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Abstract

The Hailom are the largest and most widely dispersed San population in Namibia. Like many other San peoples in southern Africa, the Hailom were dispossessed, marginalized, and discriminated against by other groups and by the colonial state. In 1949, the South West African administration appointed a Commission for the Preservation of the Bushmen, chaired by a former Stellenbosch University professor, P.J. Schoeman, one of the architects of apartheid in South Africa. When the final report of the Commission was published in 1953, the Hailom were ignored, in part because Schoeman did not see them as “real” or “authentic” Bushmen. The Hailom were removed from their ancestral homeland in what was designated as Etosha National Park in 1953-1954. This paper examines the efforts of the Hailom to seek land and resource rights and political recognition from the 1980s to the present. The Namibian government appointed a Hailom Traditional Authority, David //Khamuxab, in 2004, established a San Development Office in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister in 2005, and in 2007 began purchasing commercial farms for purposes of resettlement of Hailom. Statements by Namibian government officials underscore the importance of humanity and compassion in the ways in which the Hailom San issue has been addressed. It remains to be seen, however, whether the Hailom of Etosha will be treated the same way as other Hailom and other historically disadvantaged or marginalized communities in Namibia.

***
The marginalization, dispossession, and mistreatment of the San (Bushmen) of what is now Namibia in Southern Africa were based on assumptions that the San were different from other people, and, because of their lifestyles and customs, they did not meet all the criteria of ‘humanity’. With respect to San, the politics of labeling looms large. Other groups sometimes characterized them as ‘vagrants’, ‘hybrids’, ‘bandits’, ‘brigands’, and ‘inauthentic’ (Gordon and Douglas 2000, 4-10; Taylor 2012, 67), which served as justifications for exploitation and, in some cases, outright genocide (Gordon 2009). On the other hand, there were institutions such as the South African military that extolled what they saw as ‘superhuman’ qualities of San, that were grounded, as Gordon and Douglas (2000, 2) put it, ‘not in humanity but in animality.’ San were viewed as being part of nature rather than society and therefore were deemed as being outside of the universe of obligation. In the past, compassion and care did not extend to the San in South West Africa, who were viewed as a threat to the state or to civilized society. The San, for their part, identified themselves not only as ‘true people’ but also as fully deserving of fair treatment and respect for their dignity and human rights.

James Suzman, who helped coordinate a Southern Africa-wide study of San peoples in 2000-2001, made the following observation:

[‘For San in Namibia, land dispossession has been more extreme in both extent and form than for San elsewhere in southern Africa. The apportioning of the country under apartheid into freehold commercial farms, ‘tribal’ communal lands and wildlife conservation areas meant that by 1976 fewer than 3% of the Namibian San population retained even limited *de jure* rights to the lands they had traditionally occupied. Close to half lived on freehold land owned by white farmers, for whom they worked and on whose employment they depended to retain basic residential rights’] (Suzman 2001a, 11).

Table 1. San Populations of Namibia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Name(s)</th>
<th>Locations</th>
<th>Population Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hailom †Akhoe</td>
<td>Oshikoto, Oshangwena, Omusati, Oshana, Cunene, and Otjozondjupa Regions, Etosha National Park, Outjo</td>
<td>11,000-15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khwe</td>
<td>Zambezi Region, some in Tsumkwe District West (N≠a</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clan</td>
<td>Region</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡Xun</td>
<td>Oshikoto, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana, West and East Kavango, Zambezi, and Otjozondjupa Regions</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ju’hoansi</td>
<td>Otjozondjupa, Omaheke Regions, Tsumkwe East, Tsumkwe West (N≠a Jaqna), Grootfontein, Gobabis</td>
<td>7,500 total including 2,400 in Nyae Nyae, 400 in N/a Jaqna, 600 in the Grootfontein farms, and 4,100 in Omaheke Region and Gobabis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>//Anikwe</td>
<td>Zambezi Region</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naro</td>
<td>Omaheke Region, Otjine and Gobabis Districts</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡X'ao-</td>
<td></td>
<td>'aen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‡Xõó</td>
<td>Omaheke Region, Otjine and Gobabis Districts, Mariental Region, Hardap District</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Auni</td>
<td>Mariental Region, Hardap District</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>u (//Nu-//en)</td>
<td>Mariental Region, Hardap District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>38,000 plus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled from reports and documents on file in the WIMSA library, the Namibia National Archives, field researchers, and published literature (e.g., Gordon and Douglas 2000:7; Suzman 2001b:3, Table 1.1; Biese and Hitchcock 2011:6, Table 2; Dieckmannn et al 2014:23, Table 3.2)
The Hailom (Heilom) are the largest San population in Namibia, numbering some 11-15,000 people (see Table 1). Yet for generations they were disregarded both by other groups in the country, by settlers, by the colonial governments of Germany (1884-1915) and South Africa (1915-1989), and, in some ways, by the Namibian state. The Hailom are some of the most widely distributed San people in the country (Fourie 1928, 83; Schapera 1930, 34-35; Barnard 1992, 213-218; Widlok 1999, 15-41; Gordon and Douglas 2000, 7; Harring and
Odendaal 2006, 15-21; Bieseke and Hitchcock 2011, 6, Table 2; Dieckmann 2014; Dieckmann et al 2014, 23). The Hailom are divided into a number of different named groups (see Figure 1 and Table 1, Gordon 1997, 177, n. 2; Dieckmann 2007, 112, Table 4.1; Rapold and Widlok 2008, 133-135). Some northern Hailom use the term †Akhoe to refer to themselves (Widlok 1999, 15-18) while others describe themselves as ‘just Hailom’. Hailom communities are found primarily in the north-central and central regions of Namibia, with the !Xun to the north and the Ju/'hoansi to the east (see Figure 1). Sizable numbers of

Hailom and †Akhoe reside on commercial farms in central Namibia, while others reside in small communities and settlements in communal areas in the northern part of the country in five regions (Widlok 1999; Takada 2008; Hüncke and Koot 2012; Koot 2013; Dieckmann et al 2014) (see Figure 2). Today, most Hailom pursue mixed economic patterns, combining farm labour in some cases with a small amount of foraging, agriculture, pastoralism, small-scale businesses including craft production, and wage labour in towns. A number of Hailom also work in the mines of Namibia, Botswana, South Africa, and Zambia and in tourism-related industries throughout the country.
The history of the Hailom has been a complex one. Many Hailom were dispossessed by other groups, settlers, and the colonial German and South West African governments. As Longden (2004, 16) puts it, ‘During the last 150 years, the history of the Hailom has been dictated by the greed, politics and rivalry of white colonialist settlers and other ethnic groups’. Most of the Hailom who lost their lands ended up working on commercial farms as herders and domestic servants while a few men were retained as trackers, scouts, and laborers by the Department of Nature Conservation in the game reserves. In the 19th century Hailom engaged extensively in trading high value goods including copper ore, some of which they mined themselves. Missionaries, soldiers, botanists, and others observed Hailom caravans carrying copper ore on trading expeditions (Hahn 1867, 286; Schinz, 1891, 339-340; Gordon and Douglas 2000, 23-40; Guenther 2005, 13). The German administration of South West Africa and the media expressed concern about periodic attacks on laborers going to the mines by Hailom and other San groups (Gordon and Douglas 2000, 57-63). There were also fears on the part of Afrikaner settlers about cattle raids by well-armed Hailom and other San, including attacks on the short-lived Boer settlement of Upingtonia near Grootfontein in 1885 which resulted in hundreds of cattle being taken and two settlers being killed (Aitken 2007, Dieckmann 2007, 49; Guenther 2014, 33).

Gordon (2009, 42-45) points out that four different strategies were recommended for handling what came to be known as the “Bushman Problem”: (1) outright extermination, (2) “cleansing” of areas, removing Bushmen from productive areas, and forcing them to go to mines on the coast of Namibia (e.g. Luderitz) or driving them into the vast sandy waterless areas in the northeastern part of the country, (3) “civilizing” the Bushmen through habituating them to work, and (4) creation of special “reserves” for Bushmen. Another strategy for dealing with Bushmen that practiced in the 1940s was to provide them with food, tobacco, and jobs (Taylor 2012, 66-68), something that the South West African Administration saw as ‘civilizing’ policies (Taylor 2012, 71).

Over time, the Namibian economy underwent significant transformations, especially in the livestock and mining industries (Schmokel 2007; Wallace 2011; Kidd 2014). By the early part of the 20th century, there were dozens of freehold farms in the hands of settlers and others in the Grootfontein and Outjo districts (Suzman 2001b, 12-13; Dieckmann 2013, 258-
Because of changes in the livestock economy and commercial farming, the labor force on commercial farms shifted (Suzman 2001b; Dieckmann 2013). There was a reduction in the numbers of ‘generational’ farm workers (those who lived and worked full-time on farms and were totally or mostly dependent on the farm owner) and a shift to the use of more migrant and shorter-term seasonal laborers (Suzman 2001b, 13-15). Whereas in the past, some commercial farms may have had as many as 50-70 Hailom living on them, these numbers declined over time. As Taylor (2012, 67) says about the Khwe, the incorporation of the Hailom into the regional labour economy signified their ‘hybrid’ nature. With the introduction of a minimum wage in the agricultural sector Namibia in 2003 many commercial farmers opted to reduce the numbers of workers on their farms. Some of the Hailom who had to leave the farms moved to the informal settlements surrounding towns such as Outjo, Otjiwarongo, Tsumeb, and Otavi or to small communities in the communal lands.

The Dispossession of the Hailom from Etosha

In 1949, the South West African administration appointed a two-person Commission for the Preservation of the Bushmen. It was chaired by a former Stellenbosch University professor, P.J. Schoeman, who also became the Chief Game Warden in Etosha, South West Africa’s most significant protected area (Dieckmann 2007, 53). Schoeman, through his writings, including *Hunters of the Desert Land (Jagters van die Woestylnland)* (Schoeman 1957), helped popularize stereotypes of San as pristine hunter-gatherers and as people capable of surviving in marginal environments.

Schoeman and the commission produced an interim report in September, 1951 in which two ‘Bushmen’ reserves were recommended: one for Khaung (!Kung) and another for the ‘Heikom’ (Hailom) (Schoeman 1951). When the final report came out in 1953, however, there was only one Bushman reserve recommended, that of ‘Bushmanland’ (Schoeman 1953). Bushmanland was where the Ju/'hoansi lived, now designated as Tsumkwe District East in the Otjozondjupa Region. Figure 2 shows the locations of the various regions of Namibia including Otjozondjupa and the location of Etosha National Park. Etosha National Park, formerly a game reserve, represents an important part of the ancestral homeland of the Hailom people (Dieckmann 2003, 61).
As Dieckmann (2003, 59-60, 2007, 186, 189-191) notes, in the final report of the Bushman Commission, the Hailom, the largest San population in the country, were not given a reserve. There were several reasons behind this decision. These reasons related to the labor needs of commercial farmers, to concerns about the Hailom, and to fears of some people in the Department of Nature Conservation that Hailom might have a significant impact on the wildlife populations in the reserve.

There was also the assumption on the part of Schoeman that the Hailom were not ‘real’ or ‘authentic’ Bushmen because of the fact that many of them wore western clothing, kept livestock, worked on commercial farms, and because of the language that they spoke (Schoeman 1953; LeRoux and White 2004, 112-114).

In the 1950s, the Bushmen and other peoples in Namibia were under the administrative oversight of the Department of Bantu Administration and Development (Marshall 1976, 13; Thomas 2006, 279). In this system, Bushmen had no right to self-representation; they had no leaders recognized by the South West African Administration; and they had no say about what could be done with regard to the land (Biesele and Hitchcock 2011, 9). If decisions were
made about land allocation, labor requirements, or the establishment of protected areas and passage of wildlife legislation, Bushmen had no say whatsoever.

In 1954, all but twelve Hailom families who worked for Nature Conservation were told that they would have to leave the Etosha game reserve. The rest of the Etosha Hailom either had to resettle in Ovamboland or on white commercial farms south of the reserve (Widlok 1999, 25-27; Gordon and Douglas 2000, 165; Dieckmann 2003, 59-60, 2007, 186ff.). The Native Commissioner of Ovamboland told the Hailom that they ‘had to leave the reserve for the sake of the game’, and would be allowed to return only if they were in possession of a permit (Dieckmann 2007, 192). The similarity to the discourse used by the government of Botswana in the Central Kalahari Game Reserve case in the period between 1986 and 2002 could not be more striking (Sapignoli 2012).

The political and land situations of the Hailom got even more complex after the removals from Etosha. When the Odendaal Commission recommended the creation of ‘Bushmanland’ along with other ethnic ‘homelands’ (e.g. Hereroland, Damaraland), in the early 1960s, the Hailom were omitted. As a consequence, many Hailom were left, for all intents and purposes, largely landless. It is this history of dispossession and marginalization that led to the post-independence Namibian government’s decision to provide the Hailom with land and development assistance in the early part of the new millennium.

At 22,912 km², Etosha is one of the larger parks in the country and is the one that hosts the largest number of international visitors, some 220,000 people per year (Berry 1997; Mendelsohn, Jarvis, Roberts, and Robertson 2009; Turpie, Barnes, Lange, and Martin 2010). The Hailom have lived in Etosha from ‘time immemorial’ as they put it, and they were there at the time of Etosha’s establishment as a game park in 1907. Many Hailom see their removals in the 1950s as a major blow to Hailom well-being and as an example of the unfairness of apartheid (ethnically based separate development or ‘apartness’).

Oral history information and testimony suggests that Hailom who were not workers nor their family members continued to visit the park quietly after the removals from the park in the mid-1950s up to recent times (Kadisen //Khomob, personal communication, 2012). After 1954, individuals and small groups entered the park surreptitiously to see relatives, to collect wild resources, to visit sacred sites, and to go to the graves of relatives and friends. In the
1990s and early part of the new millennium efforts were made to identify and map the traditional areas used by the Haiлом in the park, and Haiлом elders identified the location of some 180 of their original settlements and sites inside Etosha (Vogelsang 2005; Peters, Dieckmann, and Vogelsang 2009). The Haiлом saw re-gaining rights to Etosha as a key objective because of its close connections to their cultural heritage, history, and identity.

There was a transformation over time in the ways in which the Haiлом have related to the land both in the park and outside of it (Longden 2004; Pickering and Longden 2006; Dieckmann 2007, 2009; Peters, Dieckmann, and Vogelsang 2009). As is the case with other San in Namibia such as the Ju/'hoansi and the Khwe, Haiлом sought to obtain land and resource rights in various ways. They asked traditional authorities in the past for land. Some Haiлом applied to the South West African administration and later the Namibian government for land rights. Some of the Haiлом in the Otjiwarango area formed an independent political party, the Original Peoples’ Party of Namibia (OPPN), with the express aim of obtaining social, economic, moral and formal equality of ‘the Bushmen’ (Dieckmann 2007, 309). One of the problems that the OPPN faced is that some of its leaders could not speak English, a constraint the contributed to the failure of the organization (Dieckmann 2007, 309).

The Haiлом also engaged in demonstrations both in Etosha and Windhoek in order to bring attention to their lack of land rights. In January 1997 Haiлом demonstrators blocked the entrances to two gates into Etosha National Park and 73 people were arrested (Suzman 2004, 221-222). This incident brought international attention to the situations that the Haiлом were facing in terms of land access, especially relating to Etosha National Park. The government offered three resettlement farms to the Haiлом but they were refused because of uncertainty over governance and land tenure. In more recent years, the Haiлом applied to Land Boards or the Haiлом Traditional Authority for land but with relatively little success4.

There were efforts by Haiлом in various parts of Namibia to get land allocated to them over which they could have secure title. This land struggle is part of the Haiлом identity revitalization that is on-going. Some of these processes are playing out on a set of farms south of Etosha National Park, which was purchased by the government of Namibia for purposes of resettling Haiлом, some of them from Etosha as well as from elsewhere in the country.
Traditional Authorities in Namibia and the Haiom

Following the passage of the original *Traditional Authorities Act* in Namibia in 1995, several San groups held elections to choose Traditional Authorities (TAs) (Thoma and Piek 1995). The first two San Traditional Authorities who were recognized officially in 1998 were those of the Ju’/hoansi and the !Kung, Txamkxao ≠Oma and John Arnold. These two Traditional Authorities operated in the eastern and western parts of what used to be known as Bushmanland, now Tsumkwe District in the Otjozondjupa Region. Subsequently, three other San Traditional Authorities’ were recognized, one of whom was Hai//om, and two others who were in Omaheke North and South, both Ju/'hoan.

In May 2000, the Centre of Social Sciences at the University of Namibia undertook a fact-finding mission to twelve Haiom settlements to assess whether a Haiom umbrella organization could be formed (Hainyanyula 2000). In 2000-2001 discussions were held at the local, regional, and national levels relating to Haiom traditional leadership and governance (Jones and Diez 2011; Lawry, Begbie-Clench, and Hitchcock 2012, 88). There was a general lack of agreement about best to set up a Haiom organization and how to go about choosing a Haiom traditional authority.

In some ways, it can be said that the office of Traditional Authority was created from the top as means of facilitating Namibian political control post-independence. In Namibia, Traditional Authorities have the right to provide advice on government policy, assist in handling conflicts among their members, oversee the customary courts in the Traditional Authority’s jurisdiction, and give suggestions on the management of land and natural and cultural resources.

In 2004 the government of Namibia appointed a Haiom Traditional Authority, David //Khamuxab. There were differences of opinion among the Haiom about how Mr. //Khamuxab was selected. Some people said that the government of Namibia appointed the TA without reference to local opinions. A number of Haiom raised questions about the electoral process that led to the appointment of the Traditional Authority (Dieckmann 2014, 223-231). There were Haiom in some areas of Namibia who said that they had held elections but that none of the individuals who they voted for was considered by the government for the Haiom Traditional Authority⁵.
The Namibian government uses the Haiom TA to handle the various complex issues that arise among the Haiom. Some Haiom maintain that the Namibian government in a way supports the TA as a way to avoid dealing with what the government feels are numerous Haiom political factions. The Namibian government does this by saying the TA is their legal representative and that therefore he serves as the appropriate channel for dealing with all Haiom-specific issues and concerns.

There were tensions that arose between the Haiom Traditional Authority and some of the non-government organizations working on behalf of San in Namibia, including the Working Group of Indigenous Minorities (WIMSA) and the Legal Assistance Center (LAC). In March 2005, a group of Haiom with the support of the TA carried out a demonstration against WIMSA at the WIMSA offices in Windhoek, demanding the resignation of the manager of WIMSA and the shutting down of the organization. The police were called to prevent the demonstration from escalating into violence.

The Haiom Traditional Authority set up its own trust in 2007, calling the organization the Haiom San Community Development Trust. The Haiom TA insisted that NGOs such as WIMSA put all their project money for the Haiom through that trust’s account. There was substantial reluctance to do so on the part of WIMSA, as there were fears that the control over the finances would be in the hands of the Traditional Authority and those with whom he worked.

The government support for the Haiom TA ensured that the Haiom Traditional Authority and his staff were able to ignore those Haiom that did not support them. This was true, for example, for those Haiom who were inside Etosha National Park, those in Oshivelo, and others such as those living to the east of Etosha (Koot 2013). Some of these Haiom are part of a group called the Concerned Group of Haiom (Jones and Diez 2011). The Concerned Group of Haiom sent letters to the government of Namibia, complaining of the ways in which they were being treated by the Haiom Traditional Authority, and asking for land both inside and outside of Etosha National Park which they had de jure (legal) rights over.

There were several major differences between the Haiom and other San groups in northern and central Namibia. One of them was the degree to which the Haiom worked for other
groups, sometimes in highly exploitative situations on the commercial farms and in the
northern communal areas. A second difference was the fact that fewer Haiлом than other San
groups such as the !Xun and the Khwe joined the South African and South West African
militaries in campaigns against the South West Africa government during the decades-long
liberation struggle beginning in the 1960s. A third difference was the power and influence of
the Haiлом Traditional Authority relative to other San TAs and those of some other groups in
Namibia (Lawry and Hitchcock 2011; Koot 2013).

Humanity and Compassion and the Haiлом Issue

Statements by Namibian government officials underscore the importance of humanity and
compassion in the ways in which the Haiлом San issue has been addressed. A meeting of the
Inter-ministerial Technical Committee on the Haiлом held on August 7th, 2007 identified the
need to ascertain how many households might be involved in a Haiлом Resettlement Farms
effort. The participants in the meeting vowed to ‘Engage in a consultative process with
intended beneficiaries, stressing the importance of the ownership of the process by the
people’. Two new conservancies for San were designated in 2007 as part of an agreement
between the Haiлом people and the Namibian government (Jones and Diez 2011; Lawry and
Hitchcock 2011).

In late 2007 the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR) made arrangements for
purchases of commercial farms for the Haiлом, with funds provided by the government of
Namibia to the San Development Office (SDO) in the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister
(ODPM). In September, 2008, the first of the resettlement farms to be purchased, Seringkop,
was handed over to the Haiлом officially.

Additional resettlement farms were purchased in the period between 2008 and 2011. On the
14th of November, 2011 a handing over of Toevlug took place. A consultancy was carried out
in November, 2011 and a draft report on the Haiлом Resettlement Farms and Livelihoods
Support Plan was circulated and a presentation made to some of the members of the National
Technical Committee on Haiлом Issues (Lawry and Hitchcock 2011). This effort, which was
sponsored by Millennium Challenge Account-Namibia and the Ministry of Environment and
Tourism, had its challenges, in part because of complexities in relationships among the various stakeholders (Lawry, Begbie-Clench, and Hitchcock 2012; Dieckmann 2014).

In the process of upgrading the housing and enhancing the facilities in Etosha National Park for park employees, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism had to confront the issue of what to do about the Haiom living in the park. In 2010 there were some 400-450 Haiom in Etosha National Park; they resided in several locations including Okaukuejo, Namutoni, Halali, Ombika, and Von Lindequist Gate. Some of the Haiom in the park were employees of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and Namibia Wildlife Resorts (NWR). Many of the park employees had extended family members living with them. The numbers of Haiom in Etosha National Park fluctuated over time, depending in part upon environmental, social, and economic conditions, and on the numbers of children coming to the school near Okaukuejo. Table 2 shows the numbers of Haiom who were residing in the park in June 2010.

Table 2. Numbers of Haiom residing in Etosha National Park in June, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Senior Staff Housing</th>
<th>Junior Staff Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Okaukuejo</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombika Gate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halali</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namutoni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Lindequist Gate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data adapted from Aurecon (2010:11, Table 4)

The numbers of family members living with relatives in Etosha vary on a day-to-day, monthly, seasonal, and annual basis, depending on a number of different factors such as the timing of salary payments, the school calendar, pension payments, short-term job
opportunities, and environmental conditions. For example, flooding in northern Namibia in 2008 resulted in an influx of people to the Etosha National Park. In September, 2011, huge fires in the Etosha area that resulted in the deaths of large numbers of wild animals including elephants, rhinoceros, and giraffe, affected Hailom population movements. The fires also affected the reputation of the Hailom, since some government officials blamed Hailom on the commercial farms for engaging in charcoal production, which were said to be the source of the fires. In fact, the majority of the charcoal production in the area was in the hands of white Namibians.

The government of the Republic of Namibia said specifically that the Hailom residing in Etosha would not be required to move out of the park involuntarily. The Namibian government also said that it will consult with the Hailom regarding the options available to them. The Minister of Environment and Tourism made this promise explicitly in a phone discussion with a group of Okaukuejo Hailom led by Kadison Khomaub in Etosha in November, 2011. The Minister said that (1) any moves of Hailom out of the park will be totally voluntary, (2) the people working currently for the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Namibia Wildlife Resorts would be allowed to remain in the park should they so choose. This policy is in line with international law on indigenous peoples’ rights such as the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and with the policies of international organizations such as the World Bank, the International Finance Corporation, the European Union, and the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD).

However, in March 2012, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism announced that those Hailom who are not employed in the park or who are directly related to a current employee would have to move out of Etosha National Park. The Ministry said that they would support those that move out of the park by providing housing materials including corrugated iron sheets (known as ‘zincs’ in Namibia), wood for frames, doors, and windows for construction of homes on the resettlement farms. As of July, 2013, fewer than twenty Hailom households had made the move from Etosha to the resettlement farms.

The Hailom of Etosha stress the importance of having a choice about where they live as an issue of basic human rights and of recognition of their humanity. From the government
perspective, the allocation of commercial farms to the Hailom for resettlement purposes is an example of a humanitarian gesture, one involving equitable treatment of Namibian citizens.

The Namibia government provides assistance to the Hailom resettlement farm residents in the form of visits by agricultural extension officers, veterinary officers, health personnel, social workers, and representatives of the Hailom Traditional Authority. The Hailom on the farms are also being assisted through a Regional Hailom Technical Committee, chaired by the Regional Administrator for Kunene Region. They receive some of the livelihood supports, pension funds, and goods that are provided to other Namibians including food for children in school (see Levine, van der Berg, and Yu 2009; Lawry and Hitchcock 2011).

Some of the Hailom, along with the Legal Assistance Centre of Namibia, have examined government land tenure, resettlement, and traditional authority policies in detail (Republic of Namibia 2000, 2001, 2002, 2012) in an effort to understand issues such as whether or not they can obtain secure title over land on the resettlement farms. They have also assessed some of the resettlement programs mounted by the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement and other organizations in Namibia (see Republic of Namibia 2010). After their investigations of government legislation and resettlement experience, concerns were raised about the degree to which local people in communal (298,200 km$^2$ or 36.07% of the country), commercial areas (356,700 km$^2$ or 43.11% of the country), can have security of tenure over lands that they occupy, especially given that all land in Namibia is considered state land.

Based on assessments of the situations of the Hailom on the resettlement farms, in November 2011 and August-September 2012 (see Lawry and Hitchcock 2011; Lawry, Begbie-Clench, and Hitchcock 2012), concerns of the residents of the farms included (1) land tenure, (2) political representation, and (3) self-government. There were also worries expressed about the availability of functioning boreholes to provide water for domestic use (for drinking, sanitation, bathing and clothes washing), for watering livestock, and for use in watering crops in gardens. Data on the numbers of people on the farms and the status of farm purchase as of September, 2012 are provided in Table 3 (See Table 3 and Figure 4). People moving to the resettlement farms would like to have greater numbers of employment and income generating opportunities on the farms so that they do not have to resort to having family members live in towns in order to work and send remittances to people on the farms.
Table 3. Hailom Resettlement Farm Size, Population and Farm Purchase Status, September 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Farm and Farm Number</th>
<th>Size (Hectares)</th>
<th>Population on the Farms (HHs or persons)</th>
<th>Persons Registered</th>
<th>Status of Farm</th>
<th>Number of Households with Livestock on the Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mooiplaas (Farm no. 462)</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>In process of being abandoned</td>
<td>162 persons.</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>2 of 8 (25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellalaika (Farm no. 458)</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>10 households. 287 plots allocated. MET houses under construction.</td>
<td>Outjo and surroundings: 184 persons. Etosha 103 persons. Total 287 persons</td>
<td>Approx. 2/3 of farm purchased</td>
<td>3 of 10 (30%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elandsfontein (Farm no. 463)</td>
<td>Ca. 6,000</td>
<td>12 people</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No plans to purchase but recommended</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werda (Farm no. 469)</td>
<td>6,414</td>
<td>24 people in 2 large households 19 total households plus people coming from Mooiplaas, Outjo</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>2 of 19 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seringkop (Farm no. 454)</td>
<td>6,531</td>
<td>80 households with plans for more from Etosha, Khorixas</td>
<td>241 persons</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>10 of 80 (12.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuchas (Farm no. 468)</td>
<td>6,361</td>
<td>9 persons, 1 resident employee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toevlug (Farm no. 461)</td>
<td>6,217</td>
<td>12 households with more coming from Mooiplaas, Etosha</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Purchased</td>
<td>2 of 12 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koppies (Farm no. 1,436)</td>
<td>1,436</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Approx. 1/3 of farm purchased</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Services</td>
<td>Offer Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsabis (Farm no. 470)</td>
<td>Ca. 6,700</td>
<td>28 persons</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Offer still pending in 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>Ca. 30,359 hectares of resettlement farms</td>
<td>Ca. 121 households, total of some 621 persons</td>
<td>690 persons</td>
<td>7 purchased and 1 offer pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data obtained from the San Development Office, Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, the Haiom Traditional Authority, the Haiom Regional Technical Committee, and fieldwork on the farms.

**Figure 4. Farm Status of Purchase (as from September 2012)**

A crucial area of concern for resettlement farm residents was having educational opportunities for their children. Education is vital in building the next generation of decision makers and leaders, and in giving support to those who would like to have opportunities beyond those on the resettlement farms. In the case of the Hailom resettlement farms, there is
only one school at present on the farms, one at Seringkop, the David //Khamuxab Primary School. Teachers were provided through the Ministry of Basic Education and Culture, and students received some assistance in the form of food and clothing from government. In 2012, there were at least seven Traditional Birth Attendants and two home based care givers at Seringkop who also handled minor emergency issues. Some of the children worked in a community garden, the produce of which was used in the school kitchen.

One of the on-going issues at the school in Seringkop was the quality of the hostel, which for some time has consisted of a large tent. There were outbreaks of disease among students; as a result, the cooking of good quality and safe food for the children was a major issue. The German development agency GIZ agreed with the government to support the upgrading of the hostel as part of its support to the Hailom under the Namibian-German Special Initiative Program (NGSIP). Parents of children on the other resettlement farms were concerned about having their children go all the way to Seringkop for school, and some of them have recommended that there be schools at each farm, something that the government and the Hailom TA thus far have been unwilling to support.

The regional educational office in Korixas and the Ministry of Gender and Child Welfare (MGECW) recommended that greater attention be paid to orphans and vulnerable children, of which there were 111 at Seringkop in 2010 (31 females and 80 males). Social workers are concerned about the issue of vulnerable children; in some cases on the farms there are child-headed households, as the parents have either died or gone to towns such as Outjo or Otjiwarango or to other farms or to Etosha National Park to work. In 2012, several of the resettlement farms (Seringkop, Bellalaika, Mooiplas, and Toevlug) were being visited by health workers from the Outjo Clinic on a monthly basis, depending on road conditions. According to the nurses interviewed in September 2012, problems on the settlement farms ranged from water and sanitation difficulties, inadequate housing, respiratory diseases, diarrheal diseases, and under-nutrition among children and some adults on the farms.

Much of the work of the Namibian Government’s San Development Office and the Regional Technical Committee on the Hailom San in Cunene District dealt with issues ranging from livestock production to the provision and maintenance of water points, fencing, and latrines on the resettlement farms. Work was still required on issues involving household energy, like lighting and cooking, two of the fundamental requirements of the resettled families. The
provision of solar lighting is a major facilitator of activities such as reading, craft manufacture and maintenance of domestic items, and children doing homework after sunset. It would be beneficial for resettled families to be provided with a basic solar lighting kit to enable them to carry out activities at night. Resolving the water, heating, energy, and light issues of the resettlement farm households would go a long way toward enhancing the quality of life on the Hailom resettlement farms.

Conclusions

It was clear that the Namibian government backed the Traditional Authority and its role in the resettlement and development process relating to the resettlement farms south of Etosha National Park. Whether or not this is positive for the Hailom who are not on the resettlement farms or who would like to see a more democratic system is another question. Tensions remain between the office of the Hailom Traditional Authority and members of the Etosha Hailom community, a number of whom have opted not to move to the resettlement farms. Some of these tensions revolved around the membership of an association formed in 2012 with rights to a tourism concession related to the Etosha National Park known as the !Gobaub Concession Association (GCA), which the Ministry of Environment and Tourism and the Millennium Challenge Account-Namibia were seeking to support as a means of promoting income generation and employment for the Hailom.

On September 7th 2012, at the first official meeting of the !Gobaub Concession Association, it turned out that only one member of the Hailom Traditional Authority was elected to the management committee of the new association. The Etosha Hailom believed that they should have representation in the !Gobaub Concession Association, something that neither the Namibian government nor the Hailom Traditional Authority supported. As a result, tensions between the three parties continued to be felt in late 2014.

The question some Hailom have asked is: are there alternatives to the oversight and management of the current Hailom TA? It is unlikely that the TA would give up control. All of the suggestions that Hailom communities and the non-government organizations have come up with to date include the Hailom either centrally or on the margins, as seen, for example, in the case of the resettlement farms. Some Hailom see the Traditional Authority’s push for a set of resettlement farms as a land grab for personal gain and personal recognition
and power, while others see it as an effort to alleviate poverty and ensure secure tenure for the Haiлом people.

The government of the Republic of Namibia said explicitly that the Haiлом in Etosha will not be required to move involuntarily, but later reversed this decision (in March, 2012), suggesting that the Haiлом who were not directly employed by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism or Namibia Wildlife Resorts would have to leave the park and move to the resettlement farms or to other places in Namibia. This position is not in line with international best practice regarding people living in conservation areas (Oliver-Smith 2009). In Decision VII/28, the 7th Conference on Parties (COP) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), of which Namibia is a signatory, stated,

[['‘The establishment, management, and monitoring of protected areas should take place with the full and effective participation and the full respect for the rights of indigenous and local communities consistent with domestic law and applicable international obligations’]] (Convention on Biological Diversity, COP Decision VII/28, 9-20 February 2004).

In the case of the Haiлом there have been shifting boundaries over time about who could be identified as Haiлом and what rights they had. The removals of Haiлом from Etosha were justified on the basis of their ‘inauthenticity’ and their potential threat to the wildlife, in spite of the fact that the Haiлом had lived in Etosha for generations. Namibia was one of a dozen African states that called into question the concept of ‘indigenous people’ and ‘indigeneity,’ and pressed for changes in the draft Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples in 2006 (Crawhall 2011). After some changes were made in the draft declaration, Namibia was one of the 6 southern African countries that voted in favor of the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous peoples in November, 2007. Namibia went on to host a Sub-Regional and National Conference on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples/Marginalised Communities in Windhoek from 11-13 October, 2010 (see International Labour Organization 2010). It was at this meeting that the Namibian government took the position that indigenous people were but one of a number of historically marginalized communities and that all marginalized communities should be treated fairly and provided with humanitarian assistance⁹.

When the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the human rights and fundamental freedoms of indigenous people visited Namibia from September 20-28, 2012, he highlighted the
particular problems facing the Etosha Hai (Anaya 2012, 2013). While expressing appreciation for ‘innovative arrangements’ with San ‘through which they have been able to increase their control over management of land areas and derive some substantial benefits,’ there were problems regarding security of tenure for Hai at Oshivelo who had been evicted from Etosha in the 1950s (Anaya 2012, 2). He went on to say,

[[‘More needs to be done to identify adequate lands for resettlement and to develop land use planning arrangements, in consultation with the affected San communities, as well as to provide support for the sustainable development of resettled communities’]] (Anaya 2012, 2).

While he admitted that the purchase of the resettlement farms ‘was a step in the right direction’ to provide redress for their removal from the park, close consideration needs to be given to the unresolved claims of the Hai people within the national park (Anaya 2012, 2). Opinions expressed by some Etosha Hai indicated their willingness to proceed with a legal case against the government of Namibia if the government persisted in removing them involuntarily (again) from Etosha National Park.

Statements by Namibian government officials underscore the importance of humanity and compassion in the ways in which the Hai San issue has been addressed. There was concern on the part of some Hai, particularly those in Etosha and Oshivelo, that the government and the Hai Traditional Authority were practicing what might be called ‘selective humanity’, assisting some groups and not others, depending on their social and political allegiances. Efforts were being made to form new and more effective Hai community-based organizations as a means of expanding their power, especially relative to the Hai Traditional Authority (Koot 2013, personal communication, 2014). As Arun Agrawal said in relation to about the management of forests in Kumaon in India, ‘The specific ways in which different conceptions of people are activated – whether as persons, selves, subjects, or agents – are all visible in the emergence of new forms of government’ (Agrawal 2010, 209).

It remains to be seen whether the Hai of Etosha and Oshivelo would be treated the same way as other Hai and other historically disadvantaged and marginalized communities in Namibia. A major concern of the Hai is that it is only Hai Ministry of Environment and Tourism and Namibia Wildlife Resorts employees and their families who are being told
that they have to leave Etosha, not members of other groups such as Ovambo, Kavango, and Herero. It should also be noted that the Etosha and Oshivelo Hailom were viewed with suspicion by the Hailom Traditional Authority and their complaints about lack of equitable treatment and fair distribution of land, livestock, and other resources were generally ignored\textsuperscript{10}.

By November 2012 7 resettlement farms had been purchased by government, and there were 610 residents living on 4 of them (Lawry, Begbie-Clench, and Hitchcock 2012). In mid-2013, some of the residents of the resettlement farms had left because of what they saw as poor soils, insufficient water, problems with predators, and lack of support from the government and from the Hailom Traditional Authority. Some of the Hailom on the resettlement farms were calling for more transparency and accountability on the part of both the Hailom Traditional Authority and the government of Namibia\textsuperscript{11}.

The ways in which the Hailom in Etosha have been dealt with have changed over time, especially in the 2000-2014 period. At first the Etosha Hailom were told that they could move to the resettlement farms voluntarily. Subsequently, they were told that they had no choice about relocation; they had to do so. In some ways, the Namibian state is acting like its neighboring states of Botswana and Zimbabwe, which have required San and other residents of protected areas to leave those areas (Sapignoli 2012; Hitchcock, Begbie-Clench, and Murwira 2014). This is a continuation of some of the past injustices to which the Hailom were exposed. Part of the problem relates to the way in which the government of Namibia works through the Hailom Traditional Authority. Many Hailom, however, have demonstrated their power and agency vis-à-vis both the Hailom TA and the state, as seen in their efforts to resist the resettlement and to gain control over community-based associations in the resettlement farms and in the northern and central Namibian communal areas and towns.

Many of these problems could be avoided if the government of Namibia were to adopt an approach that is more humanitarian in its orientation. It would be helpful if the Namibian government followed international declarations and protocols on the rights of indigenous peoples and to free, prior, and informed consent regarding resettlement policies and programs. It would also be beneficial if both the government of Namibia and the Hailom Traditional Authority were more willing to engage in broad-based consultation and consensus-building and depend less on top-down directives. The Hailom, for their part,
would like greater autonomy and ability to participate in decision-making. This is in the spirit of democratic governance and humanity and will help ensure that the goals of building a strong, peaceful, and successful Hailom society in Namibia will succeed.

It should be emphasized that the Hailom of Namibia see themselves as both authentic San and as having both Hailom and indigenous identities. At the same time, the Hailom are highly diverse and they vary significantly in the ways in which they view the Hailom Traditional Authority and the Namibian state. The issue of the land claim to Etosha is a concern primarily of the Etosha and Oshivelo Hailom. Some of the spokespersons of the Etosha Hailom argue that the Namibian state’s claims to humanity are more rhetorical than real. The fact that the Namibian government applies the group resettlement approach to San (see Republic of Namibia 2010; Dieckmann and Dirkx 2014, 448-454) but uses another resettlement model (the Farm Unit Resettlement Scheme, FURS) in which individual households are provided with discrete plots reinforces the impression that the government does not treat all Namibian citizens equally. While the Namibia government claims to be humanitarian in its approach, many Hailom believe that they have not always been accorded full humanity but instead selective humanity by the state.
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1 An earlier version of this paper was presented in a Symposium entitled ‘Humanity and the San: Rights, Recognition, and Liberal Democracy, Fred Klaits, Organizer, 111th annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, San Francisco, California, November 14-18, 2012.

2 Humanity has been variously defined as having qualities of care for others, compassion, personhood, justice, ‘shared substance,’ inclusiveness, and membership in the group of ‘human beings’ (Feldman and Ticktin 2010; Teitel 2011; Ticktin 2011; Esmeir 2012; Kesby 2012; Fred Klaits, personal communication, 2012).

3 During the 1884-1915 period in German South West Africa Bushmen were treated harshly by settlers, so much so that some Bushmen were shot on sight. When South Africa took control of South West Africa in 1915, one of the new government’s first orders of business was “to ban Bushman hunting” (Gordon 2009, 31). As the Secretary for South West Africa put it, “The farmers must be told that shooting of Bushmen will no longer be permitted and will be prosecuted with all the rigor of the law. The Bushmen must be informed in like manner” (National Archives of Namibia [NAN] file ADM 13/35).

4 It should be noted that Traditional Authorities in Namibia did not have the right to allocate land, as specified in the *Traditional Authority Act* (Republic of Namibia 2000) and the *Communal Land Reform Act* (Republic of Namibia 2002). Instead, the responsibility of land allocation belongs to regional Land Boards under current land legislation in Namibia. See D’Engelbronner-Kolff et al (1998)

5 Discussions of the voting process and the selection of the Traditional Authority were conducted in Windhoek, Outjo, and other parts of Namibia in 2011 and 2012.
The disagreements over the issue of fires in Etosha and surrounding areas in 2011 were serious, and according to some government officials in Namibia they influenced some of the decisions about whether to encourage or require people to leave Etosha National Park for other places, including the resettlement farms.


The Millennium Challenge Account-Namibia (MCA-N) completed its work in Namibia in September, 2014, without an agreement having been reached on the composition and functions of the !Gobaob Community Association.

For a discussion of what indigenous means in Africa and Namibia specifically, see Dieckmann, Thiem, and Hays (2014a, 2014b); Sapignoli and Hitchcock (2013).

It should be noted, however, that the Millennium Challenge Account-Namibia, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, the Legal Assistance Centre of Namibia, and the Office of the Prime Minister took these issues seriously.

Information from some of the Hailom residents of the resettlement farms, in Etosha National Park, Outjo, and Windhoek obtained during interviews in August-September, 2012.