



LUND UNIVERSITY
Faculty of Social Sciences

Graduate School
Department of Political Science

SIMT29, Master's Thesis (Two Years)
in Development Studies
Spring Term 2011
Supervisor: Ted Svensson

The Power to Subvert

Government Discourse and Namibia's San Development
Policy

Silja Emmel

Abstract

The Namibian San people live in poverty and marginalisation and that despite the country's constantly increasing economic wealth. Quantifiable factors such as unemployment and education are identified as the roots of the problem, and are being addressed through aid programmes. These quantifiable factors do, however, only present an incomplete picture of the problem. By performing a critical discourse analysis (CDA) of the government discourse that surrounds the San, I point out the importance of scrutinizing the non-quantifiable, the discursive side of the problem in order to get a deeper understanding of its causes. Using a theoretical framework centred around the role of knowledge and power structures in shaping reality, and postcolonial thought in understanding the origins of these structures I find that the colonial image of the San still haunts them today in defining how they are treated and therewith plays a role in their marginalisation. In order to comprehensively address the problem, these immaterial factors have to be taken into account.

Key words: Namibia, San people, Critical Discourse Analysis, marginalisation, postcolonialism, power structures

Words: 19 977

Table of contents

1	Introduction.....	4
1.1	Research Problem	6
1.2	Structure of the thesis	8
2	Introduction to the case.....	9
2.1	San / Bushman – What’s in the name	9
2.2	Present situation of the San.....	10
2.3	Government initiatives.....	13
3	Theoretical Framework.....	15
3.1	Power, knowledge and the creation of truth	15
3.2	The concept of discourse	18
3.3	Discourse and (post) colonial ethnic identity	20
3.4	Tying the strings together	23
4	Methodological Framework.....	24
4.1	Critical Discourse Analysis	24
4.2	Shortcomings of and adjustments to the model	28
4.3	Choice of Material	29
4.4	Limitations	31
5	Historical Background on the San	32
6	Analysis.....	37
6.1	Categories of Analysis	37
6.2	Text Analysis	38
6.3	Analysis of Discursive Practice	45
6.4	Analysis of Social Practice	50
6.5	Overview over findings	54
7	Results and Concluding Reflections.....	55
8	Executive Summary	57
9	References.....	60
9.1	Discourse Analysis Material	65

9.2	Internet sources	66
9.3	Interviews.....	66
10	Appendices.....	67
10.1	DPM Speech 1	67
10.2	DPM speech 2	69
10.3	OPM Annual Report 2006-2007	70
10.4	OPM Annual Report 2007-2008.....	72
10.5	OPM Annual Report 2008-2009	73

List of Abbreviations

CDA	Critical Discourse Analysis
DPM	Deputy Prime Minister
EMU	Emergency Management Unit
GIB	Government Information Bulletin
GRN	Government
HDI	Human Development Index
HDR	Human Development Report
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LAC	Legal Assistance Centre
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OPM	Office of the Prime Minister
SADF	South African Defence Force
SWAPO	South West African Peoples Organisation
WIMSA	Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in southern Africa

1 Introduction

In finding solutions for enduring poverty and marginalisation of groups of people, much attention is commonly paid to material and measurable factors like access to health care, education and work. As a consequence aid programmes and policies mainly address these quantifiable factors. The importance of these in tackling poverty is undeniable; numerous studies have focused on the impact of social policy and development, and measures such as the Human Development Index (HDI), the Gini coefficient of inequality, and even the Millennium Development Goals, are based on those factors. Focussing solely on material factors does, however, provide an incomplete picture of a situation of enduring poverty and marginalisation.

An examination of immaterial factors such as language and with it rhetorical subjugation of a group could complete the picture. An analysis of language's influence on the ways in which society is structured¹ and what people believe are the right norms and values can provide deeper understanding of society and its functioning. Societal structures and power hierarchies influence the opportunities of people and their place in a society - structures communicated through language. Hence, by analysing the use of language and with it the discourse around a topic carefully, deeper reasons for the disadvantaged position of some in society and the privileged position of others can be uncovered. This thesis will do exactly that: explore how much discourse can contribute to persistent poverty and marginalisation, and the extent to which an analysis of discourse can lead to the identification and possibly solution to the problem. By looking not only at the visible symptoms of the problem – i.e. lack of money, education and low life expectancy – but also the discourse around a problem, an understanding of the actual causes of the problem could be gained.

I started wondering about these questions after returning from a fieldwork trip to Namibia, where I was trying to find the reasons for an indigenous ethnic minority's marginalisation and continued poverty despite the country's growing economic wealth (The

¹ Of course, social structures are also dependent on material factors like wealth but as will be explained later on, discourse can play a significant role in establishing and maintaining these structures - especially in the case in a former colony.

Economist 2011).² The indigenous ethnic minority are called the San and also known as “Bushmen”.

While they once were the sole inhabitants of Southern Africa, they now exist as minority groups in Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, Angola, Zambia and Zimbabwe. After Botswana, Namibia has the second highest San population in the region; estimates suggest that there are presently approximately 38.000 San in Namibia (ILO, 2010). They are the country’s most marginalised and impoverished ethnic group, as quantifiable factors as those mentioned above show (Daniels: 46 in Hitchcock et al. 2004)³.

To investigate the reasons for their marginalised situation for my thesis, I went to Namibia for two month in March and April 2010. However, already after a few days I realised that the task was much harder and the problem more complex than expected: where to start, who to talk to, where to find “the San” and how to get there?

The first obstacle was to find people to talk to. The majority of San in Namibia live in remote areas that are far away from the capital and hard to reach. This is especially true during the rainy season of March and April when I was there. Further, different San groups live in dispersed areas spread throughout the northeast of the country, each group with its own set of challenges. Despite meticulous background research before arrival, I only learned about the variety of difficulties upon talking to various people in Windhoek, the capital. Among my sources was the regional coordinator of one of the two NGOs that work with and for the San in Namibia, who tried to convince me of the impossibility of my venture. I therefore decided to concentrate my research on one government programme – the resettlement of landless San, a programme that I had learned about through inquiries in Windhoek. I visited two resettlement facilities in Tsintsabis and Uitkomst, and talked to San in both locations, as well as to neighbouring farmers. The interviews clarified how very complex the San’s situation actually was. The conclusion I could reach after spending two month in Namibia was that, apart from the San I talked to, everyone else – farmers, scholars and government officials - had a great deal to say about the San, their situation and their future perspectives. These were not only interviewees, but also people with whom I interacted informally, including the owner

² It should however be mentioned that next to being “one of Africa’s political and economic successes”, Namibia is also “the world’s most unequal nation” (The Economist 2011; Armbruster 2010: 1231).

³ The term San actually comprises not one but various ethnic groups. This will be explained further below. Despite this fact, however, all the different groups summarised under the term San share a poverty and marginalisation level that is higher than that of the rest of Namibia’s population and therewith unites them as a group.

of a grocery shop in a small town, farmers from different parts of the country, and people at a lecture in the capital.

Upon further reflection, I realised that the most interesting angle on the San problem was provided by looking at the discourse that surrounds the San and the question of its impacts on their livelihoods. Discourse is part of, and takes part in, shaping reality – and addressing discourse and the issues that come with it (power structures, knowledge production) will speak to larger themes of socio-economic inequality, social protection, and group identity.

While confusing, the fieldwork provided much insight into the problem I set out to investigate and enriched my understanding of the topic. I did, however, not get much data in form of interviews that is useable in the thesis from a methodological point of view. Consequently, I decided to use the interviews only supplementary, and the theoretical and practical arguments that I make will be based on other secondary material. Short passages from interviews will be used to collaborate the findings from other sources, including official documents and academic literature.

1.1 Research Problem

The goal of this thesis is to investigate factors that could explain the San's situation has not improved noticeably in the twenty years since Namibian independence in 1990. As will be elaborated on, when split into ethnic groups, the San's HDI⁴ is for example still much lower than that of other Namibians (WIMSA Report on Activities 2007-2008: xiii). To narrow the scope of my argument, I plan to examine the government discourse(s) that surround the San's situation, to be found in state action plans, speeches and annual reports. The aim is to investigate the effects that the discourse, by depicting them in a certain way and structuring relations to the rest of the population, has on the San's reality. In detail, I will investigate:

- *How the San are portrayed and discussed in government texts,*
- *The type of relationship between San and government revealed in the texts,*
- *How the government through discourses takes part in shaping the San's life and*

⁴ The HDI measures both social and economic development. The four indicators life expectancy at birth, mean years of schooling, expected years of schooling and gross national income per capita together make up the HDI, which can be a figure between 0 and 1 (hdr.undp.org).

- *If and how the colonial discourse on ethnic identity has influenced today's discourse.*

My hypothesis is that despite the seemingly inclusive and empowerment-focussed official discourse found in policy documents and official reports, the often patronising, colonial image of the San (e.g. child-like, passive, unreliable and of lowest social status⁵) still exists today and makes real socio-economic progress impossible. The colonial image is still embedded in peoples' heads and is (consciously or not) continuously recreated in government speeches, reports and aid programmes. This in turn has a strong negative influence on the possibilities of the San to change their situation, to themselves determine the direction of change and on their self-perception. Also, power structures rooted in colonial hierarchies seem to make agency for the San difficult. Due to those structures, they do not yet hold the power necessary to participate in creating a stronger self-image needed for increasing their opportunities.

To answer the questions posed and to confirm my hypothesis I use a theoretical and methodological framework that is centred on discourse, and with it on the relationship between power and the creation of knowledge and subsequently reality. Foucault's works on power and knowledge and Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) will provide the main theoretical and methodological foundation for the attempted analysis.

I find it well suited as a tool for answering the questions because CDA "aims to reveal the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of the social world, including those relations that involved unequal relations of power", like in the case of San and Namibian government (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 63). I will supplement these theories with theories that draw attention to colonialism's continued influence on discourse through the manipulation of ethnic identities and power structures. By including the colonial past in the analysis I seek to get a deeper understanding of present day Namibia, which is necessary for understanding the influences on, and the roots of present day discourse, power structures and inequalities (Blommaert 2005: 37).

⁵ See Robert Gordon's book for a variety of statements from colonial officials both during German and South African occupation of Namibia (Gordon 1992).

1.2 Structure of the thesis

After the introduction, there will be a brief outline of the San's present situation. This is followed by an overview over the theoretical foundations on which this thesis is based, theories on power and knowledge, discourse and postcolonialism. From there I will construct a theoretical framework used to guide the analysis of the case. Thereafter I introduce my chosen method, critical discourse analysis, which is closely linked to the theories introduced. Also, the material to be analysed and possible limitations will be discussed. Subsequently, I provide a historical background on the case with a focus on colonial stereotypes of the San. This is the prerequisite for the subsequent analysis of government discourse around the San. The analysis will roughly be split into three parts, following the afore-introduced theoretical and methodological framework. I will conclude the thesis with a presentation of my results and a concluding discussion of the findings and how they could be put to use

2 Introduction to the case

In the following section I will first look at the origins of the term San and then provide an overview over their present situation. A historical perspective is helpful due to the fact that the group now known under the name has not always been one group and is not as homogeneous as the name suggests. Since unequal power relations have been involved in the creation of the name, describing it seems relevant in the context of this thesis. The overview of the present situation is useful in order to clearly show the gap between the San peoples' development and that of the rest of the Namibian population. Also, it will show that unlike the rest of the Namibian populations' situation, the San peoples' situation has improved only marginally since independence.

2.1 San / Bushman – What's in the name

The term San, as well as the term "Bushman", suggests that there is an ethnically homogeneous group of people. This is, however, not the case. Both terms group together various ethnic groups, whose main commonality is that they speak one of the various Khoes and San languages rather than a language of Bantu origin (WIMSA Report on Activities 2007-2008: xi).

In Namibia, the term San/Bushmen is applied to at present roughly 38.000 people. They belong to the ethnic groups of the Hai//om, !Kung, Khoe, Kxoe and !Xo. The different groups live in different, sometimes overlapping parts of northeast Namibia and speak different languages. Some of the languages are so different that they cannot even communicate with the other San/Bushmen groups (Suzman 2001: 3).

Until very recently, they did "not see themselves as a single integrated unit, nor [did] they call themselves by a single name" (Gordon 1992: 4). Instead, and in most situations they still identify as Hai//om, Ju/'hoansi etc. (Widlok 1999: 15) as one informant confirmed:

Unfortunately, in Namibia, if you ask somebody 'who are you?' even me I wouldn't say I'm a Namibian. I would tell you I'm a Hai//om. So ethnic groups come the first" (Interview 2).

This suggests that the terms San and Bushmen were invented, not by the group of people bearing the name, but by other groups, most likely during colonial times (Gordon 1992: 4, 5). In the last few years, however, due to a focus on indigenous rights and the increased contact between “indigenous minority groups” worldwide (facilitated by NGOs), the originally different groups refer to themselves as San in certain, mostly political, contexts (Widlok 1999: 17).⁶ This could be the case because San is the term under which they are known as an indigenous minority internationally and under which they can possibly secure rights and development for their group.⁷ A very interesting point for the thesis is, however, that the group, which originally was no group, became reality through discourse. Despite them not being a group that naturally formed, they now experience the same fate of marginalisation and impoverishment (as a group).

2.2 Present situation of the San

I will now give a picture of the present situation of the San in comparison to the rest of the Namibian population using indicators such as the Human Development Index (HDI) (based on factors like life expectancy, literacy rate and child mortality). It shows that if measured separately, the San would have a much lower HDI than that of the whole Namibian population (WIMSA Report on Activities 2007-2008: xiii), which in turn shows, that despite various government efforts and Namibia’s comparably good economic situation, equality between the San and the rest of the population has not been achieved since independence.

James Suzman presents a separate HDI ranking from the years 1996 and 1998 for all the ethnic groups in Namibia. It shows that the San’s ranking is well below that of other ethnic groups. While all other groups scored 0.5 or more, the San’s ranking was 0.3 in 1996 and fell to 0.27 in 1998. All other groups’ rankings stayed the same or rose from 1996 to 1998 (Figure 1.1 in Suzman 2001: 1).

⁶ Regarding the question of naming I will follow Heike Becker’s approach (Becker 2002: 5, 6) and use the specific group names when ever possible and in cases where it is not I will write San. I do that because the few people I talked to called themselves by their ethnic groups’ name (Ju/’hoansi and Hai//om) or in the wider context San.

⁷ As for example Steven Robins (2001, 2003) and Renee Sylvain (2005) explain, identities in this case are adopted strategically and are fluid and changing, depending on the situation.

According to Suzman, “San life expectancy is some 22 per cent below the national mean”, which can be seen as indicators of their poor nutritional and basic health care status. Also the level of San school attendance is 50 per cent below the Namibian average, which at the same time explains their 20 per cent lower literacy rate compared to the average. Lastly, the San have the lowest per capita income in the country and the majority of San have “no direct cash income” (Suzman 2001: 1,2).

As a result, a lot of San rely heavily on government aid. According to data from the government’s Emergency Management Unit (EMU), between 17000 and 22000 of the 38000 Namibian San rely on food aid provided by the government (Suzman 2001: 7). This was also the case in the two resettlement facilities that I visited during my fieldwork. Most of the people I talked to did not have regular employment and especially during the dry season relied on the irregular food aid deliveries by the government. The other main source of income for many families was the state pension, as one interviewee explained:

“It’s a little bit the other way around you know...in...you know in the UK or like that you work...after 60 and if you are an old man you go back home. You’re retired and you are at home. But at this time our grandmothers become the people that...breadwinners...if they get that 470 N\$ per month [...] they are the ones who buy the food, they are the ones who buy the shoes for the kids” (Interview 2).⁸

Another important factor that contributes to the San’s poverty is their lacking access to land. According to Suzman, the biggest difference between the San and other rural poor is that “few San have any independent access to land outside of their workplaces and hence when unemployed cannot engage in subsistence farming to support themselves” (Suzman 2001: 8).⁹ This puts them in a comparably worse situation than their non-San counterparts because without land they cannot grow their own food and are dependent on food aid to survive. Lack of land also impacts residency: in case of unemployment families do not have a place to stay because of not owning land.

This precarious problem is reality for most San, very few live in cities. Most work and live on commercial farms (especially in the Omaheke region, the region with most San residents). The remaining live in resettlement facilities the government set up after independence or in the communal areas, where they work for members from other ethnic

⁸ This finding is congruent with the information Renee Sylvain gathered during much longer fieldwork research in the Omaheke region (see Sylvain 2005). Suzman’s (2001) and Pakleppa’s (2004) findings also confirm it.

⁹ Interesting to note is also that despite efforts by the government to increase the farm ownership of black Namibians, no San owns a farm in one of the by San highly populated commercial farming areas Omaheke (Sylvain 2001: 719).

groups. Both, when working on commercial farms and in the communal areas, they occupy the lowest rank in the labour hierarchy and are accordingly paid little and sometimes only food (Sylvain 2002: 1077). Only around 10 per cent of all San live in what under colonial times was “Bushmanland”, the only area in Namibia in which the San presently have customary rights (Suzman 2001: xvii-xix, Sylvain 2005: 359). It is, however, not traditionally the home territory of all San groups but only some very specific ones. Also, according to Sidney L. Harring it is a very remote area, “a vast stretch of desert”, which is sparsely populated. This means that at the moment the remaining 90 per cent of Namibia’s San live on land that belongs to other people (Harring 2004: 72).

Moreover, the San’s communal land is threatened. According to Namibian law, the state is the owner of all communal lands (Odendaal 2006: 3). This means that the state used former “Bushmanland” to resettle people from various ethnic groups in the area without consulting the San. This had the effect that cattle owners from other ethnic groups are slowly taking over more and more territory in the only place in which the San have some kind of control in form of customary rights (Harring 2004: 73, 74; Suzman 2001: 51).¹⁰

Next to lacking access to land, as one interviewee explains, “*there is very little kind of political involvement with the San*” (Interview 1). This minimal political representation means that their needs and wishes remain unheard (Daniels 2004: 56; Suzman 2001: 50, 104). Thus, without political representation the possibilities to have an influence on policy are minimal, also regarding the “smaller” decisions for example concerning elements of the government run San development project and how they should be conducted. Most of those projects are said to be run in a top-down way with limited consultation of the beneficiaries (Daniels 2004: 56).

The last point concerns ethnic heterogeneity in Namibia. After the experience of Apartheid, the government’s post- independence policy has been strictly “non-ethnic”, focussed on the creation of one national identity as opposed to the various ethnic or “tribal” identities that were in use during colonialism (Suzman 2001: 71, 73; Dieckmann 2007: 232, 233).¹¹ Despite this non-ethnic policy, however, ethnic identities and some of the colonial

¹⁰ This is the case with the exception of the Nyae Nyae conservancy, which the San control. Even there, however, I was told the resident have problems with cattle farmers that want to move into the conservancy to feed and water their animals.

¹¹ In 2008, and after initial refusal in 2007, Namibia signed the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (OPM Annual Report 2008-2009). The delayed signing had to do with the concept of being indigenous.

stereotypes associated with the different ethnic groups still play a substantial role in daily life in Namibia (Sylvain 2002: 1075)¹² as for example the voting behaviour shows (Melber, 2007: 70; Lemon 2007: 837). This was also expressed in one of my interviews:

“Even the ‘Buschleute’ [Bush people] know that this ethnic group is like that and the other one like that” (Interview 3)

As I will elaborate on later, the just described is part of the San’s problem as it still leads to them being treated differently and as inferior. Two informants gave examples:

“I don’t have any written evidence but when I am ... being with [San] people and you observe what happens and how other people treat them [...] [San] people are being pushed aside” (Interview 1).

“When I went to high school in Ondangwa I had to hide my identity [Hai//om]”. In the last year people discovered that my informant was a San and “people were making remarks like ‘he’s a San and our children don’t understand him what he’s saying. There must be Ovambo speaking headboy” (Interview 2)

2.3 Government initiatives

Since independence in 1990, the Government¹³ made a much greater effort to promote San development compared with colonial times. From independence on, the government expressed its specific concern for the problems of the San and stated that it “made their development a priority” (Suzman 2001: 71). Until 2005, however, there was no programme specifically for the San and their problems. Possibly as a consequence, by 2004, there had been no tangible change in the situation of the San. Also, “the majority of San [did] not feel that they have benefited from GRN initiatives in any substantial way” (Suzman 2001: 70, 76; Sylvain 2001: 717).

In 2005, the San Development Programme was launched under the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (DPM), focussed specifically on the concerns of the San. The programme contains amongst other things a resettlement scheme, vocational and literacy

The Namibian government had argued that everyone of an African bloodline is indigenous to the country and not only the San (Sylvain 2011: 90).

¹² This is especially still the case on the commercial farms, where many San work, as for example Renee Sylvain’s extensive fieldwork has shown (Sylvain 2001, 2005).

¹³ The present government has been in place since independence in 1990. SWAPO, the former liberation movement, has since then been the ruling party with a dominant and to date unchallenged majority (Lindeke 2009: 2, 3). Hence, when speaking about “the government” in this thesis, I speak about the SWAPO government that has been in office since 1990.

training (OPM Annual Report 2005-2006). Uitkomst, one of the resettlement facilities I visited was created as part of this programme. Especially after a lack of concrete programmes in the first 15 years after independence, this programme can be seen as a positive achievement of the government. However, the way especially the resettlement programme is implemented is questioned regarding the actual potential to improve the beneficiaries' situation in a sustainable way (Harring and Odendaal 2002: 54, 60; LAC Livelihoods Report 2010). Most of the farms are in very remote and dry areas of the country, in rural areas with few employment opportunities (LAC Livelihoods Report 2010: 120, 121). Most beneficiaries are dependent on government food aid.¹⁴ Newspaper articles raise the same concerns:

“These farms [resettlement facilities Drimiopsis, Skoonheid and Uitkomst] are now rendered community reservations. Those settled have no income and are on State welfare, with the State taking responsibility for water and electricity development and service bills” (The Namibian, June 29, 2010).

“What they [the San] don't have are jobs. Aside from a few working as farmhands on nearby estates, most of the San at Uitkomst depend on government food rations, waiting for promises of agricultural training to be met” (Mail and Guardian online, June 1, 2009).

“Even though land reform is necessary, the resettlement policy of the Government has not brought the desired results and not a single farm has become sustainable” (The Namibian, January 5, 2007)

These quotes suggest the limited success of the resettlement programme. The San development programme, partly through resettlement with apparently limited success, aims at improving the San's situation. I therefore chose to examine documents relating to it more closely. Thus, the documents used for discourse analysis deal mainly with the programme.

The programme is mainly addressing the material changes mentioned in the introduction by providing land, literacy training and work. Looking at the limited success, however, it seems that a factor has so far remained unaddressed. As the quotes given earlier illustrate, there are immaterial inequalities that show themselves for example through different treatment. For the San's situation to clearly improve, these have to be addressed as well, which the analysis of this thesis will show.

¹⁴ The issue was raised in both resettlement facilities I visited. In Uitkomst, out of the group of approximately 35 adults I talked to very few had work and only two or three permanent employment on a neighbouring farm. Especially in the dry season, the food they received came exclusively from government aid rations.

3 Theoretical Framework

In order to understand the discourse around the San and their relationship to other ethnic groups in Namibia today, past and present power relations as well as influences through the colonial past and have to be taken into account. To do that, a theoretical framework to analyse power and knowledge structures, and how the discourse around the San is influenced by these structures, is needed. A number of theoretical approaches, amongst them discourse analysis, which is theory and method at the same time, look at truth creation and power/knowledge relations more generally. Some of the main starting points come from Foucault and will briefly be elaborated on. Next to the general theories of power and knowledge one set of ideas in particular, postcolonialism, is of interest for this thesis because of the specific focus on former colonies.

In the following section I first provide an outline of some of the existing theories that deal with the relationship between power and knowledge production with a focus on Foucault's work. I then elaborate on the idea of discourse and the links between discourse, power and knowledge. This will be followed by a brief overview of postcolonial theory with a focus on processes of identity creation and formation from a postcolonial perspective. I will finally integrate the three different parts into one theoretical framework that provides the basis for this thesis. This section will be the foundation, on which methodology and consequently the analysis part are based.

3.1 Power, knowledge and the creation of truth

The argument of this thesis presumes a certain ontology and epistemology, an understanding of how the world looks and what can be known, that must be elaborated on. For one, it presupposes an understanding of reality in which discourse is seen as taking part in shaping that reality substantially, which makes it necessary to examine where discourse comes from, meaning who participates in producing it. The production of this reality is related to power. Those with power can create knowledge that defines reality and this reality then in turn reinforces their powerful position (Foucault 1979: 27). This therefore makes an analysis of

power structures important because with power comes the ability to shape discourse. I will now first explore the concepts of power, knowledge and truth in preparation of how they are linked in theory, and secondly look at how that is related to discourse.

Especially in his latest works, Foucault has a “positive view” of power, not only seeing it as a force of domination and repression (Macmillan 2010: 371). Rather, Foucault sees power as it is exercised from the seventeenth century on as “a productive network”, involved in all relations. As Foucault points out: “If it [power] never did anything but to say no, do you really think one would be brought to obey it” (Foucault 1980: 119). Hence, if power only worked through repression, the repressed would revolt at some point. However, since power is not just repressive but involves everyone through power networks it continues to function. This is the case because even the less privileged are given access to some form of power through these networks, which in turn minimises resistance. Foucault describes the new techniques of power as more “efficient and much less wasteful” than the techniques that were formerly used (Foucault 1980: 119).

This new kind of power is what Foucault calls “Bio-Power” (Foucault 1991a: 262). Unlike the solely deductive power before, this new bio-power is concerned with investing “life through and through”. In order to do that, “power had to be able to gain access to the bodies of individuals, to their acts, attitudes and modes of everyday behaviour” (Foucault 1980: 125; Dean 2010: 118, 119). To achieve that, the establishment of various “techniques” for controlling the population became necessary (Dean 2010: 28). Control was attempted for example through the establishment of public clinics, mental asylums, universities and schools and the norms and modes of behaviour taught in those places (Foucault 1991a: 262). This is also, where the exploration of the relationship between power and knowledge can begin.

Foucault argues that “power produces knowledge”, “that power and knowledge directly imply one another” and “that there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations” (Foucault 1979: 27). In other words, power and knowledge are closely linked and in a way mutually reinforce each other. Because of that one cannot be analysed without looking at the other at the same time. Specific power relations lead to the creation of a certain “corpus of knowledge” and this knowledge then enhances the power relations in place (Foucault 1979: 29). Practically, this happens through the formation of knowledge about what is acceptable and what is not, what is true and what is false and how people should live their life. For example by defining who is ill, who is a criminal, what is an

acceptable sexual practice and what can be understood as knowledge/science, society is shaped in a certain way congruent with the needs at the time and related the ideas of those that design the policies and that 'do the shaping'.¹⁵ Foucault derives these theories from analysing aspects of social life through different periods of history.

From here, the step to investigating the relation between power and truth is small, given the argument that knowledge creates "truth". First of all, truth here is not understood as something absolute and unchangeable. Rather, it is considered to be something that changes over time, can be understood as something different from society to society. Also it is strongly influenced by the power relations in a given society. As Foucault explains, "truth isn't outside power". Rather "each society has its régime of truth, its general politics of truth: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as true" (Foucault 1980: 131). That is to say, through discourse, controlled by powerful institutions of knowledge creation (for example schools, universities, media, politicians), certain ideas about what is true and what is false are generated and disseminated. In turn, such beliefs are transformed into what that society believes to be "true". These truths reinforce the pre-existing societal power structures since they are part of what is considered true (Foucault 1980: 132). Therefore, "truth is linked in a circular relation with systems of power which produce and sustain it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it" (Foucault 1980: 133).

This brief overview of Foucault's reasoning concerning power, knowledge and truth acts as a theoretical starting point for this thesis because it questions the existence of a "single truth". His theories draw attention to the importance of scrutinising what in a given society, in this case Namibia, is taken as the truth, why this is the truth for the society and how the country's power hierarchy define this truth. In short, it points out the importance of analysing and challenging what is widely accepted and taken for granted in a society and consequently of uncovering the hidden effects of this taken for granted knowledge. Relating it to the case of Namibia, who has the power to speak the "truth"? How is that "truth" created? And how does the power of this truth hurt others?

The concept of discourse will be of help to understand that. Therefore I will in the following define discourse and outline its place in relation to power, knowledge and truth and how it will be employed in this thesis.

¹⁵ For the detailed analysis of the penal system see Foucault (1979) *Discipline and Punish*, for an analysis of treatment of mental illness see Foucault (1991b) *Madness and Civilisation*, for the development of norms concerning sexuality see Foucault (Foucault 1991c) *The History of Sexuality*.

3.2 The concept of discourse

What is understood as discourse depends on the respective theoretical foundation one uses (Hammersley 1997: 237). This in turn defines the particular ontology and epistemology, meaning the “particular assumptions about the nature of the social world and the way we attain knowledge of it” that one bases research on (Howarth 2010: 3, 4). Hence, there are more or less broad understandings of discourse depending on whether they are based on for example a positivist, realist or a post-structuralist foundation, each having an at least slightly different ontology and epistemology. For positivists an objective reality defines discourse, meaning that reality is outside of discourse and discourse merely describes this reality. This view is not shared by all. As Norman Fairclough explains, “it is a commonplace in non-positivist social science that social phenomena are socially constructed” (Fairclough 2007: 10). This is also the understanding in this thesis.

Discourse takes part in shaping the reality of which it speaks (Howarth 2010: 7). Hence, discourse does not simply describe what is there. Rather, as Foucault explains, discourses “form the objects of which they speak (Foucault 2010: 54). Fairclough expands this, arguing that there is a dialectic relationship between discourse and the non-discursive (Fairclough 2000: 64), meaning that discourse is influenced by reality but at the same time takes part in defining reality and making things real – which is how this thesis will deal with the concept of discourse.

I will now further elaborate on how discourse is understood and will be used in this thesis and how it is linked to the preceding part on power, knowledge and truth. As Fairclough argues:

“Different discourses are different perspectives on the world, and they are associated with the different relations people have to the world which in turn depends on their positions in the world, their social and personal identities, and the social relationships in which they stand to other people” (Fairclough 2003: 124).

As well as giving a brief definition of what discourse is, the quote touches upon the relationship between discourse and society, and through that power and knowledge. The quote describes that people create discourse and that there are different discourses because people are different. Therefore, there are various discourses corresponding to the various life experiences and social positions. Next to defining a person’s experiences, social positions and relationships to other people determine a person’s place in power hierarchies and whether

they have access to knowledge (for example through education) and more importantly knowledge production (for example at a university, the media). Through that, discourse and the social are closely linked. “Discourses contribute centrally to producing the subjects we are, and the objects we can know something about” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 14).

Another close link exists between power and discourse (linked through language), which the following quote makes very clear:

“Language is so central to contemporary social life, and to the calculations of and struggles over power, so that no one these days can develop the grasp of their social circumstances ... without a critical awareness of how language figures within them” (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2001: 9, 10)

As Norman Fairclough explains, “language is part of society” in the sense that it on the one hand shapes society and on the other is shaped by it (Fairclough 2010: 18, 19). Language together with some other forms is how we communicate and express ourselves. All these communication and expressions make up discourse (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2001: 38). “Discourse is defined...as the fixation of meaning within a particular domain” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 141), done through language.

There are, however, different discourses that compete in the same domain to define its meanings. The competing discourses are all part the same order of discourse and some are more dominant than others (Ibid. 74, 141, 142).¹⁶ They go back to dominant groups in a society that try to maintain the present order of discourse in which they have a powerful position. Through that they, though not exclusively, define our reality and what we take for granted (Fairclough 1995b quoted in Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 74).

They do that by acting as the norm-setters within a larger society. It ties back to the Namibian case because the Namibian government is the one setting the dominant discourse and maintaining the present order of discourse through their position of power. That discourse is demonstrated and entrenched through their various publications, speeches, and action plans. It is, however, also influenced by the Namibian past, for which to understand I will now introduce some relevant postcolonial ideas.

¹⁶ An order of discourse is as Chouliaraki and Fairclough explain “a socially structured articulation of discursive practice (including both genres and discourses) which constitutes the discursive facet of the social order of a social field” (Couliaraki and Fairclough 2001: 114).

3.3 Discourse and (post) colonial ethnic identity

“Colonialism refracted the production of knowledge and structured the conditions for its dissemination and reception” (Loomba 2005: 62). As part of that, “colonial bureaucracies played a key role in the construction of ‘tribal’ identities” (Berman et al. 2004: 5). Therefore, in order to understand the processes of knowledge production and power structures and with it discourse in present day Namibia, attention has to be paid to the colonial influence on knowledge production, dissemination and reception. More specifically, past processes shape present-day identities and power structures through stereotypes of the different ethnic groups that were formed through the racial policies of colonialism and that continue to exist today¹⁷. Therefore, to understand present day relations between the San and the government in Namibia and the discourse around the San, a profound understanding of identities formed during colonialism and how these colonial identities impact post-independence society through discourse is necessary

“Postcolonial theory is one way of recognizing how decolonized situations are marked by the trace of the imperial pasts they try to disavow” (Gikandi 1996: 14, 15 in Baaz 2005: 33). I will use postcolonial theory to formulate research categories that will guide me through the analysis to get an in-depth understanding of the effects of colonialism on the relationship between the San and the other ethnic groups in Namibia today.

Broadly speaking, postcolonialism addresses issues like “the impact of colonial practices on the production and reproduction of identities”. It problematises language in the context of colonial rule and its impact on now independent countries (McEwan 2009: 11, 117). These foci make it well suited as a supplement to the theories outlined above and the critical discourse analysis approach used as the main methodology.

Postcolonialism is used to analyse “cultures, discourses and critiques that lie beyond, but remain closely influenced by, colonialism” (McEwan 2009: 17). It is, as the word post suggests, something that comes after colonialism. This should, however not be understood in a temporal sense, that suddenly after colonialism there is postcolonialism (Hall,

¹⁷ I use the terms ethnic identity and ethnicity in the understanding that they are something that is socially constructed and changing and not a division that has always been there (Berman et al. 2004: 4, 5). However, as Edwin N. Wilmsen et al. explain, “to say that ethnicity is artificially constructed does not enable us to dismiss it as illegitimate” (Wilmsen et al. 1994: 348). As the example of the San shows, even though artificially constructed the group is now a real group, facing real problems.

1996: 247). Rather, countries that have acquired independence are not necessarily postcolonial, which they would be if the temporal sense was used (McEwan 2009: 22). Also, they do not have to be homogeneous in being colonial and postcolonial (Bhabha 1994: 6, 7). “The term ‘postcolonial’ does not apply to those at the bottom end of this hierarchy” (Loomba 2005: 13). This means that in a country that is in a temporal sense postcolonial not everyone necessarily experiences postcolonialism. Marginalised groups can still live in a colonial situation even though the country is independent. Therefore, looking at “these internal fractures and divisions [is] important if ‘postcolonialism’ is to be anything more than a term signifying a technical transfer of governance” (Loomba 2005: 14).

The internal divisions that postcolonial theory helps to uncover are possible because after independence, not all citizens automatically benefited equally. The movements that fought for the country’s independence in most cases did not do so with all people’s interest in mind because the population rarely consisted of one homogeneous group. Also, as Loomba points out, colonialism was not only practiced from the outside. The elites that came to power through the liberation struggle had an agenda of their own that sometimes had been highly influenced by colonial thought and in a way replicated it (Loomba 2005: 16)¹⁸ – an important insight when analysing discourse around a marginalised group, since the variation in colonial and postcolonial experiences of different groups is problematised.

A consequence of the heterogeneity was that some voices were heard better and louder than others. Especially Gayatri Spivak (2006) examined the issue of agency and voices of the less influential or “subaltern” people and whether it is possible for them to make their voices heard or who can make their voices heard (Loomba 2005: 195).

Since the San in the Namibian context do not have much political or economic influence, the concept of the subaltern is useful when analysing their situation and their options to influence the situation. “Subaltern” describes people, who are excluded from influence in a society and therefore either do not speak or if they speak are not heard (Spivak 2006: 28). However, the term should be applied with care because it does not apply to all suppressed or marginalised groups or persons. To be applicable, the group/person has to “have no access to processes of cultural imperialism” (McEwan 2009: 16, 70). Thus, for the group/person to be called subaltern marginalised or belonging to a low social class is insufficient. Rather, they have to be ignored by the rest of society and have no influence on

knowledge production in society in general and specifically about them (Spivak 2006: 28, 35). Instead, dominant people always speak for them and therewith define their reality (McEwan 2009: 15-17). To avoid polarisations like “us” and “them” and creating a more dynamic concept, Fernando Coronil suggests a fluid understanding of subalternity, seeing it “as a relational and a relative concept” (Coronil 1994: 648, 649).

Another way in which postcolonial theory contributes to this analysis is in drawing attention to the different stereotypes colonisers created during colonialism. The stereotypes influence postcolonial citizens’ view of each other and other ethnic groups today. Colonisers did not see the native people as a homogeneous group (Ranger 1982: 121, 122). The creation of specific stereotypes for specific ethnic groups was part of colonial policies. “In Africa and India, by attributing particular characteristics to specific tribes and groups, colonial authorities not only entrenched divisions between the native population, but also used particular ‘races’ to fill specific occupations such as agricultural workers, soldiers, miners, or domestic servants” (Loomba 2005: 85). The created hierarchies often diverged from the pre-colonial social structures. However, after some interaction between the colonisers’ and the colonised’s ideas “the European ideas came to be adopted and made use of by very many Africans” (Ranger 1982: 122). Especially those who benefited from the coloniser’s hierarchy by getting the best jobs helped to perpetuate the racial categorisation (Ranger 1982: 130). By adopting and perpetuating it, the categorisation became reality.

Even though the differences between the various ethnic groups were something constructed during colonial times, they became the source of real inequalities and still shape the groups’ occupational future after independence. Therefore, to fully understand the present the constructed stereotypes from colonial times and their “realness” have to be scrutinised (Loomba 2005: 106; McEwan 2009: 15). I aim to show how colonial ethnic identities and social hierarchies shaped and still shape the discourse around the San.

Concluding, I want to allude to some final consideration concerning the use of postcolonial theory. When performing postcolonial analysis, there is a danger of participating in reinforcing the inequalities under analysis by continuing to use the same “framework of Manichaeic opposition”, black vs. white and colonised vs. coloniser, used during colonial times (Jolly 1995: 26; Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 193). An analysis can benefit from

¹⁸ A fact that fits well with Foucault’s observation of power as a productive network (Foucault 1980: 119, 120): By making benefits accessible to part of the colonised population, the colonisers could sustain their own power.

detaching itself from those binary opposites and instead examine the formation of the various postcolonial subjectivities and their origins (Jolly 1995: 26, 27; Loomba 2005: 153).

3.4 Tying the strings together

The ways in which the San are portrayed and spoken about in government discourse has contributed to their persisting marginalisation – the origins of which can be found in the discourse and the power structures that define Namibian society.

The overview over theories on power and knowledge and their connection to discourse outlined above makes clear that power structures on the one hand form the basis of discourse and on the other hand are being reinforced by it. Hence, in order to understand the continued marginalisation of the San, a thorough understanding of the concepts of power and discourse and how they interact is an essential basis for conducting the discourse analysis.

In addition, postcolonial theory that shares ontology and epistemology with the theories on power and discourse can be of use. Post-colonial ideas help to make clear the power relations inherent in discourses from a historical perspective, and help in the scrutiny of contemporary discourses. As a result, having the tools to analyse the present discourse and power structures provided by the first part of the theoretical framework, postcolonial theory makes it possible to understand where this discourse comes from.

4 Methodological Framework

When using discourse analysis as a method, method and theory are inseparably linked (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 3,4). In the preceding part I have outlined some of the broader theories discourse analysis is based on and some theories that I find useful in complementing the analysis. In the following I will look more closely at the actual method, its practical application to my case, the choice of material and some limitations. I will start by introducing discourse analysis as a method, explain how I apply it to my case and point out some problems with the approach and possible solutions. Further, I will elaborate on the material I chose for the discourse analysis and why I did so. Finally I will look at possible limitations especially in terms of material collected during my fieldwork.

4.1 Critical Discourse Analysis

In trying to uncover, how the image of the San is created and recreated through discourse, and which effects that has on their possibilities to change their situation, I will use Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as a methodological tool. As Kathy Thompson explains: “Critical Discourse Analysis is concerned with social and cultural criticism, analyzing language in everyday contexts. It views language as actively constructing versions of reality” (Thompson 2002: 16). This makes it very suited as a method for answering my research questions.

“Discourse analysis ... makes it possible to trace connections between the visible and the hidden, the dominant and the marginalised, ideas and institutions. It allows us to see how power works through language, literature, culture and the institutions that regulate our daily lives” (Loomba 2005: 45). CDA is one of three main approaches to discourse analysis, the other two being Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory and discursive psychology. The three approaches share basic ontological and epistemological assumptions, meaning they agree on ideas of what can exist and what one can know and are based on social constructionism (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 4).

Moreover, the three approaches agree that “our knowledge of the world should not be treated as objective truth” but rather as “products of our ways of categorising the

world”. Hence, it should not be taken for granted that what we “know” of the world is the only way to see it and generally accepted assumptions about the world should be questioned. Consequently, the way we view the world is not static but can change over time through discourse, a form of social action that takes part in producing social reality, and is based on our historical and cultural experiences. It can therefore also differ from place to place. Also, our knowledge is created through social interactions and rivalling claims to what is true and false. This creation of truths in turn has consequences for social actions. By creating a certain type of knowledge and declaring things to be true and false, certain types of behaviour become unthinkable, while others become socially accepted (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 5,6). Next to those common key premises CDA deviates from the other approaches in a number of ways.

I have chosen CDA as a method for this analysis because it offers a framework to analyse not only discourse, but also the relations *between* discourse and non-discursive elements (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 61; Fairclough 2010: 4). This is one of the main points that separate it from the other approaches. Unlike Laclau and Mouffe’s discourse theory, CDA does not understand everything as created by discourse. Instead, discourse is understood as one amongst other aspects of social practice – “society and culture (in this case relations and fate of one group to the rest of society) are shaped by discourse, and at the same time constitute discourse” (Titscher et al. 2000: 146; Farrelly 2010: 98). That is to say, every discursive event is shaped and framed by events and social structures, and at the same time discursive events shape those structures.

Moreover, CDA looks at discourse’s active role in constructing the social world with a focus on the role of language in social and cultural processes (Titscher et al. 2000: 146). As Jørgensen and Phillips put it, CDA “aims to reveal the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of the social world, including those relations that involved unequal relations of power” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 63). The investigation of unequal power relations and how discourse is related to their maintenance or change will be one of the main foci when analysing the case of the San further below.

Also, CDA addresses how discourses change or maintain a certain social order by drawing on pre-established meanings or creating new meanings by combining different discourses in new ways. In the case of the San, historically established meanings/knowledge about them as a group, and the power relations between the different ethnic groups might still be used/have an impact in the discourse and reinforce or possibly change certain perceptions.

CDA seems to be a very useful for the analysis of discursive influences on the Namibian San's situation and especially at mapping the power dynamics at play between the different actors because it helps to analyse “*both* the discursive practice which constructs representations of the world, ... including power relations, *and* the role that these discursive practices play in furthering the interests of particular social groups” (Jørgensen and Phillips, 2002: 63). Or as Fairclough and Chouliaraki put it: “power and the struggle over power are constant concerns for CDA (Fairclough and Chouliaraki 2001: 93).

In order to understand these processes of power and knowledge generation analysing the material, I will use Fairclough's three-dimensional model as my main analytical framework.¹⁹

According to the model every discursive event is at the same time text, discursive practice and social practice (Titscher et al. 2000: 150). Hence, a complete analysis of a discursive event includes an analysis of all three dimensions (Janks 2008: 1): “description, interpretation and explanation” (Titscher et al. 2000: 153). The discursive practice mediates between text and social practice. Social practice shapes the text production and at the same time, the text can lead to changes in the social practice. (Fairclough 2010: 94). I will now outline the three dimensions and elaborate on how they relate to each other since they will guide my analysis.

1. Text

The first step is the description of the text, an analysis of the linguistic features. This is done through tools such as the study of grammar (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 83). I follow Fairclough's understanding in the sense that “text” does not only mean written documents but also includes spoken language, visual images, gestures and a combination of those (Fairclough 2010: 173). I will analyse grammar mainly in the form of how certain adjectives, verbs and subjects are used, and how verbs are made to be active or passive.

2. Discursive Practice

The interpretation consists of two components: first the *situational context*, how a text has been produced, how it is received by an audience and the kind of “societal and institutional orders” that lead the audience to placing the text into a “situation type”, is analysed. Second

an analysis of the *intertextual context* examines the types of discourses the text draws on (*interdiscursivity*), and earlier events and texts by which the text is influenced (*intertextuality*) (Fairclough 2010: 121; Fairclough 2000: 47)? Interdiscursivity²⁰ is the mixing of different discourses and genres²¹ in a communicative event. It is a form of intertextuality, based on the claim that “all communicative events draw on earlier events” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 73). Is this done in a new and so far unknown way then it can be seen as an indication of possible socio-cultural change. If, however, different discourses are mixed in a more “conventional” way, it is a sign for stabilisation of a “dominant order” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 73).

In summary, discursive practice links text and social practice (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 73, 81, 82; Fairclough 2010: 75, 94). By interpreting situational and intertextual context knowledge about the text’s place and function in the wider social context can be gained

3) *Social Practice*

“Analysing the social context involves answering two major questions: what makes this discourse possible and what are its social functions?” (Brooks 1995: 463). To do that text and discursive practice must be placed in the broader social practice²². It needs to be determined to “what kind of network of discourses” or order of discourse the discourse under analysis belongs. Also, the partly non-discursive relations and structures that frame the discursive practice have to be mapped with help of other, for example social or economic, theories. It is during the analysis of the relationship between discursive practice and social practice that an assessment of the effects of the text on the order of discourse can be made (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 86).

¹⁹ Pictures as well as interviews will be analysed as if they were linguistic text – a common practice in CDA (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 61).

²⁰ Originally the concept of interdiscursivity was formulated by Mikael Bakhtin and the concept of intertextuality by Julia Kristeva in 1986. Fairclough then included both into his framework (Titscher et al. 2000: 150).

²¹ Genre in this context means “language use that is associated with a particular social activity”. Several genres can be mixed in one discursive event (Titscher et al. 2000: 148).

²² For something to be a social practice it has to be a “relatively stabilised form of social activity” (Fairclough 2010: 264). This social activity can be anything from family dinners to going voting.

4.2 Shortcomings of and adjustments to the model

Jan Blommaert points out three important shortcomings of CDA and the model. First, there is a strong linguistic bias, especially in Fairclough's work. Next to relying heavily on one linguistic theory, this implies that only existing discourse can be analysed. But, as Blommaert points out, the absence of a discourse is often worth as much attention (Blommaert 2005: 34, 35), an important observation in the case of the San.

Second, CDA mainly analyses discourses from "the core of the world system" (Blommaert 2005: 35). This will say that the discourses under analysis are predominantly western and there little analysis of discourses that originate elsewhere even though CDA could be of as much use there, exemplified by this thesis.

Third, the historical timeframe used for CDA is very short and a more thorough look at history would be beneficial (Blommaert 2005: 37). This I attempted to include through adding a relatively far-reaching historical background of my case. As Blommaert explains, "power and inequality have long histories of becoming" (Blommaert 2005: 37) and only when understanding those, the present situation can be analysed.

Jørgensen and Phillips point out a last problem. Fairclough's model is assuming a dialectical relationship between discursive events and non-discursive events. Discourse influences social practice (among it the non-discursive elements) while simultaneously a frame set by the existing social practice limits discourse. Even though theoretically interesting and useful this distinction poses certain problems in the application to empirical research. It seems difficult to clearly show empirically, where discourse is influenced by non-discursive elements and the other way around, as well as which elements are discursive and non-discursive – a necessary distinction before influences of one on the other can be determined. The distinction is difficult because there often is no clear line dividing discursive and non-discursive (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 90).

An analytical distinction between discursive and non-discursive, rather than a theoretical one solves the problem (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 90, 91). This will also be my approach when applying the methodological framework to the Namibian case. This means that I will define what in the specific case is understood as discursive and non-discursive. However, this analytical distinction only fits that specific case and is no general distinction applicable to other cases.

4.3 Choice of Material

I use different types of material from different sources for the analysis, although some will be given greater priority than others. The interviews, for example, will provide supplementary information to ground the case and to stress findings made in the text analysis. The text analysis will be based on a few selected government documents.

First, I have chosen two speeches by the Namibian Deputy Prime Minister (DPM) Dr. Libertine Amathila, head of the San Development Programme. They were given respectively at a handing-over ceremony of the San resettlement facility Uitkomst (DPM speech 1), and at a handing-over ceremony of draught animals at the resettlement facility Skoonheid (DPM speech 2), both in the Omaheke region. The first speech lists achievements in Uitkomst up to that point and future plans. The second speech outlines government's achievements for the San and the specific plans for the handed-over animals. The speeches were chosen because they were written and delivered by the same person, the head of the San development programme and therewith the key government representative in relation to the San. Also, the speeches were delivered in direct interaction with an audience in the resettlement facilities – although the speeches are given in different styles, despite a similar theme. The speeches also vary slightly in content and reveal contradictions, as will be shown in the analysis.

As well as the two speeches, I will analyse selected parts of four annual reports published by the Office of the Prime Minister (OPM) between the years 2006-2009. Additionally, I will look at selected parts of three government information bulletins (GIB) from 2007, 2008 and 2009. All documents have been directly published by and downloaded from the Office of the Prime Minister's homepage to guarantee their authenticity. Such care is important because my aim is to analyse the government's portrayal of the San, which makes it necessary to know for sure that the government authored the texts and that they have not already been interpreted by, for example, a journalist. Also, all the documents deal directly or indirectly with government programmes (especially the San Development Programme) that target the San specifically. Further, the documents present the government's view of the San, the challenges they face and the solutions the government foresees, which is very interesting for answering the research question.

As supplementary information, I will make use of various materials that I have gathered during and after a two-month fieldwork stay in Namibia. More specifically, I have

gathered Namibian as well as some international newspaper articles about the San during the last year (2010) and NGO reports on the San's situation from the last 10 years. The reports were provided by two Namibian NGOs: Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) and the Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), who are both active in supporting the San's struggle to land and other issues. Additionally, I use parts of three interviews conducted during the fieldwork in Namibia. I will also be influenced by my own impressions of Uitkomst, a San resettlement facility that is part of the government's San Development Plan and the conversations I had with the people living there.

The interviews I chose for supplementing the findings from the discourse analysis were with:

- The country coordinator of the biggest San NGO, WIMSA in Windhoek,
- A Hai//om, manager of community project in one of the biggest San resettlement facilities, Tsintsabis, in Northern Namibia, and
- A farmer that lives in the same area and was recommended to me as a "San-expert" and founder of Ombili, a San foundation by several white farmers of German origin.²³

All three interviews were conducted informally, and were taped (upon the permission of the subjects). The interviews lasted between 45 minutes and two hours. Selected relevant sections of the interviews will be used, rather than the complete conversations. The interviews will act as supplementary information to the governmental texts and newspaper articles, to confirm and better illustrate the tendencies revealed in the texts.

Finally, I utilize my impressions of experiences made and information gathered during a short period of fieldwork in Namibia (mainly observations and informal conversations) supplying me with the necessary background knowledge to link texts and social practice. The observations of the Uitkomst resettlement facility will be used in the same way; they will help me to relate the texts that I have collected to the broader situation.

²³ I specify the skin colour and origin here because, despite the end of Apartheid in Namibia over 20 years ago, I still clearly perceive that these factors influence who people associate with, how they treat you and what kind of information you get access to. For the part with German origins this can be confirmed by for example Heidi Armbruster's fieldwork (Armbruster 2010).

4.4 Limitations

The biggest limitations are caused by the fieldwork I conducted and the difficulty in finding possible interview partners. First of all, most San live in remote places, spread over a huge area of Namibia. Hence, it was difficult to reach people due to the long distances between the places (600km and more) and I could only visit two resettlement facilities and talk to a small number of people.

Next to living in remote places, with all but one San I could only communicate with through an interpreter. Most of the people at the place that were willing to talk to me were older and only spoke their own Khoesan-language²⁴ and sometimes Afrikaans, which I have basic knowledge of but I am not fluent in. This of course had an impact on the quality of the information I got, because I could not directly understand peoples' answers but instead had to rely on the interpreter's interpretation of both, my questions and the peoples' answers. Also, the people I met were very shy and in the beginning very hesitant to talk to me, fearing negative consequences. This most probably has influenced what they were willing to tell me. However, since the impressions and information I received during the visits will only be used indirectly in the form of background knowledge when putting the text material into context, I do not see the just described as a big limitation. Rather I see it as something that should be mentioned and taken into consideration when reading this thesis. Also, the limitations just mentioned do not apply to the interviews I chose to partly include. Language in their case is not an issue since two of them were conducted in English and one in German, both of which I speak fluently.

A last limitation that should be mentioned is the difficulty of accessing government publications and material. Even though the government runs a "San Development Programme" for example, no detailed information about the programme other than brief descriptions are accessible. Therefore, unlike NGO documents that are accessible and exist in abundance, I had to choose my text material from the limited amount of government documents accessible. This limitation, however, only further illustrates the point that I hope to make: the discourse surrounding the San is limited and at the same time limiting for the San people.

²⁴ Of which there are several that all are so different that communication between them is impossible. In the case of the people I talked to they either spoke Hai//om or Ju/'hoansi.

5 Historical Background on the San

History is an important part in understanding the present (Foucault 1991c: 334; Foucault 1991d: 351, 352; Merquior 1985: 15). Also, “by drawing upon historical and anthropological material ‘foreign’ to oneself and one’s own empirical material, one can try to establish a site outside one’s culture from which one can identify what is taken for granted from within” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 194). I will do that in the following, to show some of the historical reasons for the perceptions of the San today.

There is plenty of historical information on the San, but I will concentrate on what is pertinent regarding this thesis’ topic. Hence, in the historical overview I will focus on how a certain picture of the “Bushmen”²⁵ was created by the other ethnic groups and especially the German and later the South African colonial administration. I do this because, as some of the present day material in the analysis will show, certain of these images still exist and are quite powerful. I will mainly use the postcolonial theories outlined above to point out colonial influences on power structures and ethnic identity today. This is a preparation for the discourse analysis below since a proper understanding of the historical influences is a prerequisite for situating the text materials in discursive and social practice.

In outlining the picture that was created of the San before independence, I would have to mainly rely on historical accounts of colonial administrators, colonists and missionaries. These are, however, difficult to find. Therefore, I got most of my information from two sources, which I found to be experts concerning San in Namibia²⁶. The first is Robert Gordon’s book “The Bushman Myth”, which contains a big collection of original sources from colonial times. The second source is Suzman’s report “Assessment of the status of the San in Namibia”. I will supplement those two sources with others.

Researchers believe that the ancestors of present day San once were “the sole occupants of much of southern Africa” (Daniels 2004: 45). Originally, they lived in small,

²⁵ I write “Bushmen” here because this was the term commonly used and established during colonial times, with which a certain image of the San as “docile” (Sylvain 2001: 723), “primitive and childlike” (Sylvain 2002: 1078) is associated.

²⁶ I concluded that because in the post-1990s material there is on the San in Namibia, these two scholars are constantly recurring as references.

dispersed groups of hunters and gatherers, who occasionally traded with each other and other, neighbouring ethnic groups. This changed with the arrival of other ethnic groups and colonist. According to Suzman, by the late 19th century only a relatively small group of San still lived relatively autonomous in the eastern parts of Namibia (Suzman 2001: 5).

Contrasting widespread belief, however, the different San groups have not lived in complete isolation for a long time but were part of regional trading networks. This also shows that they did not exclusively live from foraging, which in turn does not fit into the picture commonly drawn of San as traditional, isolated hunters and gatherers who are uninterested in material goods (see for example Namibia Tourism Board homepage).

Bit by bit, large parts of the formerly open land were transformed into privately owned, fenced-off farmland. In the Omaheke region in eastern Namibia for example, 87 farms were established in one go in 1928-29 by the South African colonial administration. This number turned into over 700 by 1950. As a result, the San “were completely dispossessed of their land and incorporated into a rural class system” (Sylvain 2002: 1077). Similar developments took place in the area around Grootfontein, where the Hai//om traditionally lived. There the appropriation of land as farmland already reached a peak around 1908 (Gordon 1992: 54).

The land acquisition had consequences for the Ju/'hoansi and respectively the Hai//om, whose “traditional territories” these lands once were (Sylvain 2001: 719; Gordon 1992: 54, 55). For one, a foraging lifestyle, which required liberty to move around on a big amount of territory, was much harder due to fenced-off farms. Also, due to a shortage of farm labourers, San were forced to work by colonial authorities²⁷ or entered into working relations “voluntarily”. Not really voluntarily, however, since they often needed work because of food shortage due to hunting bans in an increasing number of places and of certain kinds of animals in general (Gordon 1992: 54).

Next to dividing the Namibian land into privately owned farms, both the German and later the South African colonisers started categorising native Namibians into a hierarchy – a process that happened in many colonies (Lomba 2005: 95; Ranger 1982: 122). The San ended at the bottom of that hierarchy (Sylvain 2001: 720). Even though there were differences and conflict between the ethnic groups before colonialism, overall they seem to have lived in a functioning network. Some San were even said to have friendly relations with

their Ovambo neighbours and there was intermarriage between the two groups (Gordon 1992: 27, 28). By 1905, however, according to the German colonial state “Bushman life was considered to be of even less worth than other blacks” and the colonial administration made a distinction between “natives” and “Bushmen”. This also revealed itself in the colonial state’s treatment of San, who on occasion were badly beaten or killed by colonists without severe consequences for the offenders (Gordon 1992: 52). Not all San accepted this quietly but resisted in various ways, which further worsened relations with the colonists. In 1911, colonial officials even talked about a “Bushmen Plague” (Gordon 1992: 57, 58).

Due to the thesis’ focus on the power of discourse in creating reality, it is also interesting to look at the role of academics at that time in categorising the San. Especially the aforementioned acts of resistance by the San led to discussions “as to whether Bushmen reserves should be created” or how to otherwise deal with “the Bushman problem” (Gordon 1992: 59, 65). From a contemporary point of view, the discussion is grotesque to read. One argument was that “as a race, Bushmen were on a closed development path” and that therefore “jail and the correctional house would be a reward, and besides do not even exist in that country. Does any other possibility exist than shooting them” (Passarge 1907: 124 quoted in Gordon 1992: 60). Others disagreed with this position and argued for the necessity of creating a reserve, where “they can live in peace and where they can maintain their lifestyle so important for scholarly research” (Deutsche Kolonial Zeitung, 1909: 452 quoted in Gordon 1992: 60). While policy suggestions differed, what these thinkers shared was the evolutionist idea that the San were on a lower evolutionary step than the other ethnic groups and the colonisers (Seiner 1913: 311 quoted in Dieckmann 2007: 60).²⁸

The German colonial government’s plan to resolve the “Bushman problem” was to educate the San to work. To do that, they decided to focus especially on the children and remove them from their parents. “The youngsters can be made to work but only if the children are taken away from their parents, which in these cases can be done without much ado” (Quote from a Hauptmann Hollander in Gordon, 1992: 66). Also, arrested San were deported to places far away from their home with their families; preferably to regions without any local San that could corrupt the deported further (Gordon 1992: 66).

²⁷ Both, the German colonial administration before World War I and subsequently the South African colonial administration, who took over control of Namibia after Germany’s defeat in the war (Gordon 1992).

²⁸ That this rhetoric is still in use could be confirmed in one of my interviews: “*Because they [die Buschleute] have been very far behind, they still lag behind*” (Interview 3). That this one is not an unrepresentative example shows Sylvain’s fieldwork on Afrikaner farms in the Omaheke region (Sylvain 2001, 2002, 2005).

After Germany's defeat in World War I, Namibia (then called South West Africa) was made a South African protectorate with a South African administration taking over government business. At least in the beginning, this resulted in less harsh treatment of the San (Gordon 1992: 89, 90).

However, the more tolerant attitude did not last for long. The South African administration's approach to solving the "Bushman problem" was slightly different from the German administration's. Instead of deporting and "training" the San, they decided that encouraging white South Africans to settle in the trouble areas would solve the problem (Gordon 1992: 90-92; Harring and Odendaal 2002: 22, 23). According to the administration, "the only policy ... successful in overcoming the [Bushman] trouble is the settling of a European population in the area where these raids occur. When this particular area ... [is] more thickly populated, the Bushmen will retire and seek new fields" (Military administration annual report 1916 quoted by Gordon 1992: 90-92). Important to note is the way in which the administration spoke about the San. In many instances they for example used the terms "untameable", "savage" and "wild". Also the phrasing "they will become extinct" can be found repeatedly in various statements of colonial officials (see Gordon 1992: 98, 124, 160; Dieckmann 2007: 101), terms normally used when talking about animals, not humans.

Next to an increased amount of white South African settlers moving in, the colonial administration promoted a doctrine of separate development, based on ideas of racial superiority and inferiority (Dieckmann 2007: 101). The doctrine aimed at splitting the country into white farming land and several "native reserves", where the different ethnic groups were supposed to live. The Odendaal Commission worked on fully realising the plan between 1964 and 1972 (Suzman 2001: 28). In some cases, ethnic groups were moved into territory that was not traditionally theirs or in which they had only lived a very short time. A consequence of this policy was, that the San were "forcibly integrated into homelands of others, especially Herero" because they did not have their own homeland (Gordon 1992: 172, 173). Unlike in the white farming areas, the land in the homelands was owned communal and administered by an appointed traditional or tribal authority (Harring and Odendaal 2002: 26). This basically left the San for the most part without influence because they had been integrated into other groups' territory and rule (Suzman 2001: 28). When Bushmanland was established in 1971, less than 3 per cent of all San lived there (Suzman 2001: 5). This was a main reason for one of the biggest problems of the San today: landlessness.

The final historical episode that played a role in defining relations of the San to the other ethnic groups in Namibia today was the Khwe's and !Kung's involvement in the

independence war. Unlike the other ethnic groups they fought for the South African Defence Force (SADF) and not SWAPO's military wing, the People's Liberation Army that fought for Namibian independence from South Africa (Daniels 2004: 50). They were recruited to form a "Bushman Battalion" by the SADF after some San had fought successfully for the Portuguese army in Angola (Suzman 2001: 55). As the quote of an SADF colonel shows, they were thought of as a great asset:

"The Bushman soldier is unique in many respects. Born to use a bow and arrow, he learnt to use modern weapons with surprising efficiency, and his incredibly keen senses and thorough knowledge of the bush made him a soldier feared by all who crossed his path. (Uys 1993: Foreword quoted by Suzman 2001: 55).

As one interviewee explained, however, most San joined the SADF out of economic rather than ideological or political reasons:

"The San weren't really politically affiliated more than they saw the benefits of being employed and been given food and they were also...I think some were kind of more coerced into this kind of work" (Interview 1).

The pay and opportunities offered by the SADF were convincing, especially since there were few other income options in the area (Suzman 2001: 56; Lee 1986: 94). Yet, the San's involvement on the side of the colonial forces did have negative consequences for the San once the SADF troops left after independence, since they were seen as having fought on the wrong side (Pakleppa 2004: 83, 85).²⁹ The interviewee just quoted confirmed that:

"If you came here around the early 2000s you'd still find that there is a lot of tension about the San and a lot of suspicion that they are involved in secessionist movements in Caprivi for example or still wanting to cooperate with the South Africans" (Interview 1).

Concluding this section, estimates show that in 1970, only 5 per cent of San still lived as hunters and gatherers (Suzman 2001: 1, 2, 4). Due to the landlessness caused by colonial policies, a lot of San now needed to work on farms to have a place to live (Hitchcock 1997: 98). Besides the land issue, and more important for this thesis, a discourse on how and what San are as well as their place at the bottom of the colonial hierarchy had been established during the colonial time, and is still influential today³⁰. This discourse laid the foundations for stereotypes and prejudices that today make it so hard for the San to change their situation.

²⁹ This animosity was increased through the South African media, making it sound like the San "hate Swapo", while that was not the case as San testimonies show (Lee 1986: 96, 97).

6 Analysis

The structure of the analysis part will broadly follow Fairclough's three-dimensional model. The analysis is therefore divided into three parts. First, a textual analysis of the government documents presented. Second, an analysis of the discursive practice, meaning an examination of production process as well as intertextuality and interdiscursivity. In the third part the findings of the former two will be combined to draw conclusions concerning the materials place in and influence on the broader social practice. The theories on power and knowledge as well as the postcolonial theories outlined above will be used for that.

6.1 Categories of Analysis

This set of categories that I developed in preparation for the text analysis serves as a guide through the analysis of the text material. The categories are formed after a primary analysis of the text material, while taking into consideration the historical and present background information of the case as well as the theoretical framework. They help to identify reoccurring utterances and patterns of language use that are relevant for answering the research questions.

1. Own activity, other's passiveness (Patronising attitude)

“The dichotomy between the passive and the active plays a vital role in the formation of identities in the development aid context” (Baaz 2005: 120). By emphasising own activeness and the San's passiveness, the government takes the agency away from the San and puts them in the position of passive receivers. With this comes that the “giver” is in a “privileged power position” since he makes the rules (Baaz 2005: 75).

2. Othering

“The basis of othering is that differences between ‘us’ and ‘them’ are pointed out, constructed or given weight” (Boréus 2006: 420). Despite the emphasis on a united Namibia the

³⁰ Especially on the commercial farms where a high number of San work, the “racial-evolutionary attitudes” described above can still be found to the effect that San workers are lowest in the hierarchy (Sylvain 2001: 719, 719, 723).

government texts create a difference between ‘us’, standing for the people of Namibia, and the San. This is done for example by describing the San as being very different to the rest of the population.

3. Exclusion or Silencing (Speaking for the other)

Exclusion takes place when “voices of a particular group are totally absent from the manifestations of a discourse, the texts”. The strongest form of exclusion is a complete silencing (Boréus 2006: 413-415). By speaking for the San and talking about their needs and problems without letting them contribute they are silenced. Another way of excluding the San is the use of English in all documents, a language not spoken by many San.

4. Inferior other-presentation (Establishment of stereotypes)

As Kristina Boréus explains, negative other-representation is “the presentation of ‘others’ as inferior to the members of the group one considers oneself a member of” (Boréus 2006: 410). I change this to inferior other-representation for the analysis of this case. There is no clear negative presentation but one in which the San are presented as living in a way that is not like and below how other so-called “normal” Namibians live.

5. Creation of universals

A certain way to live and what is to be achieved by citizens are presented in government speeches and documents as the only way, beneficial to everyone and not questionable. By not addressing other options these are practically erased and the vision propagated by the government is realised without the use of force (Foucault 1980: 122, 125) fitting very well to the theories on power and knowledge outlined earlier.

6. Conflicting messages

Concerning various topics, for instance empowerment and the image of the San, conflicting messages are conveyed in the texts. While at first sight there does not seem to be a conflict of messages, closer scrutiny and comparison of documents allows the detection of conflict.

6.2 Text Analysis

In the following I will present a number of examples of language use in which the Namibian government talk about the San and programmes directed at them. I will analyse what the syntax says about the relationship between the two parts and specifically examine what kind of picture of the San, the government and their relationship the official documents and speeches under analysis disseminate through the use of specific wording. This part will

provide a basis for the next two steps of the analysis, namely analysis of discursive and social practice. In analysing the text I will follow the categories outlined above. The first three categories mainly deal with the relationship between San and government while the next two look at the presentation of the San in the documents and the last one at inconsistencies in the content.

The first interesting point to note when going through the text material is the distribution of active and passive formulations. The government is described as active and carrying out activities. The San on the other hand are the receivers of activity, and the way the documents are written, not active themselves. By presenting itself as active, initiative taking and in a position to help it the government reaffirms its power. The people that need its help on the other hand have less power. The following examples will illustrate that. They are taken from the Office of the Prime Minister's (OPM) annual report 2007/08 and from the speech given by the DPM, the head of the San Development Programme, at the opening of a resettlement facility. Additionally, I have chosen a picture that underlines the findings of the text analysis.

"The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister identified aquaculture for the San as another way of alleviating their poverty and providing them with employment opportunities. Therefore, an Aquaculture Farming Pilot Project was launched" (OPM Annual Report 2007-2008: 5).

"There was no way I could sit back and relax after putting them in the tents" (DPM speech 1).

"Let us be inclusive and accommodate previously disadvantaged and marginalised members of our society, particularly the San community as well as Ovatoe in our development endeavours" (DPM speech 1).

The three text examples and the picture depict the same distribution of "activated" and "passivated" actors (Fairclough 2003: 145, 147). In the first example, the OPM is activated in identifying an employment opportunity and consequently launching a corresponding project. They do so for the San community, who in the text has the role of the passive receiver of this decision. The second quotation is even more pronounced. The speaker is very clearly the activated one and the San are in a very passive role. The speaker is active in putting "them", the San, in tents and emphasises her activity further by saying that she needs to do more after this action. The use of active self and passive other shows a clear distribution of power (Baaz 2005: 120, 121), in which government or DPM is in a powerful position and the San in a subordinate one.

The picture underlines that. In the picture the Namibian president is giving an inhabitant of the resettlement facility Uitkomst the key to her house. He is in a powerful position as the one having the key. The only thing the woman can do, is wait to receive the

key. The same power structures can be found in the last text example. “Us”, the Namibian society, is put into a position of power by having the choice to be inclusive. Also “us” is the active one, while “previously disadvantaged and marginalised” are being included and accommodated. The distinction between “us” and the ones to be included leads to the next issue to be analysed.



In all the documents used for the analysis the authors make a clear distinction between “we” and “them”. “We” is to be understood as either the government or the Namibian people. “Them” are the San, the marginalised that are not (yet) part of Namibian society. This can be illustrated by some examples. The first excerpt is the opening sentence of a speech given by the DPM at the opening ceremony of the resettlement facility Uitkomst.

“It makes me happy to have you all here today, because as Namibians we are witnessing again another mile stone that is achieved by our government through our developments projects. Allow me to present you a short layout of the Farm Uitkomst, this might help you to see the future of these people” (DPM speech 1).

The prime minister addresses the audience and in the following categorises herself and the audience as belonging to one group, Namibians. This can also be seen from the “we” that follows “Namibians”. In the next sentence this group is contrasted to the “other”. The prime minister, who counts herself to the group of “Namibians”, presents the fellow group members the inhabitants of the resettlement facility, “these people”. Through the title “these people”, the inhabitants are discursively separated from the “we” group that consists of Namibians.

This excerpt is one example of a process of othering through the use of language. Two further examples will illustrate that this process of othering is not only present in one speech, but as well though to a lesser degree in government documents. The three excerpts are from annual reports from the years 2006/07 and 2007/08 published by the Office of the Prime Minister.

“It is therefore our collective responsibility as patriotic citizens of Namibia, to ensure that the San too are brought on par with all other communities” (DPM speech 2).

“During various consultations it was learned that San people, unlike other Namibians, were buried in plastic bags” (OPM Annual Report 2006-2007: 6).

In both examples, a degree of othering can be detected. The first example talks about the Namibian citizens’ duty to bring the San on level with the rest of Namibian society. While in

line with the empowerment aims, it shows that at present the San are seen as different from the rest of the Namibians. The same can be interpreted when reading the second example. Normal Namibians bury their dead in coffins, the San are different from that norm because they use plastic bags.³¹ However, despite marking the difference between San and the rest of the population both excerpts describe San as Namibians, which the first quote does not. Hence, they are examples of a much lower degree of othering. Of course, othering is not necessarily discrimination. However, othering is often followed by “differential treatment” because as Boréus explains: “The more different the ‘others’ are considered to be, the more differently they can be treated” (Boréus 2006: 421).

Next to othering, the aforementioned texts show examples of exclusion or silencing. It is, however, something that is not as easy to show through a single text example (Boréus 2006: 413), also since absence of voices is what characterises exclusion. As Boréus explains, the highest degree of exclusion is reached, when “issues of relevance to group members are discussed without reference to their own expressed interests” (Boréus 2006: 415). This is actually happening most of the time when the documents mention the San Development Programme and the various activities that fall under it. An example is the GIB from August 2009. The GIBs serve the purpose to inform the public about government programmes and activities (GIB August 2009: 2). In this respect, the GIB contains a page on the handing over of farm *Uitkomst*, bought by the government to resettle San people. The GIB describes programme, ceremony and quotes the DPM extensively. However, it does not contain inhabitant voices (see GIB August 2009: 5). The same can be said for the other GIBs that mention San-related programmes (GIBs December 2008 and September 2007). In the annual reports and the speech there are no direct quotes of San due to the type of document. However, the concerned peoples’ opinions “are neither directly voiced...nor referred to” either (Boréus 2006: 414) even though that would be possible and give those affected by the programmes a voice.

Another and very explicit and important way in which the San are silenced in the discourse under analysis is through the choice of language. All the documents are in

³¹ It should be said, that the fact that San bury their dead in plastic bags can be mentioned out of two reasons: first to enable the San to bury their dead in coffins because they wish to do so or second to assimilate their behaviour to what is seen as proper by the author. The texts do not provide information as to which of the two applies. This does, however, not change the finding that the text points them out as different to all others.

English, which is not spoken by many San, as opposed to Afrikaans.³² By choosing English as the language of communication a great part of the San are automatically excluded from the discourse and silenced.³³ Though English is Namibia's official language, if these projects aim at inclusion an interpreter or a second version in Afrikaans – or even better, a local language - would have been a step towards achieving that goal.

The process of silencing/excluding can be linked to the theoretical idea of subalternity explained earlier. In the government documents the San are spoken for and cannot take part in shaping their image, let alone programmes that concern them.

The next feature that can be noted throughout the government documents is a representation of the San as inferior. “Negative other-presentation might ... be expressed in the way people are described, or the traits or typical behaviour attributed to them” (Boréus 2006: 411). I decided to specify this to inferior other-representation, inferior also being negative but fitting more precisely to the case. Even though the text examples do not speak about the San in a negative way, they perpetuate (though probably unintentionally³⁴) an image of difference and more importantly inferiority and passiveness. The first example presents this image of passiveness.

“The San People that we see today happened to work on the commercial farms in the Hochfeld area for the past fifty plus years and when they are no more needed on a certain farm they were just chased away and others were brought in” (DPM speech 1).

Once again the San are the passive ones in the text, which as Fairclough explains underlines “their subjection to processes” (Fairclough 2003: 150). They are chased away without resisting. The next formulation used continues to “passivate” the San. Other San people “were brought in”, which reads as if they had no say in that and thus were receivers of a decision made by others. This does, however, not only passivate. It also leads to the creation/affirmation of a passive image of the San, portraying them as incapable to help

³² During my visit in Uitkomst there were three younger San that spoke some English. The rest of the people only spoke Afrikaans and of course Ju/'hoansi.

³³ This finding is in line with what Keyan G. Tomaselli found out during extensive fieldwork with Kalahari San. He was asked by his informants to translate his publications into Afrikaans so that they can read them (Tomaselli 2005: 139).

³⁴ I want to mention that I find it hard to determine whether there is intention to create of a negative picture of the San and think that it most likely is unintentional. But especially if unintentional, it is important to point out that it is still happening and that is probably due to the categorisation of the different ethnic groups during colonialism that has never been properly dealt with after independence due to the need to create one nation and distance to apartheid policies.

themselves and take charge of their life. The next extract, from the second DPM speech, confirms these findings.

“I will not come again to make donations to you, you must now work hard with what you have been given today and show us all the good results of your work. I also do not want to hear stories of animals that were lost or animals that were eaten. If you do not use this donation for its intended purpose, you will stay poor and be abused by other wealthier people” (DPM speech 2).

In this quote the author, the DPM, demonstrates power in various ways, for instance through the use of “modal auxiliaries”. As Fairclough explains, “*must* conveys the personal authority of the speaker” (Fairclough 2010: 105, 151). Next to *must* the DPM uses *will*, which gives the statements fact status. Further, she makes use of negation (Fairclough 2010: 128), which I will discuss in further detail below when looking at intertextuality. The quote is full of negative assumptions concerning the San’s ability to take care of themselves. Hence, it contributes to a negative or inferior other-representation. The third quote does so too.

“The Deputy Prime Minister is not happy that business people have established shebeens³⁵ and alcohol outlets close to where the San people live to rob off their pension money” (GIB September 2007: 7).

The DPM wants to stop “business people” from selling alcohol to the San and therewith stealing their pension money. Like the former quote, this is a patronising statement. The quote suggests that the San cannot themselves decide not to buy alcohol. The context (see GIB September 2007) makes clear that the government has to become active to stop the selling. Hence, it contributes to the picture of the San created in the first quote. The San do not know what is good for them, are being used by others and cannot protect themselves. Next to inferiority, this also perpetuates the clear power hierarchy already pointed out in other quotes.

What comes with power is the potential to control knowledge. This means that when in a position of power, one can define what life should look like and what kind of life people should live (Foucault 1979: 27, 29). In the case analysed here, the government is defining how life should be lived through the published documents and development programmes. Two examples will illustrate that.

“Since then the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has helped establish numerous small projects among the San communities to make sure that they too become part of the general economic mainstream” (GIB September: 8).

In February 2008, the Office succeeded in resettling 306 members of the San community on the

³⁵ A shebeen is an illegal/unlicensed drinking establishment. Shebeens are very common in rural Namibia.

Farm “Uitkoms 514”³⁶... A Government technical committee was set up to oversee the resettlement process” (OPM Annual Report 2007-2008).

The first quote is less precise concerning what is to be achieved. It is not specified how the “general economic mainstream” looks like. What is said, however, is that the San should become part of this mainstream. The San are again not active and the excerpt does not show that they participated in defining the aims to be achieved. The second quote deals with the resettlement of a group of San. The text makes clear that the resettlement is initiated, coordinated and controlled by the government, therewith defining how the San are going to live. Also, activity is again with the government. The context shows that it defined the amount and placement of the houses and what other facilities there will be on the farm. This sets a norm about how to live. In both quotes, it is the government that defines what is the norm and to be achieved, therewith shaping the San’s life, possible through the power it holds.

Finally I want to point out some contradicting statements concerning the San that can be found in the various texts used for analysis. In order to do that I will quote several, since it only then is possible to show how they are conflicting. The first quotes come from the same speech and convey very different messages concerning empowerment (DPM speech 2).

“Today is a truly happy occasion, as another milestone is reached in the attempts by the government to empower the San people” (DPM speech 2).

“To the San, take note that the animals are for breeding and ploughing purposes, not for consumption. Therefore, you must use the animals and implements for the purpose they were intended for” (DPM speech 2).

The first quote expresses satisfaction over results of empowerment initiatives of the government aimed at the San. Thus, empowerment of the San seems to be a government goal. The second quote, however, raises questions concerning either the government’s understanding of empowerment or the seriousness of the goal. As Fairclough explains, “beginning an utterance with *look* marks it as putting somebody in their place, or forcefully correcting their misapprehension” (Fairclough 2010: 152). The “take note” can be replaced by *look* and has the same effect, which is further amplified by the explicit addressing “to the San” in the very beginning of the quote. The second sentence stresses the contradiction further. “Must” is an example of what Fairclough calls “relational modality”, “a matter of the authority of one participant in relation to others” (Fairclough 2010: 105). The “must” signals obligation (Fairclough 2010: 106); obligation to comply with the plans of intended purpose of

³⁶ It is not entirely clear if this is the resettlement farm I visited, since according to this report it is in a different

the animals. Interesting in that sentence is that it is not clear who decided on the purpose of the animals. However, since the San are told that they should only use the animals in a certain way, it can be deduced that it was not in dialogue with them that an intended purpose was decided. This means that power to make these decisions lies in a different place. Thus, despite the conflicting statements concerning empowerment, power structures especially in the second quote resemble what I have found in other quotes. Power is with the speaker, not with the San reinforcing the speaker's position and passivating the other.

Also concerning 'what the San are', the documents are providing inconsistent information, as these quotes show.

"Since 2005, the Deputy Prime Minister has been spearheading the San Development Programme to cater for their needs in term of income and wealth generating projects to ensure the survival of the people whose life is nomadic and who used to survive on wild berries and animal hunting" (GIB September 2007: 7, 18).

"Following intensive efforts to bring previously marginalised communities on par with the rest of their compatriots through various tailor-made projects, these projects reached the monitoring and evaluation stage" (OPM Annual Report 2008-2009: 4).

The first quote makes use of the essentialist image of the San (Robins 2001: 834) that is still promoted through for example the tourism industry as words like "nomadic" and "survival" underline (see Namibia Tourism Board homepage). Most of the San targeted by the San Development Programme, however, are farm labourers who do not fit this essentialist picture anymore (Sylvain 2005: 362).³⁷ The image that can be found in the second quote is different, talking about the San as a previously marginalised group.

6.3 Analysis of Discursive Practice

"Description needs to be complemented with interpretation and explanation" (Fairclough 2010: 118). Hence, I will now analyse the discursive practice. This is what Fairclough calls *interpretation* and the step that "mediates" between text and wider social practice and prepares for the last step of the analysis, *explanation* (Fairclough 2010: 117). When analysing discursive practice I examine how the texts under analysis are produced and how they are

region (Otjozondjupa) and spelled without a t, which it is in other government documents.

³⁷ Sylvain explains the complicated the San farm labourers are in. They are encouraged to "to conform to the very picture of pristine Bushmen" because that is what donors are interested in. This image, however, also justifies their treatment as an underclass which is therewith reinforced (Sylvain 2005: 362).

interpreted. This includes looking at the different “representations of societal and institutional social order” that influence interpretation (*situational context*) and the different discourses that the texts made use of (*intertextual context*) (Fairclough 2010: 121, 122, 127). I will start by examining the situational context.

All eight documents are produced and published by the Namibian government and fall therewith under the *institutional status* political (Fairclough 2010: 156). Also, they all deal with the San and the San development programme. However, the eight documents (and picture) under analysis can be categorised into different genres and differ in purpose and audience. The genre of DPM speech 1 and 2 is “public speech”. Thus, originally there was a direct and limited audience – the people that attended the two ceremonies and spoke English, excluding many of the actual beneficiaries of the donations³⁸. The purpose of both speeches is first to hand over donations from the government to the two San communities. A related purpose is to call attention to these donations and make government efforts and especially the San development programme public, since the handing over could otherwise have happen without ceremony and speech. Also, both speeches only address San-related issues.

The next group of documents have the genre “government report”. The reports are published by the government, in writing and online. Hence, everyone that has Internet access and can read English can potentially be an addressee. Unlike the speeches that have a local audience, the addressees are likely to also be foreign governments and organisations and the range of topics addressed is wide. Hence, next to informing about the San development programme, these documents have the purpose to inform about other government achievements of the last year and promote Namibia internationally.

The remaining three documents, government information bulletins, are more difficult to classify and exhibit *genre mixing*, an aspect of interdiscursivity (Fairclough 2003: 216) that will be discussed when I look at the intertextual context. The documents have elements of a newspaper, a government report and a newsletter. Unlike the other two they contain many pictures and are very colourful. The addressees are “government institutions and the Namibian public” and its purpose is to inform about “programmes, policies and activities” (see explanation in beginning of GIBs). Due to the many pictures and colours they seem to be more aimed at the public than the other documents, though like the others they are

³⁸ Since both have been publish on the government homepage, however, the audience is now everyone with access to the homepage and, importantly, the English language. Due to the very local topic the audience will probably be local or at least Namibian.

limited to an English speaking audience. As the annual reports, they address various topics, the San development programme being one among many.

Despite the differences in genre, audience and topics, however, all three types of documents have the “strategic purpose to make a politically favourable impact” (Fairclough 2010: 157). Also, they are likely to be believed and seen as truthful since the government is the author. This has to do with societal and institutional order in Namibia. The government inherited the high amount of authority the colonial administration had and is since independence in 1990 in an unchallenged ruling position (Melber 2003: 268, 272; Lindeke 2009: 2)³⁹. This strong position of the government gives the documents authority and power. At the same time, the authors know that and (especially in case of the speech) exhibit this power and authority strongly therewith strengthening the government’s position – the dialectic process mentioned above. Also, all eight texts are not in conversation form and therewith not directly challengeable, like it would be the case in for example an interview. This increases the influence and the power of the content since they remain unchallenged.

Next to analysing situational context, the intertextual context of the texts needs to be determined. I will identify different texts (intertextuality), discourses, genres (interdiscursivity) that the materials from the analysis draw upon and look closer at the inconsistencies discovered during text analysis.

Intertextuality identifies the texts used in the production of the text under analysis. It includes the use of quoted speech and summaries of what was said other places, which are easier to identify (Fairclough 2003: 40). The three GIBs make use of quotations and summarise what others, and especially the DPM said. What is more interesting in this case, however, is “which texts and voices are ... excluded and what significant absences are there” (Fairclough 2003: 46, 47). The example Fairclough gives is very fitting. In a text about the senior management, voices of the senior managers are excluded and those of workers included. It is about “what senior management do, not what they say” (Ibid.: 47). This is very comparable to the material analysed here, with the difference that it is San voices that are excluded. There is not a single quote or summary of a San point of view, despite the repeated mentioning of inclusion. The only way it differs from the senior manager example is that the

³⁹ The position is so unchallenged that various scholars categorise Namibia as a one party dominant political system, in which SWAPO, the party in power is in an unchallenged position (Bauer 2001; Bogaards 2004; Matlosa 2007).

power dynamics are opposite. The San are in a less powerful position than the government, whose voice is included through for example the partial quoting of the DPM's speeches.

Looking at interdiscursivity, it can be summarised that all eight documents draw on various discourses and, as pointed out above, some of them also contain different genres. Even though the different discourses used in the documents are at first sight and in their original form incompatible⁴⁰, they are all part of an order of discourse of politics (Chouliaraki and Fairclough 2001: 114, 115). This will say that the way they are fitted together, they consolidate the image of a strong and able government and reinforce the government's already powerful position and the existing order of discourse. This fits with Foucault's argument that those in a position of power can create knowledge that defines reality and reaffirms their power (Foucault 1979: 27).

The two speeches, the annual reports and to a certain extent also the GIBs make use of an empowerment discourse. These quotes are examples to illustrate that:

“Today is a truly happy occasion, as another milestone is reached in the attempts by the government to empower the San people” (DPM speech 2).

“The initial stages of the process included visits by the Deputy Prime Minister to various San communities across Namibia. These meetings were aimed at consultations with the San on their needs and on what they considered as pressing challenges facing them” (OPM Annual Report 2006-2007: 5)

The first quote mentions empowerment directly, the second informs about consultations/visits, which in the context can belong to a participatory development discourse, which in turn is very closely linked with empowerment (Green 2000: 69, 70). However, as mentioned above, at the same time the texts contain policy discourse that emphasises government control in planning programmes and is in strong contrast with ideas of empowerment advocates. Even when using a more limited understanding of empowerment, community participation in planning and execution of a programme is part of it (Mohan and Stokke 2000: 252) and evidence of that is difficult to find in the material. Rather, the government is the exclusive decision-maker and executor.

Next to empowerment, the documents draw on development discourse. Formulations like “developmental issues”, “national development programmes” (OPM annual report 2006-2007: 4, 5), “monitoring and evaluation stage”, “project management plan”

⁴⁰ With incompatible I mean that a pure liberal market discourse and a pure empowerment discourse talk about very different views of the world, what is achievable and how that should be achieved. Due to that, in pure form they do not seem to be combinable.

(OPM annual report 2008-2009: 4), “socio-economic developments” (DPM speech 1) and “endeavour for empowerment and development” (DPM speech 2) are examples. Phrases such as project development plan and socio-economic development as well as the context of the texts point more specifically to the discourse used by intergovernmental organisations like IMF and World Bank and not a more alternative development discourse (Rist 2008: 242, 247). This also fits in with words coming from a liberal market discourse contained in the texts like “income and wealth generating projects” (GIB September 2007), “business” and “private sector” (DPM speech 1).

Also, traces of a national identity or patriotism discourse can be found in the texts. Examples are: “patriotic citizens of Namibia” (DPM speech 2), “compatriots” (OPM annual report 2008-2009) and “as Namibians we are witnessing again another mile stone that is achieved by our government” (DPM speech 1). They are often in combination with praising the government’s achievements, as is the case in the last quote, reaffirming the government’s position. Furthermore, the use of this discourse can be understood as an attempt by the government to strengthen a common national identity as opposed to the ethnically divided identities during apartheid (Dieckmann 2007: 237).

Moreover, the speeches and one of the GIBs contain utterances belonging to a discourse of “colonial guilt” concerning the reasons of today’s and specifically the San’s problems. Interestingly, while a negative view on colonialism is voiced, the texts seem to make use of and replicate some of the ethnic stereotypes coined during colonialism. As explained above, “in southern Africa, pre-colonial tribal groupings were transformed by white differentiation and the assignment of particular kinds of jobs to different groups of people” (Loomba 2005: 106). The colonisers established a stereotype of the San as being unreliable, uncivilised and wild and lowest in the created ethnic hierarchy. Also, they were often compared to children, or worse, animals (Guenther, 1980: 137; Sylvain 2011: 93). Some of these colonial stereotypes, though in a milder form, can be found in the texts. They seem to inform the government’s behaviour towards the San.

“When they are no more needed on a certain farm they were just chased away and others were brought in” (DPM speech 1).

“To the San, take note that the animals are for breeding and ploughing purposes, not for consumption... I also do not want to hear stories of animals that were lost or animals that were eaten” (DPM speech 2).

“The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister identified aquaculture for the San as another way of alleviating their poverty and providing them with employment opportunities” (OPM annual report 2007-2008: 5).

The formulation “chased away” is conventionally used when talking about animals. In the other two quotes the government and the DPM decide for the San and the second quote actually resembles a parent speaking to a child. Also, it draws back on the view of the San during colonialism as unconcerned with the future and unable to save (Gordon 1992: 63; Sylvain 2005: 360). Hence, despite the anti-colonial discourse used, the authors seem to be influenced by and thus replicate some of the colonial discourse on ethnic groups and the stereotypes attributed to them⁴¹. The DPM makes use of the colonial stereotypes more openly⁴², though without calling them that. Influence of these stereotypes can also be found in the other documents but there they are only in the form of a patronising attitude and therewith less strong and harder to see.

Besides the discourses that I just gave examples for, various other discourses are used in the texts. These are for example a law and international conventions discourse, a gender quality discourse, and an employment discourse. Though, since they are not as relevant for the topic of this paper I will not analyse them further. What can be said is that all the documents analysed use a high number of different discourses. According to Fairclough a high level of interdiscursivity generally signifies change (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 82, 83). This is, however, not necessarily the case and will be discussed further in the analysis of social practice.

6.4 Analysis of Social Practice

I will look at how the discursive practice analysed relates to the wider social practice – “whether the discursive practice reproduces or, instead, restructures the existing order of discourse and what consequences this has for the broader social practice” (Jørgensen and Phillips 2002: 69). I will determine, as mentioned earlier, what makes this discourse possible and what its social functions are (Brooks 1995: 463). That also means that partly non-discursive influences such as social structures on the discourse under analysis have to be

⁴¹ This is the process that I have explained in more detail in the theoretical part on postcolonial ideas.

⁴² Generally there is a difference between the DPM speeches and the other documents, them being more moderate. The speeches, however, are important since the head of the programme is giving them. It is safe to assume that her views and attitude towards the San have strong influence on the execution of the programme.

identified to the extent possible (Fairclough 2010: 30, 31).⁴³ The analysis will be divided into two parts. First, I will determine which “institutional processes” the discourse belongs to, how it is shaped by them and shapes them. The same will be done when looking at “societal processes” (Fairclough 2010: 158, 160).

Concerning the institutional processes, the discourse belongs to the field of politics. It therewith cuts across various institutions, namely governmental institutions, political parties and since the discourse involves development also international institutions. These institutional frames, national and international, are understood here as the non-discursive influences mentioned, which exercise influence on the discourse but are also influenced by it as I will elaborate on.

Concerning national institutional processes, the discursive practice strengthens and reinforces the existing power relations and reaffirms the present institutional settings in Namibia (consisting of a dominant government), rather than challenges them. This is, however, softened by for example the use of empowerment and development discourse and words like inclusion while in reality the government is still the sole decisions-maker. As Fairclough puts it: “Claim solidarity but assert your authority” (Fairclough 2010: 157). This strategy remains relatively unobjectionable. While raising doubts about the efficiency of the government programmes for San, the Namibian media for example does not criticise the patronising behaviour towards the San and the content of government plans detailing the aims of change in the San’s life (The Namibian 2007 and 2010; Namibia Economist 2008).

As briefly mentioned above, interdiscursivity is high in the texts, which according to Fairclough is a signal of change in the discursive order (Fairclough 2000: 96, 97). The discourses used in the text do, however, not challenge the order of discourse it belongs to and the present power hierarchy of Namibian society. Rather, they recreate and strengthen it by interweaving various discourses with a strong government discourse, blurring the boundaries between them and thereby making them inseparable. What could explain the high use of discourses, without the bigger order being challenged, is the need of the Namibian government to be accepted internationally, by the international institutions mentioned. While the Namibian government is very strong nationally this is not the case internationally. Namibia, as many other developing countries is dependent on aid and the good will of international institutions like IMF and World Bank. By using discourses like empowerment

⁴³ As explained earlier, discursive and non-discursive will be divided analytically rather than theoretically.

and a certain approach to development that are propagated by these institutions the government makes its policies acceptable and tries to legitimise itself in the eyes these institutions.

The sudden interest of the government in improving the situation of the San starting in 2005 could have a similar explanation. It came after the publication of a report on the situation of the San from the African Commission on Human and People's rights and subsequent critical questions of opposition parties regarding the matter of the San (Dieckmann 2007: 238, 239). By launching the San Development Programme the issue that presented a challenge to the Namibian government's image and power, the suffering of the San, was removed.

When looking at the effects of the San Development Programme documents on social practice a return to the theories on power and knowledge outlined earlier seems fitting. As Foucault explained populations are controlled by powerful institutions without the use of force through the establishment of various places like universities and schools and the norms and modes of behaviour taught in those places (Foucault 1991a: 262; Foucault 1980: 131, 132). This can

be applied to the San Development Programme and especially the resettlement scheme. It can be understood as setting norms for how to live, i.e. in houses positioned in a certain way with gardens and fences, a clinic and a



school as the picture shows.⁴⁴ Also, norms are set about what goals in life should be, for example to become “future doctors or engineers” (DPM speech 1). The norm setting is not judged here as positive or negative. It simply illustrates that the dominant discourse is the one setting norms and therewith influencing social practice.

Concerning the societal processes elements of class struggle can be detected in the discourse, a struggle that in the case of Namibia is aligned with struggle between ethnic groups. As Fairclough finds in his analysis of a Margaret Thatcher interview (Fairclough

2010: 160), the ruling political party tries to improve the situation of the lower classes or in this case one specific ethnicity through development programmes, but it fails to challenge the existing hierarchy that lead to that situation. This is also the case in the discourse under analysis. While giving the San food and a place to stay, the perception of them as being of the lowest status in the Namibian society (Sylvain 2002: 1077) is not consequently challenged by the rhetoric or the programme itself⁴⁵, which both still does not allow much agency to the San.

On the one hand, through the way the San are spoken about in the policy documents, the government takes part in reinforcing an image of the San as unable to make their own decisions and take charge of their lives even though demands are made that that is exactly what they should do (see DPM speech 1 and 2, GIB September 2007). At the same time, and that is the dialectic relationship explained before (Fairclough 2000: 65), this attitude towards the San is influenced by discourse. Specifically, traces of the discourse that came to life during colonial times and depicts the San as childlike, as different and inferior to the other ethnic groups in Namibia can be found in it (Sylvain 2001: 724; Suzman 2001: 8, 14).

These influences could through the help of postcolonial theory and looking at the colonial history of the San and the other ethnic groups in Namibia become visible - that despite the negative view of the speakers on colonialism, the colonial ethnic stereotypes and the hierarchy once developed on the base of ethnicity (Loomba 2005: 106) still have an influence on the treatment of the San today⁴⁶. The San are still spoken about and to with a patronising attitude (Dieckmann 2007: 239) and belong to Namibia's lowest social class, the same place they occupied in the colonial ethnic hierarchy (Sylvain 2002: 1077). Thus, the separation of them from other Namibians that was propagated during colonial times is, though to a lesser degree, still visible in present-day discourse, therewith reinforcing that social reality. As quoted above, one informant was accepted as a headboy in school while claiming he was Damara but not anymore when fellow pupils and their parents learned that he was Hai//om.

⁴⁴ I mention the houses and how they are placed specifically because, even though "normal" for a western reader, this was not the way most San homes away from the resettlement farm looked.

⁴⁵ Though there are statements by the DPM condemning the treatment of the San as "slaves" and emphasising that they need assistance in demanding minimum wages (GIB September 2007).

⁴⁶ And possibly all other ethnic groups in Namibia.

6.5 Overview over findings

The CDA in form of a three-dimensional model was chosen because it not only looks at the texts under analysis, but additionally allows an examination of discursive and social context in which the texts are situated therewith producing a more comprehensive analysis. A short summary of the findings made in the analysis seems fitting.

On the textual level I presented examples of the relationship between the San and the Namibian government that the discourse creates as well as of the image of the San that arises out of the discourse. I found textual evidence for various processes. The picture that arises from the discourse is one in which the government is active, initiative taking and powerful. The San on the other hand are depicted as passive, different from the rest of the population, voiceless. The government is the one that defines norms and a way of life in the text, though in some instances sending conflicting messages.

Through analysing the discursive practice, the influences on the texts' production, I linked the text with the wider social context. All texts are published by the government, which gives them a certain authority and is used with the strategic purpose to reinforce the government's position and dominate that order of discourse the texts are part of. Through the use of various discourses, government efficiency is interwoven with empowerment, development and patriotism.

As the analysis of the social context explains, this is reinforcing the present social order and stabilises the government's position. The inclusion of dominant discourses of the international institutions like development and empowerment show a picture of Namibia as conforming to these institutions' standards. On the national level, criticism is minimised through the inclusion of softer policies that address the least well-off, like the San Development Programme. Through these policies, however, norms about a way of life are set. Also, while these programmes aim at improving the San's livelihood, present hierarchies are not challenged. Especially so, because traces of colonial discourse on ethnic identities can still be detected.

7 Results and Concluding Reflections

This thesis set out to investigate government discourse around the San and their situation with the aim to find clues explaining the San's continuous poverty and marginalisation. To do that I looked at the way the San are portrayed in government texts, the relationship between the San and the Namibian government revealed in the texts, the way the Namibian government takes part in shaping the San's lives and lastly possible influences of colonial discourse on ethnic identity on present-day discourse.

I found that the San are talked about as passive recipients and as still being different from the rest of Namibians, though inclusion is attempted. This does, however, happen on terms set by the government. Also there are examples of patronising by the government and the San are silenced in government discourse. This reinforces the image of San as incapable of being agents in the improvement of their own lives.

The relationship depicted in the texts is a highly unequal one in which the government controls power. This is the case, because it is the one giving and deciding when and what to give. Even the food comes from the government. This power dynamic is not being challenged, rather reinforced, by the government programmes since the San do not have much, if any say in how these programmes look and what they do.

Through making all decisions for the San communities the government, rather than empower the people, leaves them in their position of non-agency. Also, the technologies of power Foucault describes (Foucault 1991a: 262; Foucault 1980: 132) can be found to set norms and standards and therewith define a certain way of life through the government discourse.

Lastly, certain perceptions of "how the San are" that were formed during colonialism still have an influence on what is perceived as possible for them. Also, a parent-like attitude towards them might be a result of the colonial stereotypes.

The findings illustrate that next to addressing quantifiable factors when intending to improve the San's situation, analysing discourse can point to deeper societal problems that also need to be dealt with. An approach focussed on discourse next to quantifiable factors might actually be beneficial for the general inequality problem in Namibia. To tackle the stark inequality and enable all to benefit from Namibia's economic

growth solely addressing quantifiable factors such as employment and housing does not seem sufficient.

In the specific case analysed here, for development programmes aimed at improving the situation of the San to be truly successful, discourse and with it the perceptions of the San have to change. They have to be seen and treated as equally capable, and not as different and inferior, which in turn would for example lead to equal pay.

In this context, however, and to prevent reinforcing what Ute Dieckmann calls the “cult of victim” present in a lot of work on the San (Dieckmann 2007: 335), agency of the San needs to be problematised. It is not enough for others to stop treating the San differently. The San must make use of their agency to shape their own destinies and not be dependent on a government that patronises them. If they are complacent in being patronised and passivated no government policy is going to change that. Indeed, why should government change its rhetoric if the people themselves don’t complain visibly? Any changes that occur must have backing in San communities. Change must come from above, but also from below, in order for the used “empowerment” rhetoric to be effective. Also, Namibia needs to deal with the colonial past and the implications it still has on peoples’ understanding of one another, rather than declaring that from independence on there are no differences anymore.

Concluding this thesis one could ask how these findings are relevant beyond the Namibian borders. To make it simple, there are some usable insights for policy makers everywhere to gain from examination of discourse and power structures in relation to marginalised ethnic groups. Governments anywhere can spend billions on aid and development programmes, but unless discourse does not match policy, unless the government does not show consideration for the communities they are attempting to help and takes them seriously, progress will remain fragmented. At the same time, the targeted communities too must not be satisfied with the role as passive victims, but instead demand esteem from development agencies. Therefore, next to the quantifiable factors, a close examination of discourse can provide a more complete picture of a marginalisation and persisting poverty problem and the deeper causes, which in turn increases the chances of solving it.

8 Executive Summary

In finding solutions for enduring poverty and marginalisation of groups of people, much attention is commonly paid to material and measurable factors like access to health care, education and work. This results in aid programmes and policies mainly addressing these quantifiable factors. Though being undeniably important, a sole focus on material factors does provide an incomplete picture of a situation of enduring poverty and marginalisation. An examination of immaterial factors such as language and with it rhetorical subjugation of a group could complete the picture.

An analysis of language's influence on the ways in which society is structured and its norms and values can provide deeper understanding its functioning. Societal structures and power hierarchies influence the opportunities of people and their place in a society and they are communicated through language. Analysis of language use and with it the discourse around a topic can reveal deeper reasons for the disadvantaged position of some in society and the privileged position of others.

The specific case under analysis is that of the San people, an indigenous ethnic minority in Namibia. The aim is to investigate factors that could explain why the San's situation has not improved noticeably since Namibian independence in 1990 despite the country's stable economic growth. Looking at for example the Human Development Index (HDI), the San's would be much lower than that of the whole Namibian population, which in turn shows, that despite various government efforts and Namibia's comparably good economic situation, equality between the San and the rest of the population has not been achieved yet. In 2005 the Namibian government then launched the San Development Programme to ameliorate the situation.

Against this background I examine the government discourse(s) that surround the San's situation found in policy documents and speeches to investigate the effects that the discourse has on their reality. I look at how the San are spoken about in government texts, the relationship between San and the Namibian government the texts show, how through discourse the government takes part in shaping the San's life and if and how the ethnic stereotypes created during colonial times still influence today's discourse.

To do that, I develop a theoretical framework consisting of theories on power, knowledge and discourse supplemented by postcolonial theories. The theories on power and knowledge and their connection to discourse are used to show that power structures on the one hand form the basis of discourse and on the other hand are being reinforced by it. Additionally, postcolonial theory is used to make clear the power relations inherent in discourses from a historical perspective, and help in the scrutiny of contemporary discourses. As a result, having the tools to analyse the present discourse and power structures provided by the first part of the theoretical framework, postcolonial theory makes it possible to understand where this discourse comes from.

For that sound historical background knowledge of the case is essential. Therefore I give an overview over Namibia's colonial past with a focus on colonists' discourse and the picture of the San that arose from it. First the German and later the South African colonial administration established a hierarchy based on ethnic affiliation in which the San occupied the lowest place. They created a picture of the San as child-like, wild and savage and unable to think into the future – a picture, which still haunts them today.

The method chosen to perform the analysis is Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). It offers a framework to analyse not only discourse, but also the relations *between* discourse and non-discursive elements. Moreover, CDA tries to uncover the role of discursive practice in the maintenance of unequal relations of power and more generally the social world. I use Fairclough's three-dimensional model as my main analytical framework according to which every discursive event is at the same time text, discursive practice and social practice, which leads to an analysis that is split into three parts.

On the textual level of the analysis I find evidence for various processes. The picture that arises from the discourse is one in which the government is active, initiative taking and powerful. The San on the other hand are depicted as passive, different from the rest of the population, voiceless. The government is the one that defines norms and a way of life in the text, though in some instances sending conflicting messages.

Through analysing the discursive practice, the influences on the texts' production, I linked the text with the wider social context. All texts have been published by the government, which gives them a certain authority and is used with the strategic purpose to reinforce the government's position and dominate that order of discourse the texts are part of. Through the use of various discourses, government efficiency is interwoven with empowerment, development and patriotism.

As the analysis of the social context explains, this is reinforcing the present social order and stabilises the government's position. The inclusion of dominant discourses of the international institutions like development and empowerment show a picture of Namibia as conforming to these institutions' standards. On the national level, criticism is minimised through the inclusion of softer policies that address the least well-off, like the San Development Programme. Through these policies, however, norms about a way of life are set. Also, while these programmes aim at improving the San's livelihood, present hierarchies are not challenged. Especially so, because traces of colonial discourse on ethnic identities can still be detected.

The findings illustrate that next to addressing quantifiable factors when intending to improve the San's situation, analysing discourse can point to deeper problems that also need to be dealt with. In the specific case analysed here, for development programmes aimed at improving the situation of the San to be truly successful, discourse and with it the perceptions of the San have to change. They have to be seen and treated as equally capable, and not as different and inferior, which in turn would for example lead to equal pay. However, the San should not be essentialised as victims. They must also make use of their agency to shape their own destinies and not be dependent on a government that patronises them. If they are complacent in being patronised and passivated no government policy is going to change that.

The findings could prove useful beyond the case under analysis when it comes to the better working of aid and development policy. Governments anywhere in the world can spend billions on development programmes and employment schemes, but unless discourse does not match policy, unless the government does not show consideration for the communities they are attempting to help and takes them seriously, progress will remain fragmented. Therefore, next to the quantifiable factors, a close examination of discourse can provide a more complete picture of the problem and the deeper causes, which in turn simplifies solving it.

9 References

- Armbruster, Heidi (2010) 'Realising the Self and Developing the African': German Immigrants in Namibia, in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 36, No. 8, pp. 1229-1246.
- Baaz, Maria Eriksson (2005) *The Paternalism of Partnership. A Postcolonial Reading of Development Aid*. New York: Zed Books.
- Bauer, Gretchen (2001) "Namibia in the First Decade of Independence: How Democratic?" in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 33-55.
- Becker, Heike (2003) "The Least Sexist Society? Perspectives on Gender, Change and Violence Among southern African San" in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp. 5-23.
- Berman, Bruce; Eyoh, Dickson and Kimlicka, Will (2004) *Introduction*, in Bruce Berman, Dickson Eyoh, and Will Kimlicka (eds.) *Ethnicity and Democracy in Africa*. Oxford: James Currey.
- Bhabha, Homi K. (1994) *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Blommaert, Jan (2005) *Discourse. A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bogaards, Matthijs (2004) "Counting parties and identifying dominant party systems in Africa" in *European Journal of Political Research*, Vol. 43, pp. 173–197.
- Boréus, Kristina (2006) "Discursive Discrimination: A Typology" in *European Journal of Social Theory*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 405-424.
- Brooks, Heather Jean (1995) "Suit, Tie and a Touch of Juju'. The Ideological Construction of Africa: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News on Africa in the British Press" in *Discourse and Society*, Vol. 6, No. 4, pp. 461-494.
- Chouliaraki, Lilie and Fairclough, Norman (2001) *Discourse in Late Modernity. Rethinking Critical Discourse Analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Coronil, Fernando (1994) "Listening to the Subaltern: The Poetics of Neocolonial States" in *Poetics Today*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 643-658.
- Daniels, Clement (2004) *Indigenous Right in Namibia*, in Robert K. Hitchcock and Diana Vinding (eds.) *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs.

- Dean, Mitchell (2010) *Governmentality. Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: Sage.
- Dieckmann, Ute (2007) *Hai//om in the Etosha Region. A History of Colonial Settlement, Ethnicity and Nature Conservation*. Basel: Basler Afrika Bibliographien.
- Fairclough, Norman (2000) *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman (2003) *Analysing Discourse. Textual Analysis for Social Research*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Fairclough, Norman; Cortese, Giuseppina and Ardizzone, Patrizia (2007) *Discourse and Contemporary Social Change*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fairclough, Norman (2010) *Language and Power*. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Farrelly, Michael (2010) "Critical Discourse Analysis in Political Studies: An Illustrative Analysis of the 'Empowerment' Agenda" in *Politics*, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 98-104.
- Foucault, Michel (1979) *Discipline and Punish. The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Random House.
- Foucault, Michel and Gordon, Colin (1980) *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews & Other Writings*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1991a) *Right of Death and Power over Life (History of Sexuality Vol. I)* in Paul Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1991b) *The Great Confinement (Madness and Civilisation)*, in Paul Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel (1991c) *Preface to the History of Sexuality Volume II*, in Paul Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault (1991d) *On the Genealogy of Ethics: An Overview of Work in Progress*, in Paul Rabinow (ed.) *The Foucault Reader. An Introduction to Foucault's Thought*. London: Penguin Books.
- Foucault, Michel (2010) *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Gordon, Robert (1992) *The Bushman Myth. The Making of a Namibian Underclass*. Oxford: Westview Press.
- Green, Maia (2000) "Participatory Development and Appropriation of Agency in Southern Tanzania" in *Critique of Anthropology*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 67-89.
- Guenther, Mathias Georg (1980) From "Brutal Savages" to "Harmless People". Notes on the Changing Western Image of the Bushmen, in *Paideuma*, Vol. 26, pp. 123-140.

- Hall, Stuart (1996) *When Was "the Postcolonial"?* *Thinking at the Limit*, in Iain Chambers and Lidia Curti (eds.) *The Postcolonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*. London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (1997) "On the foundations of Critical Discourse Analysis", in *Language & Communication*, Vol. 17, No. 3, pp. 237-248
- Harring, Sidney and Odendaal, Willem (2002) *"One day we will all be equal..." A Socio-Legal Perspective on the Namibian Land Reform and Resettlement Process*. Legal Assistance Centre: Windhoek.
- Harring, Sidney (2004) *Indigenous Land Rights and Land Reform in Namibia*, in Robert K. Hitchcock and Diana Vinding (eds.) *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Hitchcock, Robert K. (1997) *Cultural, Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism among Kalahari Bushmen*, in Erve Chambers (ed.) *Tourism and Culture. An Applied Perspective*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Howarth, David (2010) *Discourse*. Maidenhead and New York: Open University Press.
- Janks, Hilary (2008) "Critical Discourse Analysis as a Research Tool", in *CiteSeer - Scientific Literature Digital Library and Search Engine*.
- Jolly, Rosemary (1996) "Rehearsals of Liberation: Contemporary Postcolonial Discourse in the New South Africa" in *PMLA*, Vol. 110, No.1, pp. 17-29.
- Jørgensen, Marianne and Phillips, Louise (2002). *Discourse analysis as theory and method*. London: Sage.
- Lee, Richard (1986) *The Gods Must Be Crazy, but the State Has a Plan: Government Policies towards the San in Namibia*, in *Canadian Journal of African Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 91-98.
- Lemon, Anthony (2007) "Perspectives on democratic consolidation in Southern Africa: The five general elections of 2004" in *Political Geography*, No. 26, pp. 824-850.
- Lindeke, William A. (2009) *The End of One-Party Dominance in Namibia? Re-spacing Political Parties, State and Society*, IPPR Conference Paper for the European Conference on African Studies, Leipzig, Germany, June 2009.
- Loomba, Ania (2005) *Colonialism/ Postcolonialism*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Namibian Office of the Prime Minister Annual Report 2005-2006*. Windhoek: Office of the Prime Minister.
- Macmillan, Alexandre (2010) "Foucault's history of the will to knowledge and the critique of the juridical form of truth" in *Journal of Political Power*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 365-384.

- Mail and Guardian Online (2009) *San face land invasion in Namibia*.
<http://mg.co.za/article/2009-06-01-san-face-land-invasion-in-namibia>, accessed August 16, 2010.
- Matlosa, Khabele (2007) *Political Parties in Southern Africa: The State of Parties and their Role in Democratization*. Stockholm: International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance.
- McEwan, Cheryl (2009) *Postcolonialism and Development*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.
- Melber, Henning (2003) "From Controlled Change to Changed Control: The Case of Namibia" in *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 267-284.
- Melber, Henning (2007) "*SWAPO is the Nation, and the Nation is SWAPO*" *Government and Opposition in a Dominant Party State. The Case of Namibia*. Uppsala: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet.
- Merquior, José Guilherme (1985) *Foucault*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Mohan, Giles and Stokke, Kristian (2000) "Participatory Development and Empowerment: The Dangers of Localism" in *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 21, No. 2, pp. 247-268.
- Namibia Economist (2008) *Development becomes a reality for nomadic San people*
http://www.economist.com.na/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=18528:development-becomes-a-reality-for-nomadic-san-people&catid=541:archives , accessed April 21, 2010.
- Odendaal, Willem (2006) *San Communal Lands Contested: The battle over N#u Jaqna Conservancy*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Centre.
- Pakleppa, Richard (2004) *Civil Rights in Legislation and Practice: A Case Study from Tsumkwe District West, Namibia* in Robert K. Hitchcock and Diana Vinding (eds.) *Indigenous Peoples' Rights in Southern Africa*. Copenhagen: International Working Group for Indigenous Affairs.
- Ranger, Terrence (1982) *Race and Tribe in Southern Africa: European Ideas and African Acceptance*, in Robert Ross (ed.) 'Racism and Colonialism. Essays on Ideology and Social Structure'. The Hague: Leiden University Press, pp. 121-142.
- Rist, Gilbert (2008) *The History of Development. From Western Origins to Global Faith*. London: Zed Books.
- Robins, Steven (2001) "NGOs, 'Bushmen' and Double Vision: The ≠ Khomani San Land Claim and the Cultural Politics of 'Community' and 'Development' in the Kalahari" in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 833-853.
- Robins, Steven (2003) "Whose Modernity? Indigenous Modernities and Land Claims after Apartheid" in *Development and Change*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 265-285.

- Spivak, Gayatri (2006) *Can the Subaltern Speak?*, in Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (eds.) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*. Oxford and New York: Routledge.
- Suzman, James (2001) *An Assessment of the Status of the San in Namibia*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Centre.
- Sylvain, Renee (2001) “Bushmen, Boers and Baasskap: Patriarchy and Paternalism on Afrikaner Farms in the Omaheke Region, Namibia” in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 27, No. 4, pp. 717-737.
- Sylvain, Renee (2002) “Land, Water and Truth”: San Identity and Global Indigenism, in *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 104, No. 4, pp. 1074-1085.
- Sylvain, Renee (2005) “Disorderly development: Globalization and the idea of “culture” in the Kalahari” in *American Ethnologist*, Vol. 32, No. 3, pp. 354 – 370.
- Sylvain, Renee (2011) “At the Intersections: San Women and the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in Africa”, in *The International Journal of Human Rights*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 89-110.
- The Economist (2010) *Happy but unequal Namibia. On we go. Swapo rules and harmony prevails*.
http://www.economist.com/node/18340509?story_id=18340509&CFID=170051417&CFTOKEN=41023860 , accessed May 10, 2011.
- The Namibian (2007) *Resettlement is a failure*.
http://www.namibian.com.na/index.php?id=28&tx_ttnews%5Btt_news%5D=34540&no_cache=1, accessed August 16, 2010.
- The Namibian (2010) *Special Group Services: Is There a Timeline*.
<http://www.namibian.com.na/columns/full-story/archive/2010/june/article/special-group-services-is-there-a-timeline/> , accessed February 1, 2011.
- Thompson (2002) “A Critical Discourse Analysis of World Music as the ‘Other’ in Education” in *Research Studies in Music Education* Vol. 19, pp. 14-21.
- Titscher, Stefan; Meyer, Michael; Wodak, Ruth and Vetter, Eva (2000) *Methods of Text and Discourse Analysis*. Sage: London.
- Tomaselli, Keyan G. (2005) *Where Global Contradictions are Sharpest. Research Stories from the Kalahari*. Amsterdam: SAVUSA-Series.
- Werner, Wolfgang and Odendaal, Willem (2010) *Livelihoods after Land Reform. Namibia Country Report. Land, Environment and Development Project*. Windhoek: Legal Assistance Centre.
- Widlok, Thomas (1999) *Living on Mangetti*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wilmsen, Edwin N.; Dubow, Saul and Sharp, John (1994) "Introduction: Ethnicity Identity and Nationalism in Southern Africa" in *Journal of Southern African Studies*, Vol. 20, No. 3, pp. 347-353.

Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) *Report on Activities 2007-2008*. Windhoek: WIMSA.

9.1 Discourse Analysis Material

Speech 1 of the Deputy Prime Minister Libertine Amathila (August 7, 2009) *Remarks by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister on the occasion of official handing over of the school, clinic and housing project Farm Uitkomst*, published on the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Speech 2 of the Deputy Prime Minister Libertine Amathila (November 25, 2005) *Hon. Dr. L. Amathila at the handing-over of livestock to the Skoonheid San community, Omaheke Region*, published on the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Office of the Prime Minister *Annual Report 2008-2009*, pp. 4,5, published on the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Office of the Prime Minister *Annual Report 2007-2008*, pp. 4, 5, published on the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Office of the Prime Minister *Annual Report 2006-2007*, pp. viii, 5-7, published on the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Government Information Bulletin September 2007, pp. 6-8, 12, 18, downloaded from the homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na, due to frequent problems with the homepage it can also be accessed through this link: <http://www.scribd.com/doc/52336965/MIB-Bulletin-September-Namibian-Government>

Government Information Bulletin December 2008, p. 4, published on homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na

Government Information Bulletin August 2009, p. 5, published on homepage of the Office of the Prime Minister www.opm.gov.na⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Due to problems with the format of the three GIBs they could not be included in the appendix. There is, however, a direct link to the one I most frequently quoted and page numbers indicate where to look for the text part I used for discourse analysis.

9.2 Internet sources

HDR – Human Development Report – The Human Development Index
<http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/>

ILO: <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/equality-and-discrimination/indigenous-and-tribal-peoples/lang--en/index.htm>, accessed January 25, 2011

Namibia Tourism Board (2011) *San/(Bushmen)*
<http://www.namibiatourism.com.na/bushmensan/>, accessed April 5, 2011

Namibian Office of the Prime Minister: <http://www.opm.gov.na/>, accessed at various times to download the discourse analysis material

WIMSA: <http://www.wimsanet.org/>, accessed March 12, 2011

9.3 Interviews

Interview 1: Working Group of Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) country coordinator. Windhoek, Namibia.
Gender: male. Language: English (40 minutes)

Interview 2: Hai//om manager of a community campsite in Tsintsabis. Tsintsabis Namibia.
Gender: male. Language: English (120 minutes)

Interview 3: Farmer recommended to me as a “San expert” and one of the founders of Ombili, a San development foundation. Tsintsabis, Namibia.
Gender: male. Language: German (75 minutes)

10 Appendices

10.1 DPM Speech 1

Farm Uitkomst

August 7, 2009; OPM

REMARKS BY THE HON. DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER ON THE OCCASION OF OFFICIAL HANDING OVER OF THE SCHOOL, CLINIC AND HOUSING PROJECT FARM UITKOMST

Director of Ceremonies
H. E. The President
Hon. Ministers and Deputy Ministers
Honourable Governors and Councillors
Honourable Traditional Leaders
Your Excellency members of the Diplomatic Corps
Senior Government Officials
Invited Guests
Community of Farm Uitkomst
Members of the Media
Ladies and Gentlemen

It makes me happy to have you all here today, because as Namibians we are witnessing again another mile stone that is achieved by our government through our developments projects. Allow me to present you a short layout of the Farm Uitkomst, this might help you to see the future of these people.

Farm Uitkomst was officially handed over to the San Development Programme on the 27th February 2008 by the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement after lengthy discussions and consultations. Together with the Otjozondjupa Regional Council, we managed to resettle 306 San people about 54 households consisting of 71 adults, 36 male and 35 females, 235 dependants, 81 male and 154 female including 49 school going children. Thirty two tents were erected to accommodate these people temporarily.

The San People that we see today happened to work on the commercial farms in the Hochfeld area for the past fifty plus years and when they are no more needed on a certain farm they were just chased away and others were brought in. And during the past twenty years it became evident that these people do not have their own place and consequently start squading at the Okahandja Old Swimming Pool, while others did the same on other commercial farms. In the process many lost their lives, and their children were deprived from Education and other socio economic developments.

Director of Ceremonies, ladies and gentlemen

There was no way I could sit back and relax after putting them in the tents, it put me under tremendous pressure, because I knew there was a need for decent housing urgently, which will protect them against the cruelty of extreme cold winters & rain.

During my search for funds I asked NHE to make a costing for 30 small houses, and was given a shock of my life of five million Namibian dollars (N\$5million). In September 2008 following a lengthy battle of soliciting funds, a Good Samaritan crossed my path and availed five hundred thousand Nam dollars towards this dream. This

donation laid the foundation of this enormous project.

The Farm Uitkomst Housing Project officially kicks off on the 29th September 2008. We appointed two builders who were willing to do this job for an amount under the margin and they made use of the local community members, Eight of them, including two women who received in-service training as builders during the process and will receive certificates in that regard.

In late November 2008, I asked the Permanent Secretary in the Office of the Prime Minister and Financial Advisor to visit this project to acquaint themselves on the shortfall, and as a result of their visit, one million Namibian Dollars were secured from the government for the completion of this project, in records 10 months (December excluded).

The Housing Project of Farm Uitkomst consist of 32 Community houses, 2 teachers houses/ four flats, 44 dry toilets, 35 showers with drains, 1 community office, 1 kindergarten building, 3 school building/ classrooms., 1 house for a nurse and a clinic as well as a fully installed water reticulation system.

I am equally proud to mention to you that this new village is fully electrified by our development partner namely Nampower who provide close to six hundred thousand Nam dollars towards this project through the Ministry of Mines and Energy. Cenerod was responsible for the completion of this project. The latter also donated sewing machine to the tune of seventeen thousand seven hundred and thirty Namibian dollar (N\$17730,00).

The overall cost for this entire project stands at N\$1, 4 million (N\$1, 415216-84) excluding the building of the clinic. The clinic was build and equipped by Mr. Sydney Martin and his business partners. Mr. Sydney Martin really assists us a lot as he was the first one to have donated some cattle (two milk cows), warm clothes for the community.

Other donors are as follow:

Mr. Peter Koep donated a deep freezer

Kandi Fishing donated a Photo copy Machine - Mr. Berro Tobias

Rosh Pinah donated Bed & Matrasses Mr. Chris Movirongo

Michele Mclean Trust donated blankets, hats for the kids and food for the kindergarten

Ministry of Forestry donated trees

Namibia Breweries donated Soft Drinks

Standard Bank of Namibia also contributed N\$70 000 for the school project

Rosh Pinah has donated 36x beds and matrasses to the community

Safari Hotel donated beddings, cutleries, curtains, carpets for this project

City Center Stationery contributed stationery for the school – Mrs Erb

Round Table Namibia and Round Table International donated chairs and desks for the classrooms.

Training for the sewing and bread making projects was conducted and sponsored by WAD – Ms De Klerk.

Med scheme also donated stationery and furnitures

All Neighbouring Farms for Assistance

Director of Ceremonies, ladies and gentlemen

We have just finished with the first stage in our development plan for this community. I am delighted that government could afford me the opportunity to spearhead this process of providing the most basic services which is education, health, water and housing to this community.

The next step is to bring in agriculture, business and economic development and training. My office is in consultation with the Ministry of Environment and Tourism for the establishment of the conservancy and we will continue and make sure that this community is fully integrated in the socio economic mainstream and that they also enjoy the fruits of independence. With the continued support from the line Ministries and development partners we will do a follow up and come and see the progress of this projects and identified further needs so that Farm Uitkomst become a pilot project for others to emulate. It is a fact that State subvention only will not be enough to support the San Development Programme and therefore the private sector and the donor communities are encouraged to continue with their support.

Education:

Education is now decentralized to the Regional Council – I call upon the Regional Council to take care of this primary school. Remember that good foundation is the most important beginning of a child future/ education. I don't want a situation where incompetent teachers will be dropped here because – it is the San School. These

children are by nature clever. Given a good start in education they will go far in life. They can become future doctors and engineers.

Resettlement:

The San Development Programme currently emphasizes on the resettlement of San communities due to the fact that many of these communities are displaced and do not have a place they call their own. Apart from Farm Uitkomst, other San communities have been resettled at Farm Seringkop and Kopies (Kunene region) which were made available by the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism. Securing of additional resettlement farms for San communities are needed in Oshikoto/ Oshivelo, Kunene, and Omaheke regions.

Let us be inclusive and accommodate previously disadvantaged and, marginalized members of our society, particularly the San community as well as Ovaherero in our development endeavours. I am glad to inform the President that we have members of the Ovaherero Community in our midst who came all the way from the great Kunene region to witness this event.

Lastly, to our development partners I express once again my sincere thanks to you for making these projects a reality and pledge for your continued support.

It is now my honour and privilege to call upon H. E., The President to officially hand over the school, Clinic and the Housing Project to the community of Farm Uitkomst,

Comrade President.

I thank you.

10.2 DPM speech 2

HON. DR. L. AMATHILA AT THE HANDING-OVER OF LIVESTOCK TO THE SKOONHEID SAN COMMUNITY, OMAHEKE REGION, November 25, 2005; HON. DR. L. AMATHILA

Esteemed Hon. Governor McLeod,
Councilors of the Omaheke Regional Council,
Leaders and members of the San Community,
Senior government officials,
Media members,
Ladies and gentlemen

Today is a truly happy occasion, as another milestone is reached in the attempts by the government to empower the San people.

We are all aware of the general and degrading marginalization to which the San people are subjected, and it is therefore our collective responsibility as patriotic citizens of Namibia, to ensure that the San too are brought on par with all other communities.

The handing over of these draught animal power implements and livestock today is a step by the Ministry of Agriculture, to extend a helping hand to the San community at Skoonheid, so that they can take charge of their livelihood. To the San, take note that the animals are for breeding and ploughing purposes, not for consumption.

Therefore, you must use the animals and implements for the purpose they were intended for. I will not come again to make donations to you, you must now work hard with what you have been given today and show us all the good results of your work. I also do not want to hear stories of animals that were lost or animals that were eaten. If you do not use this donation for its intended purpose, you will stay poor and be abused by other wealthier people. Therefore, your own destiny is now in your hands, work to improve your livelihood.

You must also know that constant feeding of San communities from the state coffers is not a sustainable nor a desirable policy option. Feeding of communities is meant strictly for disaster periods, and therefore, through empowerment initiatives as this one here today, the government wants to reduce "hand-outs," especially the San.

Hon. Governor,

I wish to take this opportunity to once again caution those Namibians who are actively enslaving the San and abusing their rights under Constitution and the labour law of this country, to immediately cease such practices. The abuse of San labourers is appalling to say the least, and the silence for such abuse cannot continue any longer. The long arm of the law shall follow those that disregard the human dignity and rights of the San people!

Those Namibians that have San under their employment, take note that these people have children that must attend school, stop using San children as workers. It is not allowed to have child labourers in this country!

In concluding, I thank and applaud the Ministry of Agriculture for this firm gesture of support to the San people. I would urge you, Mr. Kahuure, to keep a constant check on the progress made by the community here and to continue helping them where needed.

I thank you all, and wish the community the best in its endeavour for empowerment and development.

10.3 OPM Annual Report 2006-2007

(pp. viii, 5-7)

Our motto of effective, efficient and accountable service delivery once again spurred on the activities undertaken by the Office of the Prime Minister during the past financial year. In this spirit, too, it is my singular honour to present our Annual Report on these activities.

Among our achievements during 2006/7 was a policy adjustment to focus development for the majority of our citizens on both economic and social transformation, as opposed to the narrower previous view of economic empowerment only. This change of focus will ensure a more holistic approach to development in the country.

Also as regards empowerment, among the special projects assigned to the Office has been to manage the incorporation of members of the marginalised San communities into the mainstream. The year under review saw progress on this front as well, in terms of improving educational facilities to vulnerable communities, providing individuals with training and employment opportunities, and donating seeds and draught animals to communities in two targeted Regions to encourage crop farming.

Community interaction

Both the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister continued to interact with citizens by undertaking trips to a number of the country's 13 Regions to listen to their concerns and to share information on important issues.

During the period under review, the Prime Minister officiated at 36 events and held 78 meetings on topics ranging from security matters to investments, labour, developmental issues, media, and the like. A total of 16 local trips were undertaken by the Deputy Prime Minister during the review period. She held extensive meetings with business leaders, community members, parastatals, young people, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and labour unions. A total of 97 in-office interactions were also recorded during 2006/7.

Furthermore, the President nominated the Deputy Prime Minister to spearhead community consultations on the German Special Initiative. To this end, the Deputy Prime Minister held consultations with the San, Damara>Nama and Ovaherero/Ovambanderu communities. These consultations were successfully concluded and a report on the proceedings was presented to the President.

Special assignments

Cabinet approved the San Development Programme, Ovavue and Ovatjimba emergency assistance programmes, for execution by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

As directed by these decisions, the Programme is chaired and run by the Deputy Prime Minister and she is assisted by a Technical Committee consisting of identified Ministries, which meets regularly to ensure the Programme is being implemented successfully.

The initial stages of the process included visits by the Deputy Prime Minister to various San communities across

Namibia. These meetings were aimed at consultations with the San on their needs and on what they considered as pressing challenges facing them.

These consultations confirmed that the San live under dire conditions, and that they lack the basic social and economic infrastructure to meaningfully participate in national development programmes and processes. To counter this poignant situation, the following activities were undertaken during the year under review:

Apiculture training programme

Under this beekeeping and honey production project, 12 members of San communities from six different Regions received training in apiculture. The instructors were sourced from Kenya, and financial support was provided by the Icelandic Embassy. The successful training will soon see some of the deserving candidates visiting the Kenyan apiculture industry.

Scholarships

Four San learners from the Caprivi, Omaheke and Otjozondjupa Regions were allocated support from NamPower and the Michelle McLean Children's Trust. Under the San Development Programme, the Office also sponsored 41 San students and learners at the University of Namibia, the Polytechnic of Namibia, the International University of Management, the Vocational Training Centre, the Caprivi College of Education, the Rundu College of Education, the Namibia College of Learning, and at various secondary and primary schools.

Provision of draught animals and seeds

A number of draught animals were handed over to the San people in the Caprivi and in Omaheke Regions. These included more than 70 donkeys in Caprivi and more than 10 heifers in the Omaheke Regions respectively. Seeds for crop plantation and cultivation were also handed over to the San people in Caprivi.

National Youth Service Scheme

Thirteen names of young members of San communities were sent to the Ministry of Youth, National Service, Sport and Culture because the Ministry is eager to recruit young people from these communities in particular into the National Youth Service Scheme. The provision of nominees will need to become an annual process, so that a significant San intake can be achieved over time. The Ministry still has to report on progress made in regard to the Scheme.

Employment

In line with its employment equity strategy, the Office employed four members of San communities in various entry-level posts. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is currently facilitating the submission of names for 2007 through the offices of Regional Governors, and has written to all Regional Councils to consider possible employment for members of San communities. In addition, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister facilitated the employment of four members of San communities at the Auto Tech in Tsumeb once they have successfully completed their training at the Windhoek Vocational Training Centre, while nine others will be employed by Namibia Wildlife Resorts during the coming financial year.

Coffin Production

During various consultations it was learned that San people, unlike other Namibians, were buried in plastic bags. The Deputy Prime Minister then approached businesses involved in the manufacturing of coffins and organised a project to train San youth in coffin manufacturing. Two groups consisting of five participants from Otjozondjupa and Omaheke were then trained in coffin manufacturing. The costs associated herewith were met from the San Development fund. This project will be extended to other regions in due course.

Donations

The Standard Bank of Namibia Ltd granted financial support to the Okaepe School Project to the tune of N\$70,000 to cover the cost of donkey carts, hostel fees and mattresses, while the Donkerbos School received a grant of N\$96,000 from this benefactor. Among the many other benefactors were foreign governmentdevelopment aid agencies from the People's Republic of China and Iceland, the Red Cross, and corporate sponsors like Namdeb, Nedbank, Old Mutual, Rosh Pinah Zinc Mine, Corporate Training Solutions, Omankete Investments (Pty) Ltd and Ark Fishing.

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister facilitated the donation of mattresses, blankets and clothes to many San communities, such as those residing in Oshikoto, Otjozondjupa, Okavango and Omaheke. Other donations were as follows:

§ Window glass (N\$14,267.58), 1 x computer, 1 x printer: Motsomi Primary School, Omaheke

§ 1 x computer, 1 x printer, 1 x table (N\$400), cabinet (N\$400), Chair (N\$585), opening of account

(N\$300): OSWYDO, Omaheke

§ 1 x computer, 1 x printer (N\$3,000): Donkerbos Primary School, Omaheke

§ 1 x photocopier (N\$15,000), paper and transport (N\$2,127.50), White Stone Project

(N\$3,046.70): Tsumkwe West, Otjozondjupa

§ Training (N\$33,180): Bravo, Okavango

§ Feasibility study (N\$14,744.23): Excelsior Hostel, Oshikoto

§ 5 x pit latrines (N\$12,500): In Ohangwena – Tobias Hainyeko Primary School, Ekoka Kindergarten, Eendobe Kindergarten, Onamatadiva Kindergarten; in Otjozondjupa – Okaepe Primary School

§ Youth training (N\$30,505.40): Omaheke

§ A major donation of N\$ 500,000.00 was made by a Swedish philanthropist and deposited in the San Development Fund.

Bwabwata Game Reserve

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism has been engaged in discussions with the San community living in this area. The discussions were facilitated by the Deputy Prime Minister. The San at this game reserve cannot benefit from its resources due to restrictive national parks legislation. It has now been agreed that a Memorandum of Understanding be signed between the Ministry and the Karamashyan Association, which was formed by the San community and officially launched. To this end, a high-level Ministerial delegation is to hold a consultative forum on site with the San community in April 2007 to expedite and finalise the process of benefiting from Government resources. The community have already begun to benefit from hunting rights in the game reserve. It is worth noting that the Association will be transformed into the Game Products Trust Fund, and that the first contribution to this Fund is ready to be made. This represents a major milestone for the San community, and they are now free to engage in the community conservancy programme.

San Development Programme

The OPM provided N\$400,000 during 2006/07 as a subvention to the San Development Programme. Additional resources are intended to be obtained from various stakeholders and donor agencies through close cooperation with the National Planning Commission.

10.4 OPM Annual Report 2007-2008

(pp. 4, 5)

The San Development Programme

The San Development Programme, which was approved by Cabinet on 29 November 2005 and spearheaded by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister, is progressing very well. Its objective is to ensure that the San are fully integrated in the mainstream of Namibian society and the economy, thereby ensuring that all Namibians achieve the goals of Vision 2030. Various programmes have been implemented so far, including the provision during the past financial year of N\$400,000 as a direct contribution to the Programme. The State provided an additional N\$500,000 during September 2007.

Education scholarships

The Office launched the “Back to School and Stay at School for San Children” campaign as part of the San Development Programme. With the help of private donors, the Office is sponsoring a number of students at secondary and tertiary levels.

In addition, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is liaising with the Ministry of Education to facilitate the upgrading of schools and hostels amongst San communities, and the employment of San teachers. Requests for assistance with school needs are provided for on a regular basis. A new hostel was built for the Huigub Primary School in the Otjozondjupa Region, with funds provided by the International Lions Club.

The Office also initiated the setting up of two new project schools for the San, i.e. the Berg Aukas Project School, and the Auns Project School, both in the Otjozondjupa Region.

Literacy Pilot Project

The Office launched the Literacy Pilot Project on 21 September 2007 for San pensioners in Tsumkwe, with the target age being 55 and above. Twenty participants took part in the project, over 33 days of training. The project,

which aims to complement the Government's National Literacy Programme, specifically in respect of pensioners, was sponsored directly under the San Development Programme Fund, while the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) donated an additional N\$40,000. Agrifutura was appointed as the project's implementation agency.

Early Childhood Development Centres

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister has been working with the Ministry of Education, UNESCO and the Icelandic International Development Agency (ICEIDA) to realise this project, which involves the establishment of early childhood development centres for San children. A pilot project is envisaged to roll out in the Oshikoto Region during 2008.

Resettlement Programme

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister is collaborating with the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism in the resettlement of San communities. In February 2008, the Office succeeded in resettling 306 members of the San community on the Farm "Uitkoms 514" in the Omatoko Constituency in the Otjozondjupa Region. A Government technical committee was set up to oversee the resettlement process.

It is foreseen that various development projects will be implemented on the Farm, and plans are under way to initiate crop production, a conservancy, animal husbandry, a grass-cutting project, and the building of a clinic. Other projects and training that will target women and the youth are also planned for 2008. A housing project with the National Housing Enterprise is under discussion, and positive feedback has been received on this to date.

Aquaculture Project

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister identified aquaculture for the San as another way of alleviating their poverty and providing them with employment opportunities. Therefore, an Aquaculture Farming Pilot Project was launched on 19 September 2007 at Okatjoruu by the Hon. Deputy Prime Minister and the Hon. Deputy Minister of Fisheries and Marine Resources. In addition to stocking fingerlings, training was provided to 15 members of the San community.

Projects for women

Needlework projects for San women were started in the Omaheke and Oshikoto (Tsintsabis) Regions, with assistance from the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare. A bread-making project is envisaged for the Tsumkwe area (Appel Post), where women have already received training with support from Women's for Action and Development. In addition, the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister with the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare are preparing for the launch of the Namibia San Women's Association.

Feeding Programme

Due to the extreme poverty among San communities, the Office has been coordinating a regular feeding programme to alleviate their plight.

10.5 OPM Annual Report 2008-2009

(pp. 4, 5)

The San Development Programme

The San Development Programme was approved by Cabinet on 29 November 2005, and spearheaded by the Deputy Prime Minister with the aim of ensuring that the San are fully integrated into the mainstream of the Namibian economy. The year under review witnessed continued progress in the implementation of a series of activities in this regard.

In 2008, Namibia signed the UN Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Namibia is also a signatory to the UN Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Racial Discrimination and the Convention on the Elimination of All forms of Discrimination Against Women.

Following intensive efforts to bring previously marginalised communities on par with the rest of their

compatriots through various tailor-made projects, these projects reached the monitoring and evaluation stage. In this regard, during the reporting period, Dr Libertina Amathila undertook trips to the Caprivi, Kavango, Kunene and Otjozondjupa Regions to check on the progress of special projects in relation to the Project Management Plan.

Achievements and challenges were noted at the end of the evaluation and monitoring trip. In light of the feedback gathered, corrective and preventative actions were undertaken to bring the various projects into alignment with the Project Management Plan.

Over the reporting period the special allocation for the project was utilised to support 80 San students at schools and tertiary educational institutions. 16 San persons were trained in coffin-making. Payments were made to 45 persons to assist schools, clinics and farms by way teaching the San language, provide health education and advice and farming methods. 806 San persons were resettled on two farms. 12 San trainees received training on the beekeeping project. 64 San persons received literacy training