to be the same again.

Let me illustrate this with an example. Recently the Conservancy worked on a tracking project in six villages in the southeastern corner of Nyae Nyae to identify traditional master trackers from the older generation who could pass on their knowledge to youngsters (Alpers 2009). A main concern was that some of the elders were struggling with poor eyesight. For this reason, two of the elders made too many mistakes and one of them refused to admit this. Other elders agreed that he was right even though at first they had a different opinion. The man was not included in the training programme for younger trackers due to these mistakes but the next day this led to tension amongst the remaining elders who feared they might be the next to fail. Then the white South African tracking expert of a company called CyberTracker, who was in charge of the group, decided to let them discuss the tracks together and come up with a consensus and they consistently gave the right answer. When relating this to tourism, we can gain insight of the changed meaning that tracking can have in a new, modern environment. There are clear differences between subsistence tracking and tracking in tourism, since in the latter type of tracking most animals are spotted *from a vehicle* by trackers working in tourism on a daily basis. Before, tracking and hunting took place *on foot* (feeling, smelling, hearing) and animals such as lions, leopards, cheetah and wild dog were then rarely seen by Ju/'hoansi hunters, who used to base their knowledge of these animals mainly on the tracks they saw instead of by *seeing* them. Therefore, it is more difficult for subsistence trackers to get to know the tracks of 'tourist animals'. On top of this, trackers from the tourism industry have had the benefit of using a guide book as a reference. In one case, the trackers gave the 'wrong' answer collectively, but then they were shown a guide book after which they admitted their mistake. The authority of a book is evident here (Liebenberg 2009). This example demonstrates several points. First, it clarifies a change in the meaning of skills: They now afford something different because the skill itself has changed due to changes in the environment (using a car, the type of animal being tracked). Second, it shows a subversive attitude by the Ju/'hoansi, which can be seen in their nervousness and acceptance of white authority over their own tradition (either as a person or, indirectly, the authority of a book). Without denying any of the tracking qualities of the man in charge or the writer of the handbook, it is clear that they decide what is 'right' and 'wrong' when tracking. They therefore influence what tracking means for the Ju/'hoansi and this way dominate the environment, including ideas about traditional skills. The Ju/'hoansi seem to adapt to this dominance. Third, based on the previous two points, a process of detachment from their environment can be noted. These Ju/'hoansi trackers do not track *in* their environment but this new type of tracking is based on looking *at* it, as if nature is 'out there' to be seen, to be followed and to drive through in a car. This is an approach that follows the western nature culture dichotomy and tracking in this way is not dwelling but lodging.

Before, tracking could not be seen apart from hunting, but today most people in Africa who are defined as hunter-gatherers risk arrest and imprisonment if they engage in subsistence hunting

due to colonial and postcolonial conservation laws (Hitchcock 2001:139), whereas commercial hunting has been introduced and joint ventures are being signed between conservancies and trophy-hunting operators. Apart from these private farms, conservancies also have concessionary rights to start joint ventures for hunting, for which the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) awards hunting quotas (thus holding the ultimate power over wildlife) (Hohmann 2003:211). For hunter-gatherers hunting was a social activity, not only amongst the hunters but also with the environment, whereas today conservation projects in Southern Africa revolve around a limited number of large mammals (Sullivan 2002:176-177). Considering the meanings attributed to wildlife by many local groups and especially hunter-gatherers, wildlife has greater importance than simply its nutritional or monetary value, something that is often overlooked in conservation policies (Taylor 2002:471). It seems as if wildlife has become just another commodity without ontological significance (Tomaselli 2005:58). The Namibian MET Minister feels it is

common knowledge that tourism in general, and trophy hunting in particular, has grown to be one of the most important industries in Namibia in terms of its strong contribution to the Gross Domestic Product, creation of employment, training opportunities and the wellbeing and social upliftment of our rural people. (Nandi-Ndaitwah 2012:4)

I agree that trophy hunting creates employment, although not in substantial numbers, and the training opportunities are very limited in this type of hunting. The automatic assumption that the Minister seems to make is that the well-being and social uplifting of rural people will follow after a community generates income from trophy hunting. The main reason to start a joint venture with a hunting operator is that it creates a lot of finances, which functions as an engine behind the CBNRM policy. It should be realized that trophy hunting is not something that Bushmen are connected with because of their traditions of subsistence hunting. It is a western, mainly white, phenomenon, based on an idea of a wild and romantic Africa, in which modern technologies such as guns and cars are crucial. In trophy hunting, Bushmen take the place of assistants. And contemporary benefits such as meat handouts

might satisfy a consumptive event, but cannot meet these other aspects that the *process* and experience of the hunt also satisfies ... Hunting and other practices *vis-à-vis* environment are also accompanied by stories, songs, humour and joy: by a rich symbolic, metaphorical and affirmative language of relationship and conceptualisation. (Sullivan 2006:119-120)

Trophy hunting is providing very welcome cash income and some meat and jobs for those who use their agency to work for a commercial hunter. However, the rules and regulations concerning trophy hunting are decided by outsiders (NGOs, donors, the government), which constrains Bushmen's agency severely. It is often said that this activity suits the Bushmen because it is 'so close to their culture' but that idea is invalid because trophy hunting is a modern activity based on new power relations, which does not have a lot to do with subsistence hunting.

However, unlike many other places in Africa, the Ju/'hoansi of Nyae Nyae are still allowed to hunt as long as they use traditional weaponry: Bows, arrows, spears and clubs. Today, the only people who are allowed to use guns for hunting are trophy hunters who enter the area with a hunting safari company. This created some frustration amongst the Ju/'hoansi in the 1990s because they were troubled by the wildlife, especially elephants and lions, and were not allowed to kill the animals. They felt discriminated against when they realized that people who could afford to pay large amounts of money were allowed to hunt these animals (Hitchcock 1997:111-116; Hitchcock 2001:139). In 2010, the main contractor, an elephant hunter, had subleased part of his contract to another hunter. There is a striking difference in people's opinions of the two hunters. When I asked the group working with the main contractor in 2010 they explained that they had never been happy

working for the man because he treated them so badly, but worked for him anyway due to a lack of other opportunities. They explained that this hunter was chosen by the authorities, the Conservancy and WWF simply because he paid the highest amount for the concession, which in turn is necessary as a financial stimulation for the CBNRM project. The Ju/'hoansi workers from the hunting camp told me that they have had no influence on this. All they can do is to complain about such matters at Conservancy meetings.

More private sector involvement in transfrontier conservation

Nyae Nyae has become a part of the Kavango Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Area (KAZA TFCA), an enormous cross-border conservation initiative including parts of Angola, Namibia, Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia. TFCAs aim for a blend of conservation and development objectives in which tourism is considered a driving force, specifically as a means of achieving the objectives of economic development and poverty alleviation (Suich 2008:187-188). Supporters of TFCAs in Southern Africa have continuously argued that the development of ecotourism will bring economic growth. This is strongly linked to the CBNRM agenda, where communities manage and profit from ecotourism ventures within TFCAs (Duffy 2006:96). The WWF suggests that TFCAs have the capacity to strategically develop sustainable tourism, which in turn could support the costs of conservation management while also providing entrepreneurial opportunities and employment for the poor (Spenceley 2008b:367). However, I spoke to people of the WWF as well as NGOs who were afraid that local people would be excluded from the planning stages of the initiative again. Still, it is expected that KAZA will increase the number of tourists in Nyae Nyae (cf. Humphrey and Wassenaar 2009:96) and thereby create benefits for the community, who will be able to sell more crafts, and for private lodge owners.

In fact, the local Ju/'hoansi that I talked to in 2010, when KAZA negotiations had been going on for about seven years, were not even aware of any plans to create the KAZA TFCA. This included the local tour guides. A young Ju/'hoansi man said that "I am not aware of that...Sometimes information, some of us didn't get it, so we get it late, when it was already on the pipeline". And even in an interview at the main office of the NNDFN in Windhoek I found out that even the manager of the NNDFN in Windhoek was unaware of this initiative. This strongly confirms what Biesele and Hitchcock (2011:26) concluded, namely that

for the Ju/'hoansi...in spite of the rhetoric about public participation and the benefits of tourism that are supposed to accrue to local populations, eco-tourism programmes, more often than not, serve to dispossess poor local people and have only limited social and economic benefits as well as many risks.

The Ju/'hoansi, just as indigenous people all over the world, are dominated by others outside their local communities who make decisions for them (*Ibid.*: 27). Clearly, they see the Ju/'hoansi's environment as one in which their agency is becoming severely limited, because the environment tends to dominate them more than ever. And now that plans for private sector involvement in tourism only grew with the coming of KAZA, for which the treaty was signed in 2011, it gets more interesting to look into Ju/'hoansi relations with private operators.

For example, in 2007 the Tsumkwe Lodge (that was started in 1994) changed ownership and was sold to Namibia Country Lodges to be renamed Tsumkwe Country Lodge. There are now only a few Bushmen working at the lodge, but it is based on traditional Bushmen culture, which is also symbolized in their logo in which a figure walking with bow and arrow resembles a 'traditional' Bushman. Therefore it is especially interesting that Tsumkwe Country Lodge lost most of its Ju/'hoansi staff after the takeover. The staff were taken on a three-month trial basis so that both sides could see how they worked together. However, most of the staff left in these three months because they were dissatisfied with the new management. They left for two reasons: Dissatisfaction with their salaries (some told me they were cut) and a bad relationship with the new management.

Some people wondered why one man of the local staff working at the lodge was not employed as the new manager. Instead of working on better relations with the local staff, a top-down idea of starting a training academy in tourism was developed by Namibia Country Lodges to strengthen the Ju/'hoansi's traditional skills and to provide hospitality training, while there were good, qualified staff at the lodge when they took it over. For example, there was already a lot of frustration by Ju/'hoansi – Conservancy board members as well as others – about the lodge not paying the agreed N\$30,- per tourist entering the Nyae Nyae Conservancy, something that had still not been settled in 2012 (Van der Burg 2013:37), showing how local control was very limited while outsiders far away were making plans *for* the Ju/'hoansi. And although Namibia Country Lodges intended to employ more Ju/'hoansi, there is no formal obligation for them to do so, which was something that the managing director from Windhoek wanted out of the contract. The new lodge manager³ in 2010 explained that

we identified a big problem here...We [Namibia Country Lodges] want to build a classroom, a community center and in this community center we want to organize a course for the children of the community about the culture of the San people, which must be taught by the elders, those who stay in the villages, about their own tradition. Because it looks as if it is starting to die out.

In addition to paternalism, there is a strong focus on the Bushmen's traditional culture. As is so often the case, it is outsiders who are determining how this culture should be preserved, looking at culture as a static, isolated construct, while many of the youngsters in Nyae Nyae want to be educated, wear western clothes and find employment, all of which are likely to distance themselves from their traditions and involve them in a modern consumer economy (Jeursen and Tomaselli 2002:46) (Jeursen & Tomaselli 2002: 46). In addition, Conservancy members complained that two tented camps were supposed to be built by Namibia Country Lodges in Nyae Nyae already since 2004, and that this would generate benefits to the Ju/'hoansi, but this never materialized (cf. Koot 2013:91-93). Obviously, most of the local Ju/'hoansi feel sidelined since the takeover by Namibia Country Lodges. Altogether, the cooperation between the Ju/'hoansi and Namibia Country Lodges has been very disappointing.

Conclusion

The CBNRM programme in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy has altered the Ju/'hoansi's environment severely. CBNRM is a continuation of past practices, in the sense that outside powers tend to dominate the Ju/'hoansi's environment evermore. Instead of dwelling, the Ju/'hoansi tend to lodge today; they are being dominated by stronger powers in their environment. The process from dwelling to lodging is historical as well as political. In this process, interaction with powers in their environment becomes less, whereas adaptation tends to become the norm. Meanings of various hunter-gatherer activities (such as tracking or hunting) have now changed (and continue to change) under the influence of outsiders. These changes are based on new relationships that have evolved in their environment, for example with the (manager of the) Tsumkwe Country Lodge, trophy hunters, tourists, the government, NGOs, expatriates, donors and consultants, who all in their own way support the Ju/'hoansi, but always from a more dominant position. For example, the controversial take-over of the lodge by Namibia Country Lodges highlights how the private sector is not necessarily the savior it is often considered to be. In fact, after the take-over Ju/'hoansi were disempowered, which is all the more ironic when one realizes that there were well-trained, qualified staff already working there. Such disempowerment shows even clearer in relation to the creation of the KAZA TFCA in the process of which the Ju/'hoansi have simply been excluded from negotiations,

³ This man was the manager in 2010, he was later fired and another manager was appointed (Lisette van der Burg, pers. comm.). In addition, I was also told in 2014 that the lodge had closed down (Rachel Giraudo, pers.comm.).

just as they were never taken seriously by consultants in the planning stages for tourism in Nyae Nyae. Such elite policy making shows how decisions are being made *for* the Ju/'hoansi by the more powerful actors in their environment instead of *by* them. There is a clear tendency by outsiders to take the knowledge of the Ju/'hoansi very serious, but *only* if this is so-called indigenous knowledge, and not when the Ju/'hoansi have local knowledge of modernity (for example the employees of the lodge who all left had lots of knowledge about tourism in the area, the denial of tourism for Baraka, the Conservancy being overruled by the NNDFN, MET deciding the hunting quotas), whereas the consultants' report mentions throughout that the Ju/'hoansi can be involved in tourism if they show 'authentic' behavior (Humphrey and Wassenaar 2009). Although I do not doubt the good intentions of these outsiders, there is a clear tendency to iconize the Ju/'hoansi as Stone Age people by denying them a serious voice in modernity, based on an assumption that 'objective' and 'scientific' knowledge is the right way (as in the building perspective), often based on goals set in a new and dominant capitalist world economy, following this logic. Although this happens very subtle covered under a veil of development rhetoric, it is something that the famous filmmaker and Bushman activist John Marshall had already warned for in the 1980s (Marshall 1984). This, of course, can only happen because power relations have changed so much during the last century and new rules were introduced, favoring conservation and tourism. The Ju/'hoansi seem to adapt to these powers, although not completely without agency, which has become a lot more limited when compared to the dwelling days. Even though they are formally represented as a community in a legal representative body, the Nyae Nyae Conservancy, this increases the agency of a chosen few, but not necessarily of the overall community. A formal increase of power for the broad community does not necessarily result in increased agency for individuals or smaller groups (families or settlements) within that community. And while many people living in Nyae Nyae feel restricted by the Conservancy and the CBNRM programme, the Conservancy in turn tends to be influenced and restricted by the various outsiders. It is therefore doubtful to call the Conservancy a community representation, because often it tends to be a CBO that is used to implement outsiders' agendas and ideas. CBNRM clearly brings certain developments and favors conservation, but constrains other possibilities such as agriculture or private entrepreneurialism that people have shown to favor already since the early 1990s (for example expatriates demotivating private entrepreneurialism or feeling limited in starting one's own campsite after many years of tour guiding). In addition, the programme tends to create bureaucratic and hierarchical structures that most marginalized Ju/'hoansi tend to ignore because they do not feel they have enough agency to handle them.

I showed how dwelling has now turned into lodging in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy because of the Ju/'hoansi's limited control over their ever-changing environment. They are being confronted with these changes and have to adapt to them. Dwelling (that was used by Ingold as opposed to building) has gained a different meaning for the Ju/'hoansi today, strongly influenced by (new) powers in conservation and tourism. Modernization, although providing many opportunities, also constrains the Ju/'hoansi in many ways, often beyond their control. Instead of dwelling in their environment, they are today lodging in the global environment: Global powers dominate their environment continuously, who very subtly consider their knowledge of the world better than the Ju/'hoansi's contemporary local knowledge. The Ju/'hoansi tend to be pushed into subordination by connecting them with 'traditional' and 'indigenous' knowledge, as if they belong there. Their agency then becomes limited to *adapting to* these changes but *not to change itself*. Lodging, then, is not inherently different than dwelling, but it is a *type of dwelling*, and there could be more types of dwelling, in which power relations are heavily weighed. In this sense a lodging perspective is an important add-on to the dwelling perspective for the analyses of hunter-gatherers in today's world.

Bibliography

- ACHPR. 2008. *Report of the African Commission's Working Group on Indigenous Populations/Communities: Mission to the Republic of Namibia: 26 July-5 August 2005*. Copenhagen: Uldahl Graphix.
- Alpers, Friedrich. 2009. *Report on Tracker Evaluations Held in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy and Bwabwata National Park, West Caprivi*.
- Ashley, Caroline. 1998. "Tourism, Communities and National Policy: Namibia's Experience." *Development Policy Review* 16 (4): 323-352.
- Barnard, Alan. 1992. *Hunters and Herders of Southern Africa: A Comparative Ethnography of the Khoisan Peoples*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Biesele, Megan. 1993. "Land, Language, and Leadership." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 17 (2): 57-60.
- Biesele, Megan and Robert K. Hitchcock. 2011. *The Ju/'hoan San of Nyae Nyae and Namibian Independence: Development, Democracy, and Indigenous Voices in Southern Africa*. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Bird-David, Nurit. 1992. "'Beyond 'the Original Affluent Society': A Culturalist Reformulation'." *Current Anthropology* 33 (1): 25-47.
- Butcher, Jim. 2007. *Ecotourism, NGOs and Development: A Critical Analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Campbell, Ben. 2005. "Introduction: Changing Protection Policies and Ethnographies of Environmental Engagement." *Conservation and Society* 3 (2): 280-322.
- Duffy, Rosaleen. 2006. "The Potential and Pitfalls of Global Environmental Governance: The Politics of Transfrontier Conservation Areas in Southern Africa." *Political Geography* 25 (1): 89-112.
- Fennell, David A. 2008. "Ecotourism and the Myth of Indigenous Stewardship." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 16 (2): 129-149.
- Garland, Elizabeth. 1999. "Developing Bushmen: Building Civil(Ized) Society in the Kalahari and Beyond." In *Civil Society and the Political Imagination in Africa: Critical Perspectives*, edited by John L. Comaroff and Jean Comaroff, 72-103. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gordon, Robert J. and Stuart Sholto Douglas. 2000. *The Bushman Myth: The Making of a Namibian Underclass*. 2nd ed. Boulder: Westview Press.
- Hitchcock, Robert K. 1997. "Cultural, Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism among Kalahari Bushmen." In *Tourism and Culture: An Applied Perspective*, edited by Erve Cambers, 93-128. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- . 2001. "Hunting is our Heritage: The Struggle for Hunting and Gathering Rights among the San of Southern Africa." *Senri Ethnological Studies* (59): 139-156.

- . 2004. "Natural Resource Management among Kalahari San: Conflict and Cooperation." In *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*, edited by Robert K. Hitchcock and Diana Vinding, 202-227. Copenhagen: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- . 2006. "We are the Owners of the Land': The San Struggle for the Kalahari and its Resources." *Senri Ethnological Studies* 70: 229-256.
- Hohmann, Thekla. 2003. "'We are Looking for Life. we are Looking for the Conservancy'. Namibian Conservancies, Nature Conservation and Rural Development: The Nǀa-Jaǁna Conservancy." In *San and the State: Contesting Land, Development, Identity and Representation.*, edited by Thekla Hohmann, 205-254. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Humphrey, Ed and Theo Wassenaar. 2009. *Tourism Development Plan: Nyae Nyae & Nǀa-Jaǁna Conservancies*. Windhoek: Yetu Consulting Services and African Wilderness Restoration.
- Ingold, Tim. 2011. *Being Alive: Essays on Movement, Knowledge and Description*. New York: Routledge.
- . 1992. "Culture and the Perception of the Environment." In *Bush Base: Forest Farm: Culture, Environment, and Development*, edited by Croll, E. & Parkin, D., 39-56. London: Routledge.
- . 2005. "Epilogue: Towards a Politics of Dwelling." *Conservation and Society* 3 (2): 501-508.
- . 2000. *The Perception of the Environment: Essays on Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*. London: Routledge.
- Jeursen, Belinda and Keyan G. Tomaselli. 2002. "Romancing the Kalahari: Personal Journeys of Methodological Discovery." *Current Writing: Text and Reception in Southern Africa* 14 (1): 29-58.
- Kenrick, Justin. 2002. "Anthropology and Anthropocentrism: Images of Hunter-Gatherers, Westerners and the Environment." *Senri Ethnological Studies* (60): 191-213.
- Koot, Stasja Patoelja. 2013. "Dwelling in Tourism: Power and Myth Amongst Bushmen in Southern Africa." PhD, African Studies Centre.
- LAC. 2006. *Our Land they Took: San Land Rights Under Threat in Namibia*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Centre.
- Lee, Richard B. 2005. "Power and Property in Twenty-First Century Foragers: A Critical Examination." In *Property and Equality Volume 2: Encapsulation, Commercialisation, Discrimination*, edited by Widlok, T. & Tadesse, W.G., 16-31. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Liebenberg, Louis. 2009. *Cybertracker Conservation: Evaluation of Traditional Master Trackers in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy, Namibia*.
- Marshall, John. 1984. "Death Blow to the Bushmen." *Cultural Survival Quarterly* 8 (3): 13-16.
- Marshall, John and Claire Ritchie. 1984. *Where are the Ju/Wasi of Nyae Nyae? Changes in a Bushman Society, 1958-1981*. Cape Town: Centre for African Studies, University of Cape Town.

- Nandi-Ndaitwah, Netumbo. 2012. "Wildlife, Hunting and Economic Development: Namibia's Lesson for the World." *Huntinamibia*, 4-5.
- NNDFN. "Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia: A Non-Governmental Organisation Working with San Communities (Brochure).".
- Sahlins, Marshall. 1992. "The Economics of Develop-Man in the Pacific." *RES: Anthropology and Aesthetics*: 12-25.
- . 1993. "Goodbye to Tristes Tropes: Ethnography in the Context of Modern World History." *The Journal of Modern History* 65 (1): 1-25.
- . 1972. *Stone Age Economics*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Spenceley, Anna. 2008a. "Impacts of Wildlife Tourism on Rural Livelihoods in Southern Africa." In *Responsible Tourism: Critical Issues for Conservation and Development*, edited by Anna Spenceley, 159-186.
- . 2008b. "Implications of Responsible Tourism for Conservation and Development in Southern Africa." In *Responsible Tourism: Critical Issues for Conservation and Development*, edited by Anna Spenceley, 361-376. London: Earthscan.
- Suich, Helen. 2008. "Tourism in Transfrontier Conservation Areas: The Kavango-Zambezi TFCA." In *Responsible Tourism: Critical Issues for Conservation and Development*, edited by Anna Spenceley, 187-203. London: Earthscan.
- Sullivan, Sian. 2006. "The Elephant in the Room? Problematising 'new' (Neoliberal) Biodiversity Conservation." *Forum for Development Studies* 33 (1): 105-135.
- . 2002. "How Sustainable is the Communalizing Discourse of 'new' Conservation? the Masking of Difference, Inequality and Aspiration in the Fledgling 'Conservancies' of Namibia." In *Conservation and Mobile Indigenous Peoples: Displacement, Forced Settlement, and Sustainable Development*, edited by Chatty, D. & Colchester, M., 158-187. Oxford: Berghahn Press.
- Suzman, James. 2001. *An Assessment of the Status of the San in Namibia*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Centre.
- Tadesse, W. G. 2005. "Introduction." In *Property and Equality, Volume 2: Encapsulation, Commercialisation, Discrimination.*, edited by Widlok, T. & Tadesse, W.G., 1-15. New York: Berghahn Books.
- Taylor, Julie Jennifer. 2008. "Naming the Land: Identity, Authority and Environment in Namibia's West Caprivi." PhD, Oxford University.
- Taylor, Michael. 2002. "The Shaping of San Livelihood Strategies: Government Policy and Popular Values." *Development and Change* 33 (3): 467-488.
- Tomaselli, Keyan G. 1999. "Encounters in the Kalahari: Some Points of Departure." *Visual Anthropology* 12 (2): 131-136.

- . 2005. *Where Global Contradictions are Sharpest: Research Stories from the Kalahari*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: Rozenberg Publishers.
- Turner, Robin L. 2004. "Communities, Wildlife Conservation, and Tourism-Based Development: Can Community-Based Nature Tourism Live Up to its Promise?" *Journal of International Wildlife Law and Policy* 7 (3-4): 161-182.
- Van Beek, Walter, Stasja Patoelja Koot, and Jeroen Diemer. forthcoming. "Living Inside the Park: The Barakwena of the Caprivi, Namibia." .
- Van der Burg, Lisette. 2013. "Commodification of the Ju/'hoansi Culture: Destroying Authenticity Or Revitalizing Tradition?" MA, University of Leiden.