UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
Africa and Discovery: Human Rights, Environment, and Development

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2wr4j6k2

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(1)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
Hitchcock, Robert

Publication Date
1993

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 17:1 (1993) 129–152

Africa and Discovery: Human Rights, Environment, and Development

ROBERT K. HITCHCOCK

INTRODUCTION

Over the past thirty years, a dramatic upsurge has taken place in activities designed to promote human rights for indigenous peoples around the world.[1] More and more calls have been heard from indigenous groups and their supporters for promotion of civil and political rights.[2] In the case of Africa, attention generally has concentrated on what can broadly be called socioeconomic rights, especially the right of everyone to a standard of living that is adequate to assure health and well-being; sufficient food, water, and shelter; and social security.[3] The plight of indigenous peoples in Africa has been underscored by the spectres of starvation and widespread, growing poverty.

The African continent has the fastest population growth rate in the world. At the same time, the population-to-resource ratio is such that many areas are becoming overexploited. The situation has given rise to the problems of famine, degradation, and economic crisis in some African countries and regions.[4] These difficulties are especially acute among indigenous peoples in Africa, many of whom face problems of hunger and landlessness.[5]

While many indigenous peoples have become involved in efforts to promote human rights and development at the international level, the indigenous populations of Africa have partici-

Robert K. Hitchcock is an assistant professor of anthropology at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln. He also has conducted field studies for UNESCO and Cultural Survival.

pated only to a limited extent in international forums such as the meetings of the United Nations Working Group on Indigenous Peoples.[6] One reason for this lack of involvement, according to some analysts, is that, historically, indigenous peoples in Africa were often in disadvantaged positions. Secondly, the indigenous peoples of Africa tend, in most cases, to reside in remote areas. As a consequence, they frequently are marginalized politically and are cut off from information about international events such as those sponsored by the United Nations or multilateral donor agencies. As one government planner in Botswana put it, "They have little or no chance to get jobs, much less travel to New York or Geneva to take part in international meetings."

For purposes of this paper, the term *indigenous peoples* will refer to those groups who are descended from the original inhabitants of a territory or state. Sometimes called "aboriginal peoples," these groups are found in a number of African countries. It is important to note, however, that few, if any, African countries acknowledge the existence of indigenous peoples inside their boundaries. Part of the reason for this position is that they do not wish to grant primacy of one group over another. Making such an admission potentially could give credence to arguments for self-determination on the part of specific tribal or ethnic groups.

Many African societies themselves claim to be indigenous to the countries in which they live.[7] As Waehle has noted, the concept of indigenous peoples, when used in Africa, often has been restricted to either hunter-gatherers or pastoral nomads.[8] The notion of aboriginality or "first-comers" is complex in Africa, especially since states often are controlled by people who historically arrived late on the scene. Aboriginal groups frequently were dominated by other societies.

From a structural standpoint, the concept of indigenous peoples can be applied generally to "marginalized populations in a non-hegemonistic position."[9] Some of these peoples are minorities whose rights are at risk; Gurr and Scarritt[10] estimate that twenty-eight sub-Saharan African countries contain seventy-two minorities whose civil, political, cultural, or economic rights are compromised in some way.

Relatively little is known about the contemporary statuses of indigenous African populations. Some of them are hunter-gatherers whose lifestyles have changed substantially over the centuries. Others are pastoral nomads or small-scale farmers who reside in rural areas. In some cases, they have entered the national economy

as marginally successful food producers and specialized workers. In other cases, they are relatively poor and have had to become dependent for their very survival on the largesse of other groups or the states in which they live.[11]

The indigenous peoples of Africa were affected by many of the same processes that were initiated by the arrival of Columbus in the New World.[12] Contacts with colonizing state systems such as Portugal, Britain, the Netherlands, France, and Germany led to cultural destruction and dispossession. Millions of people were removed from Africa in the slave trade. Individual slaves had no rights over themselves; they essentially were commodities who had no control over their own destinies. Numerous African societies saw many of their members pressed into service as workers in the colonial political economy.[13] Colonial policies also resulted in the denial of access by Africans to natural resources. Colonialism in Africa was, as Anyang'Nyong'o puts it, "in itself a structure of violence."[14]

While apartheid in South Africa is perhaps the best-known recent example of denial of basic human rights to African peoples, there have been systems of exploitation and separate development that affected African peoples in many countries on the African continent. This was true particularly for indigenous peoples, some of whom worked on plantations and ranches belonging to governments, individuals, or multinational corporations.[15] Pygmies in central Africa picked coffee beans on plantations; Dorobo and Boni in Kenya herded cattle and harvested crops; Twa fishermen in Zambia were required to provide a portion of their catch to other groups. Fuga foragers in Ethiopia were forcibly resettled by the Ethiopian government. Maasai pastoralists in Tanzania were moved out of national parks and game reserves or had their rights restricted in such places as the Ngorongoro Conservation Area. Drought-stricken Somali pastoralists were relocated in agricultural and fishing settlements.[16]

These processes are still at work, according to many Africans. African postcolonial states have sometimes pursued some of the same policies as the colonizing European countries. Large-scale ranching and agricultural projects have resulted in the dispossession of substantial numbers of people. Land reform programs have marginalized the poor in places as diverse as Kenya and Botswana. Development programs aimed at helping the economic elite have had little effect on improving the quality of life for the poor.

Some of these programs have had negative environmental consequences, exacerbating problems of soil erosion, deforestation, and desertification.[17] The commercialization of commodities such as ivory, spices, and pharmaceuticals has resulted in overexploitation. Wildlife laws have prevented people from utilizing wild animal resources in their own areas.[18] Lack of local control over natural resources has helped contribute to the problems of environmental degradation and decline in the numbers of wild resources. Africans say that it is simply not in their interest to conserve species that are dangerous and from which they derive no benefits.

The African continent has a fairly sizable number of indigenous peoples who, at one time, depended on foraging for a substantial part of their subsistence. Table 1 presents data on some African indigenous peoples who were hunter-gatherers, along with information about the researchers or organizations who have worked with them. Of these groups, the ones that are perhaps the best known and have had the greatest amount of research done on them are the San (Bushmen, Basarwa). These peoples, who are made up of literally dozens of named groups, comprise the second largest group of indigenous peoples in Africa, the largest being the approximately 180,000 to 200,000 Pygmies of the tropical forest region of central Africa (Zaire, Cameroon, Rwanda, Burundi, Congo, Gabon, and the Central African Republic).[19] Substantial numbers of Pygmies today are more dependent on agricultural villagers than they were in the past, in part because they have lost a previously self-sufficient technology.[20]

African indigenous populations have been affected by a variety of factors ranging from drought to settlement efforts, and from wildlife laws to military struggles.[21] Over 30 million people currently are at risk from drought in southern and eastern Africa. Dams, mining projects, roads, and agricultural schemes have had major effects on the well-being of local populations, as can be seen, for example, among the Gwembe Tonga of Zambia.[22] Several groups of former foragers and agropastoralists—perhaps the best known of which are the Ik of Uganda—[23] were resettled as a result of the establishment of game reserves and national parks. Civil conflicts are having serious repercussions on local people in Somalia, Sudan, Liberia, and Mozambique.

The socioeconomic statuses of many indigenous African population groups have declined to the point where they are eking out an existence in marginal areas. A number of them have sought

TABLE 1
Indigenous African Populations Who Are or Were Hunter-Gatherers and Researchers Who Have Dealt with Them

Name of Group	Location	Researchers Who Have Worked with Them
Koroka, Kwepe, Kwise	Angola	A. de Almeida
Va-Nkwa-Nkala	Angola	S. Souindola
San (Basarwa)	Botswana	L. Marshall, J. Marshall, Kalahari Research Committee (Witwatersrand University), Harvard Kalahari Research Group, A. Barnard, M. Guenther, H. J. Heinz, G. Silberbauer, J. Tanaka, E.Wilmsen, P. Wiessner, University of New Mexico Kalahari Project, S. Kent, H. Vierich, J. Yellen, A. Brooks, P. Motsafi, G. Childers, A. Thoma
Fuga	Ethiopia	W. Shack
Boni	Kenya	D. Stiles
Dahalo	Kenya	D. Stiles
Dorobo (Okiek)	Kenya	C. Chang, M. Ichikawa, C. Kratz, G. Huntingford, R. Blackburn, C. Hobley
Mukogodo	Kenya	G. Worthy, L. Cronk
Waata	Kenya	B. Heine, D. Stiles
Mikea	Madagascar	D. Stiles
Ovatjimba (Himba)	Namibia	B. J. Grobelaar, H. R. MacCalman
San (Bushmen)	Namibia	Marshalls, R. Gordon, C. Ritchie, M. Biesele
Pygmies (e. g., Aka, Efe, Sua, Mbuti)	Ituri Forest, Zaire, Central African Republic, Cameroon, Congo, Rwanda, Gabon	C. Turnbull, M. Ichikawa, J. Hart, T. Hart, R. Harako, G. Morelli, P. Putnam, L. Cavalli-Sforza, D. Wilkie, P. Schebesta, B. Hewlett, S. Bahuchet, H. Guillaume, J. van de Koppell, T. Tanno, P. Ellison, J. Pedersen, R. Bailey, N. Peacock, H. Bode, I. DeVore, R. Aunger, B. De Zalduondo, H. Terashima, E. Waehle
Eyle	Somalia	S. Brandt
Kilii	Somalia	D. Stiles

TABLE 1 (cont'd)

Name of Group	Location	Researchers Who Have Worked with Them
Hadza	Tanzania	J. Woodburn, J. O'Connell, K. Hawkes, E. Ten Raa, N. Blurton-Jones, H. Bunn, L. Bartram, D. Ndagala, K. Tomita, J. Newman, L. Smith, W. McDowell
Kwandu	Zambia	B. Reynolds
Amasili	Zimbabwe	A. Campbell
Doma	Zimbabwe	Zimbabwe Trust, C. Cutshall

assistance from development agencies, church groups, or individuals. Some groups have formed their own development and conservation organizations in an effort to promote self-help and ensure better livelihoods and environmental quality.[24]

The purpose of this paper is to examine issues relating to human rights, the environment, and development among indigenous peoples in Africa. In order to provide insights into some of the problems facing indigenous African peoples, I have chosen to use a kind of case study approach, examining the situations of indigenous populations in southern and eastern Africa. The first case is that of southern Africa, while the second is that of the Hadza of northern Tanzania. Through these examples, I hope to illustrate some of the long-term environmental, economic, demographic, and political impacts of European discovery in Africa.

IMPACTS OF DISCOVERY IN SOUTHERN AFRICA

The political, social, and economic problems facing southern Africa today cannot be understood without reference to the complex history of the region. A significant amount of research has been done in recent years which casts into doubt some of the basic assumptions made by early historians concerning the historical backgrounds of the various populations that inhabited the southern part of the African continent.[25] One of the myths that has been repeated for generations in textbooks in South Africa is that the region was empty until white farmers, moving into the interior from the cape after 1652, came in contact with Black groups who were moving southwards. In reality, southern Africa was far from

uninhabited by agropastoral populations prior to the seventeenth century.[26]

Southern Africa was occupied for tens of thousands of years by people known today as San and Khoekhoe (or "Bushmen" and "Hottentots").[27] These groups ranged widely over the southern African landscape, seeking wild plants and animals, and, in some cases, grazing for their domestic animals. As Wilmsen has noted, the term *Bushmen* was sometimes used to identify people who were of low social status. The San and Khoekhoe were not always perceived as a set of ethnic groups so much as representatives of a social class, particularly, one could argue, an underclass.[28]

Archaeological remains of villages of agricultural and pastoral people have been found in South Africa dating back to the period around A. D. 450 to 600, well over a thousand years before white settlers established themselves in the region. These Iron Age populations, as they have been called, were smelters of iron, manufacturers of pottery, and farmers who grew crops and raised livestock. Iron Age groups lived in hamlets consisting of a number of families under the leadership of a headman or elder. The political organization of these groups was often quite complex, with a several-tiered socioeconomic system containing chiefs, nobles, commoners, and, in some cases, slaves or servants. The chiefs had significant degrees of power, overseeing the judicial system, allocating land, and resolving disputes.[29]

The Dutch encountered both foragers and pastoralists after they established a refreshment station in 1652 near what is now Cape Town. After initial contacts, some of which were fleeting, the settlers carried out trade with some of these groups. In some instances, members of indigenous groups were utilized as workers and servants. Some people who were branded as cattle thieves or "brigands" were hunted down and killed, while others suffered the effects of European diseases that spread upon contact with the immigrants.[30]

The majority of Black people in southern Africa today are descendents of these agropastoral populations. There are numerous ethnic groups speaking a variety of dialects in southern Africa. These groups range from the Venda, who number around 300,000, to the Zulu, who number approximately six million. South Africa recognizes approximately a dozen "tribal groups," while there may be as many as seventy different groups in Zambia. In one district in east-central Botswana, the Central District, an anthropological survey found twenty-two different groups in an area less

than 5,000 square kilometers.[31] South Africa does not have a racial category for Bushmen, in part because it was assumed that they had either died out or been assimilated into the overall society. In the late 1980s, however, some 4,500 Bushmen were brought from the Caprivi Strip and northern Namibia and resettled in the northern Cape Province.

A crucial aspect of the social systems of Black populations in southern Africa was that they were agropastoralists. The possession of cattle often meant the difference between rich and poor. A poor man might be able to gain access to livestock by working for other people, thus getting milk and the occasional gift of a cow in exchange for his services. Even the San—people who traditionally have been viewed as foragers—expressed the desire to own cattle. Cattle were a means of acquiring wives, providing for the future of one's children, and ensuring one's social standing in the community. Loans of cattle not only gave the borrowers a way of supporting themselves but also served to secure their political allegiance to the lender. Cattle were thus a major trade item between Europeans and indigenous populations in southern Africa in the early stages of contact.[32]

Chiefs and other high-status individuals in southern African chiefdoms were entitled to tribute payments from their subjects. These payments sometimes came in the form of cattle, but they might also be paid in the form of crops or skins of wild animals obtained during hunts. As numbers of people and livestock increased, competition for access to livestock, land, and water expanded. Chiefs could order men into battle. One major source of intergroup conflict was cattle raiding, which was an important way for a group to build up its herd and its land holdings. Many chiefdoms in southern Africa were organized into age-regiments, units in which groups of men and women of roughly similar ages cooperated in various tasks on behalf of the group, including hunting, trading, and warfare. San and other minority groups were sometimes used as "serfs"—individuals who served as clients of well-to-do or influential individuals in exchange for protection and sometimes occasional payments (e. g., of clothing or tobacco).[33]

The sociopolitical structure of the chiefdoms of southern Africa was important to the history of contacts between various groups. In the latter part of the eighteenth century, a process of massive political change began in the Zululand and Natal area of what is now South Africa. A number of chiefdoms were united under a

single paramount ruler. This period, which was known as the Mfecane, saw the restructuring of power relations and massive upheavals in which tens of thousands of people died or were forced to leave their homes and migrate elsewhere. The Zulu kingdom emerged, with a brilliant military tactician, Shaka, at its head. Shaka improved the military organization of the Zulu and introduced the use of the short stabbing spear, which was deadly in close combat. The development of the powerful Zulu military and social system led to the consolidation of power by Shaka and the destruction of numerous opponents.[34]

The emergence of the Zulu kingdom in southeastern Africa led to mass migrations that affected a vast area. Refugee groups that fled north conquered other communities, absorbing captives and forcing some groups into the Cape Colony, where they provided a supply of labor for white farmers. Armed bands moved throughout southern and central Africa, raiding villages as far north as Botswana and Zimbabwe.[35]

Within a relatively short period of time after the trading station was established at the Cape of Good Hope, some of the residents began to move out of the settlement and establish farms in the interior, where they had access to productive grazing and agricultural land on a long-term loan basis. Most of these farmers worked the land themselves, but a few of them employed European laborers.

In a sense, white South Africa began as a slave-owning society. Shortly after the founding of Cape Town, slaves began to be imported. Some of them came from other parts of Africa, others from India, and still others from the Dutch East Indies. The slaves worked as skilled artisans in some cases and as farm laborers in others. In the interior, local Khoikhoi were pressed into service as herders. The expansion of the number of slaves and local nonwhite laborers available to the settlers served to limit the development of a white laboring class. This was important in that it led many whites to the conclusion that menial labor was beneath them, and it resulted in the impression that certain racial groups were destined to be used by others to perform certain kinds of tasks.

Since the economic opportunities provided by farming were limited, it became more and more difficult for small-scale farmers to make a living. Only those with access to capital, technology, and substantial amounts of cheap labor were able to become successful. A number of Dutch settlers turned to hunting, supplying meat and ivory to a growing market. Others became successful stock raisers

or livestock traders, obtaining cattle and sheep from local people and selling them. Eventually, many of the local Khoikhoi pastoral groups were displaced, and some of the people were absorbed as cattle herders and domestic servants. A number of them fought back against the white settlers, adopting guerilla tactics, but they were met with brutal force and superior military technology.[36]

The eighteenth century in southern Africa was characterized by the movements of people who came to be known as Trek Boers (trekking, or migrating, farmers). The Trek Boers were those who turned their backs on the company, moved into the interior, and established themselves as self-sufficient pastoralists. It was these people who developed the commando system, a flexible military activity that employed hit-and-run guerilla tactics against indigenous groups. This system was responsible for the deaths of substantial numbers of Africans, and it was later to prove effective in the struggle between the Boers and the British during the Anglo-Boer War of 1899–1902.[37]

The movement of farmers into the interior served to reinforce white racial attitudes. In the interior, the hierarchy of authority was based on a single criterion: race. Whites had both technological and military superiority; nonwhites were subordinate and often had to give up their freedom in order to make a living for themselves and their families.

The conflicts of interest between the British and the white settlers led to occasional outbreaks of violence and resistance to British administration. The settlers felt that British and missionary policies threatened their labor supplies and thus their very existence. The Dutch-speaking majority resented the decision to bring English-speaking settlers to South Africa, and they disliked the judicial reforms of the British administrators. Efforts at emancipation of slaves further alienated the Dutch, some of whom decided to move further into the interior.

Because of economic depression, drought, and political disagreements, Boer sheep and cattle farmers began to expand to the north and east. The abolition of slavery and the lack of what they considered proper compensation were major sources of grievance among frontier groups, some of whom agitated for direct resistance against the British administration. The British also changed the judicial and representation systems, replacing Boer leaders with British officials who were responsible to the governor in Cape Town. The Boers realized that military revolt was useless, so some of them began to explore roads into the interior. These trips were

made possible by the wagon and the gun, as well as by the social organization of the Boers.

In the 1830s, a number of large parties of Trek Boers made their way further inland in what came to be known as the Great Trek. Some of the trekkers came in contact with various local African groups, including the Zulus, who feared that the incursions were the precursors to large-scale settlement by whites. Some of the Boers, including a group under Piet Retief, were killed. These incidents led to large-scale confrontations between the Boers and the Zulus. One notable battle was at what came to be known as Blood River, where as many as three thousand Zulus were killed by a Boer army. After their victory, the Boers were able to establish themselves over a broad area of Natal. In this way, a white-dominated social and economic system was set up, and a process of expansionism was enhanced.[38]

A number of analogies have been drawn between the westward expansion of settlers in North America and the movements of the whites into the interior of southern Africa. While there are definitely some similarities between the frontier experiences on the two continents, there are also some significant differences. Perhaps the most important difference was in the quality of the land, with South Africa's range resources being poorer in many ways than those of North America. Another contrast was the size of the indigenous population of South Africa, which was substantial; the large numbers made it possible for white settlers to obtain labor relatively cheaply.

It was the discovery of diamonds and, later, gold, that was to lead to the transformation of the South African economic and social system. In April 1867, a diamond was discovered near Hopetown, and not long afterwards diamond exploitation became a major new industry. Numerous whites moved to the diamond fields, and Blacks were employed as unskilled laborers. Large markets for agricultural and craft products were created, and the communication and transport systems of South Africa expanded. When competition for labor set in, whites tried to squeeze Africans off the land in order to get them into the commercial economy. The system of sharecropping became more widespread, and large numbers of Africans became landless tenants who had to provide a portion of their crops to white landowners.

A pattern of exploitation of local labor was established, along with a system whereby European capitalists became increasingly involved in African politics in order to secure additional labor or

land. The British managed to start conflicts with the Zulu, drawing them eventually into full-scale warfare. The Zulu won a resounding military victory at Isaldlhwana in 1879, an event that took the British public by surprise and led to a reevaluation of policy in South Africa. Not until the Zulu later suffered a series of military defeats were the British finally able to disarm them.

Industrialization and changes in diamond mining techniques led company owners to try to exert greater degrees of control over African workers. The companies began to regulate the living conditions of mine laborers, who were housed in closed compounds with tight control over entry and exit. This compound system was to provide a model for the administration of labor in the mines in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

It was another mineral discovery that was to lead to major socioeconomic and political changes in South Africa. In 1886 a gold-bearing reef was discovered on the Witwatersrand ("ridge of white waters") near what is now Johannesburg. The exploitation of gold was to bring about significant shifts in the balance of economic power. For a while, it appeared as though the strategic integrity of the British empire was at stake. The Afrikaner leaders tried to parlay their new economic power into political capital, while at the same time attempting to bring about a modern state. It was these factors that were to lead to the outbreak of the Anglo-Boer War in 1899.[39]

The nature of the gold deposits on the land were such that they required massive amounts of expensive equipment, dynamite, and other materials to extract the ore. Their depth also required huge inputs of labor. As the gold exploitation intensified, an increasingly stratified system emerged, one in which large numbers of unskilled Black laborers were overseen by a small number of skilled whites. The bureaucracy set up a pass system to prevent miners from deserting their jobs. Strict regulations were imposed on the Black laborers in order to maintain discipline.

To ensure the availability of sufficient numbers of laborers, a hut tax was imposed. Each household head was required to pay a tax in cash. This tax forced people to enter the labor market to raise cash. Alternatively, they exploited wild resources (e. g., elephants for their ivory or antelopes and fur-bearing animals for their skins). By the latter part of the nineteenth century, San men, among many others, were going to the mines and engaging in economic activities that enabled them to raise money to pay taxes and purchase commodities.

Since a major goal of the British was to enhance the economy of South Africa in order to facilitate British settlement, efforts were made to obtain cheap labor from areas far beyond the boundaries of present-day South Africa. The Witwatersrand Native Labor Association (WENELA) was given the right to recruit laborers from Mozambique, which supplied substantial numbers of mine workers. An attempt to utilize the services of landless whites ended in failure, because whites were not subject to the same discriminatory labor laws, and they were able to press for greater rights through collective bargaining and voting.

The postwar government sought to promote commercialization of agriculture in order to keep the towns and mines supplied with food. Part of this effort was devoted to "native administration," in which Blacks were disarmed, registered for taxation purposes, and, in some cases, settled as tenants on land owned by whites. The South African Native Affairs Commission was set up in 1903, and data were collected on the best ways in which to divide the land between whites and Blacks, the latter being seen primarily as laborers who would live in reserves but work in the mines, farms, and homes of whites.

The expansion of economic activity helped to shift the balance away from African subsistence production and toward commercial farming, which was dominated by whites. Large numbers of Blacks were evicted, and taxes were imposed on those people who remained on the land, thus undermining their economic independence. Some Blacks attempted to resist the taxation efforts of the government. In February 1906, a white police patrol was attacked, and two whites were killed. The white population responded with ferocity: Martial law was declared, and troops were sent into the Black reserves to put down what was assumed to be a potentially large-scale revolt.

The Blacks responsible for killing the white policemen were chased down and summarily executed, while others were put into prison. These events helped to fuel a Black rebellion, which was crushed by white government forces. Over three thousand Africans were killed, homes were burned, and cattle were confiscated. This rebellion was the last major effort by Africans in South Africa to maintain their independence through organized, armed insurrection.

In the period between the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 and the electoral victory of the National Party in 1948, several major steps were taken toward segregating South

Africa's economy and society. Since a major goal of the South African government was to commercialize agriculture and maintain the steady flow of cheap labor to the mines, efforts were made to limit land ownership by Blacks. The Natives Land Act of 1913 was passed, the purpose of which was to restrict African land purchases to "scheduled areas" of African reserves. The implementation of this legislation led to the expropriation of a substantial number of Black farms, especially in the Orange Free State.

Strong opposition to the Land Act was voiced by a Black organization formed in 1912—the South African Native National Congress, later called the African National Congress (ANC). Many Blacks realized that the 1913 Land Act would serve to divide the land of South Africa on a permanent basis between Blacks and whites. They knew that the system of territorial segregation would lead to a reduction in the number of economic opportunities for Blacks and possibly to the demise of African peasant agriculture.

The growth of the South African economy in the period between the First and Second World Wars was accompanied by social changes and splits among both Black and white political parties. Black land access was eroded further with the enactment of the Natives Trust and Land Act of 1936, which saw greater enforcement of antisquatter laws and the stopping of sharecropping on white-owned farms. One way to accomplish these goals was to impose a series of regulations that favored whites over indigenous groups.

Apartheid, which means "apartness" or "separateness," can be characterized as a theoretical doctrine aimed at keeping the races separate socially, physically, and politically. The political program that grew out of the theory of apartheid included a series of laws and regulations geared toward strengthening already existing segregation policies. These laws were backed up by strong police powers of arrest, detention, and imprisonment.

The foundations of classical apartheid were laid in the 1950s with the passage of two acts. The first, called the Population Registration Act of 1950, gave the government the power to classify all South African citizens according to race. People were divided into several categories: (1) whites (Europeans); (2) Africans ("Natives," "Bantus"); (3) coloreds; and (4) Asians (Indians). Social and spatial segregation was reinforced through the Group Areas Act, also passed in 1950. This act gave the government the power to create separate areas for each race in towns, cities, and rural localities outside of Black reserves.

The passage of apartheid laws had a number of impacts on indigenous populations in South Africa. First, it ensured continued economic domination by whites. Second, it restricted the occupancy rights of Africans, often relegating them to unproductive rural reserves or making them stay as temporary laborers on white-owned farms. Third, it had a negative impact on African families, frequently dividing husbands from wives or parents from children. The economic circumstances of many Blacks deteriorated, and poverty and social tensions increased. It is these conditions that many Black South Africans see today as needing massive transformation.

CHANGE AMONG THE HADZA OF TANZANIA

A culturally distinct population that depended traditionally on hunting and gathering, the 1,000-3,000 Hadza (also called the Kindiga, Tindiga, or Kangeju) reside in semiarid shrub savanna areas of the Rift Valley in the Lake Eyasi region of northern Tanzania (formerly Tanganyika). The Hadza are one of a number of people living in the target area of the Tanzania Ministry of Information and Culture's Rift Valley Project, established in the late 1970s.[40] In the past, the Hadza were mobile, moving their camps from one place to another according to the distribution of resources and the location of other groups.[41]

Prior to incursions of other groups in the Rift Valley, the Hadza were completely autonomous, and they made their own decisions about resource use and movements. Their success in remaining autonomous is apparent in the fact that they were perhaps the only society in Tanzania to escape taxation and administration by the European colonial authorities.[42]

Beginning in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Hadzas' access to their resource base began to be restricted increasingly by immigration of agricultural and pastoral populations. A major incursion of pastoralists began in 1948 as a result of famine in nearby highland areas. Livestock and human population densities increased substantially. The Hadza were alienated from their land, and their subsistence resources were affected by competition with both other people and livestock. Hadza moved out of areas inhabited by other groups in order to maintain their social integrity.

Access to land and resources was restricted by the establishment of government-sponsored settlement schemes both prior to

and after Tanzania's independence in 1961. The goals of these schemes were, first, to persuade the Hadza to abandon their foraging activities; second, to get them to give up their mobility and to settle down; and, third, to facilitate their becoming self-sufficient agriculturalists.[43]

In the settlements, the Hadza had no decision-making power, nor did they have any say over the way they were treated. They were rounded up and forced to go to the settlements, where they did not even have the right to choose their own places to put up their houses. As McDowell notes, the schemes "suffered from the fact that the facilities were provided on the basis of what planners thought the Hadza should have, rather than on the basis of what Hadza said they needed."[44] In general, the schemes failed, causing, in some cases, fairly serious privation among some of the Hadza. Among the problems they faced were overcrowding, poor sanitation, high rates of disease and mortality, insufficient food, water, and clothing, and lack of participation in the running of the settlements. In their interactions with other groups in the settlements, they experienced another problem: There was a stigma attached to the hunting and gathering lifestyle. Hadza males in mixed populations did not have as much of an opportunity as others did to find a spouse.

A major conclusion is that settlement schemes in and of themselves are not necessarily beneficial for African hunting and gathering populations. The long-term viability of these schemes will depend on the ways in which they are set up and whether or not participants are allowed to follow their own principles of adaptation to the local environment.

For hunter-gatherers such as the Hadza, access to game is crucial for success. One of the difficulties faced by most, if not all, foragers in Africa is that the state has imposed restrictions on hunting.[45] This was done by the Germans in Tanganyika around the turn of the century, and the Tanzanian government followed suit. However, the Wildlife Conservation Act of 1974, administered by Tanzania's Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, legalized subsistence hunting in Tanzania. As the law states, "The Director (of Game Division) may grant a designated organization (defined as corporate or unincorporated or any *Ujamaa* village) a license to generally hunt such number of scheduled animals, subject to terms and conditions and for such period as may be specified therein." Nevertheless, Hadza were still arrested for supposedly violating hunting laws. The Natural Resources Office

of the Mbulu District, for example, told the people of Endamaghay, an *Ujamaa* (resettlement scheme) village initiated by a Hadza elder, that any Hadza found hunting with bows and poisoned arrows would be arrested and prosecuted. This situation underscores the fact that national-level legislation on resource access rights is not always followed at the local level.

For non-Hadza, licenses with quotas attached must be purchased from the government. Certain species—giraffes, for example—are excluded completely. There are also stipulations about the kinds of hunting methods that can be employed: Ambush hunting is not allowed, nor are pit traps. A ban on hunting within five hundred yards of a water point has had an effect on hunting success among Hadza.

The setting up of national parks and game reserves has also had a significant impact on the Hadza and other African foragers. The Hadza were affected by the establishment of the Ngorongoro Conservation Area, which reduced the amount of land available to them. There also were cases in which Ngorongoro Conservation Area game guards seized and beat Hadza for alleged offenses. These types of incidents contributed to a distrust of government officials on the part of the Hadza. Displacement of Hadza from the springs and other water sources they had utilized in the past has led to a situation where they spend part of the year (August to October) as laborers on farms and the balance of the year (November to July) collecting wild plant foods and hunting.[46]

The Hadza, like other African indigenous peoples, recognize the need for both socioeconomic security and land tenure security. In 1980, the Mangola Hadza proposed to the Rift Valley Project research team that government aid be provided so that they could establish an agricultural settlement of their own. They requested a particular location and asked that they be provided with farm implements and food aid. Another of their requirements was that they be allowed to continue their diverse economic strategies, combining hunting, gathering, and honey-collecting with farming. The Tanzanian government did not provide them with the land for their settlement, nor did it guarantee that they would have secure land rights, but there was a possibility that such steps would be taken.[47]

Over time, the expansion of human and livestock populations has had a significant impact on Hadza resources. Tree-clearing activities for purposes of establishing agricultural plots and making charcoal resulted in destruction of *midabi* (*Cordia sinesis*), an important food resource that is the staple of the Hadza diet from

December to February. Heavy grazing pressure by livestock has affected Grewia species, and bush encroachment has resulted in a crowding out of nutritionally significant plant resources. Pressures from hunting and from the presence of large numbers of livestock have reduced wild game species in the Hadza region. Competition between Hadza and immigrant groups for valued resources such as honey has increased, affecting income levels.

The long-term sustainability of hunting and gathering in the Rift Valley is uncertain. There is no question, however, that foraging can and does provide an important buffering strategy for a number of northern Tanzanian populations. The Hadza have continued to press for rights to natural resources and for the right to make their own decisions about development.

GRASSROOTS CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA

As a response to colonization and exploitation by local communities and individuals, a variety of different types of development and conservation organizations was initiated in Africa.[48] Some of the most popular of these groups are women's organizations, many of which begin as savings clubs or home improvement societies. Farmers' groups are very common in Africa, as are multipurpose development organizations. Pastoral associations were established among the Somalis in the Horn, the Maasai in Kenya and Tanzania, and the rural populations of Senegal and Rwanda.[49] The Maasai of northern Maasailand in Tanzania have formed their own nongovernment organization, KIPOC, which promotes the interests of pastoral peoples.[50] Table 2 presents data on the various types of self-help, development, and conservation organizations that exist in Africa. The numbers of members run into the millions, and their combined treasuries contain substantial amounts of capital.

In Botswana, Lesotho, Swaziland, Somalia, Zimbabwe, and Namibia, groups have been formed to promote pastoral production and ensure conservation. Range management is done by conservation committees and community groups, some of whom are agropastoralists. A number of these groups, such as those in Lesotho, have protested the establishment of major water projects that will have deleterious effects on local economies.

TABLE 2.
Community Organizations in Africa Involved in
Self-Help, Development, and Conservation Activities

Type of Organization	Location
Farmers' Association	widespread
Multipurpose Development Organization	widespread
Cooperative	widespread
Pastoral Association	Kenya, Somalia
Grazing Association	Lesotho
Refugee Association	Ethopia, Sudan, Malawi
Women's Organization	Kenya, Swaziland, Tanzania, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Botswana
Fishermen's Cooperative	Mozambique, Zambia, Botswana
Hunters' Cooperative	South Luangwa, Zambia, Binga, Nyaminyami, Zimbabwe
Village Council	Zimbabwe
Council of Elders	widespread
Fencing Group	Botswana
Village Development Committee (VDC)	Botswana
Burial Society	Botswana, Swaziland
Water Committee	widespread
Health Committee	widespread
Sanitation Committee	widespread
Conservation Committee	Botswana, South Africa
Forestry Committee	widespread

Note: Data obtained from archival and fieldwork and from the following sources: Harrison (1988); Durning (1989); Pradervand (1989).

Hunters' cooperatives and village scouts in Zambia, Namibia, and Zimbabwe are promoting conservation and working to prevent poaching. These groups have been somewhat successful in reducing the decline of elephants and other wild animals. In addition, they have helped increase income for local people from tourism and other wildlife-related industries.[51] The number of local groups involved in wildlife management and utilization is on the up-swing, and donor agencies such as the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) and the European Development Fund (EDF) are providing money and technical assistance for local-level natural resource utilization and management projects.

Local-level development projects have been initiated in rural areas in most of the countries of southern and eastern Africa. Funds for these projects—which include small-scale irrigation agriculture, livestock production, fish farming, handicraft marketing, and ecotourism—usually have come from local sources rather than international ones. A number of the projects have enabled local groups to increase their standards of living.[52]

CONCLUSIONS

The indigenous peoples of Africa have had to deal with numerous problems, some of them a product of colonization and exploitation and others a result of demographic and socioeconomic changes. In order to counteract the negative trends, indigenous groups have embarked on a whole series of self-help and development efforts, using political mobilization as a strategy, organizing grassroots groups, and forming local institutions to facilitate achievement of their goals. In some cases, they have resisted the expansion of European state systems, both actively and passively.

There is mounting evidence that indigenous populations in Africa have begun to organize in order to press for their political, social, and economic rights. Some of them have sought audiences with high government officials so that they can put forth requests for land and economic assistance. Others have participated in demonstrations such as those against the pass laws in South Africa. Still others have used the national and international media to press their cases against governments and development organizations whose plans could lead to additional problems for people seeking land rights and higher incomes. Indigenous peoples in African democracies such as Botswana have sought political office in order to have better chances of influencing the direction that development will take.[53]

It is too early to predict tremendous success in the grassroots development movements among indigenous peoples in Africa. There is no question, though, that local communities have begun to take steps to promote human rights and development, while, at the same time, attempting to enhance conservation. Community groups and nongovernment organizations in Africa have called for greater efforts to promote sustainable development along the lines of suggestions in the 1987 report *Our Common Future* by the World Commission on Environment and Development.[54]

Some of these organizations have been able to initiate projects that have both conservation and development as objectives. Various organizations within the United Nations have provided assistance in some of these efforts, in addition to promoting the interests of Africans and other peoples through the Working Group on Indigenous Populations. African countries hope to send representatives to future sessions of the Working Group and to comment extensively on the draft Universal Declaration on Rights of Indigenous Peoples, produced by the United Nations in 1991.

As local people in Africa have noted, if they are to survive, they must gain access to resources, including land, labor, tools, and capital. They are committed to investing these resources and their energies in helping to bring about better living and working conditions. Participatory development strategies are being employed by indigenous peoples in many parts of Africa. While the activities these people undertake are not always successful, they are learning valuable lessons. Most of them realize the constraints they face in building institutions that are both equitable and effective. The future of Africa, they say, lies in their children. The needs of future generations must be considered. Only then will there be really successful, sustainable development and a satisfying set of environmental conditions. Only then will human rights extend to all African people.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Earlier versions of this paper were presented in a symposium entitled "Human Rights, Participatory Development, and Cultural Change among Indigenous Peoples and Third World Societies," at the 13th International Conference on Third World Studies held in Omaha, Nebraska, 4–6 October 1990 and at a symposium on "Indigenous Peoples and Human Rights," at the ninetieth annual meetings of the American Anthropological Association, Chicago, Illinois, 20–24 November 1992. Support of the research on which this paper is based was provided by the United States National Science Foundation (grants SOC75-02253 and BNS76-20373), the Norwegian Agency for International Development (NORAD), the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the Remote Area Development Program, Ministry of Local Government and Lands, Botswana, and the National

Refugee Commission, government of Somalia. I would like to thank the personnel of these organizations for their assistance in data collection and analysis. The indigenous people of rural southern and eastern Africa who provided information and suggestions so willingly have my heartfelt appreciation.

NOTES

1. See Jason Clay, "Organizing to Survive," *Cultural Survival Quarterly* (1984); Julian Burger, *Report from the Frontier: The State of the World's Indigenous Peoples* (London: Zed Press, 1987); John Bodley, *Victims of Progress*, 3d ed. (Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1990).

2. Robin Wright, "Anthropological Presuppositions of Indigenous Advocacy," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 17 (1988): 381–82; Roger Moody, ed., *The Indigenous Voice: Visions and Realities* (2 vols.) (London: Zed Press, 1988).

3. Rhoda E. Howard, "The Full-Belly Thesis: Should Economic Rights Take Precedence over Civil and Political Rights? Evidence from Sub-Saharan Africa," *Human Rights Quarterly* 5:4 (1983): 467–90; idem, *Human Rights in Commonwealth Africa* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1986); A. A. An-Na'im and F. Deng, *Human Rights in Africa: Cross-Cultural Perspectives* (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution, 1990).

4. L. Timberlake, *Africa in Crisis: The Causes, the Cures of Environmental Bankruptcy* (London: Earthscan Publications, 1988).

5. Clay, "Hunger among Indigenous Peoples," in *Hunger 1993: Uprooted People, Third Annual Report on the State of World Hunger* (Washington, DC: Bread for the World Institute on Hunger and Development, 1992), 48–52.

6. Douglas Sanders, "The UN Working Group on Indigenous Populations," *Human Rights Quarterly* 11:3 (1989): 406–433.

7. See Clay, "Hunger among Indigenous Peoples"; Moringe Parkipuny, "The Indigenous Peoples Question in Africa, with Specific Reference to Tanzania," *IWGIA Newsletter* 2 (Copenhagen) (1992): 48–53.

8. Espen Waehle, "Africa and the Concept of Indigenous Peoples," *IWGIA Yearbook 1990* (Copenhagen: IWGIA, 1991): 145; Clay, *The World Bank and Tribal People in Africa* (Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival, 1988).

9. Waehle, "Africa and the Concept of Indigenous Peoples," 145.

10. Ted R. Gurr and James R. Scarritt, "Minorities' Rights at Risk: A Global Survey," *Human Rights Quarterly* 11:3 (1989): 393.

11. G. P. Murdock, "The Current Status of the World's Hunting and Gathering Peoples," in *Man the Hunter*, ed. R. B. Lee and Irven DeVore (Chicago: Aldine, 1976), 13–20; Jeremy Swift, "The Future of Nomads in Africa," *Development and Change special issue* 13:2 (1982); Robert K. Hitchcock and John D. Holm, "Bureaucratic Domination of African Hunter-Gatherer Societies: The Case of the San in Botswana," *Development and Change* 24: 2 (in press).

12. Eric Wolf, *Europe and the People without History* (Berkeley, CA and London: University of California Press, 1982).

13. Suzanne Miers and Richard Roberts, *The End of Slavery in Africa* (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988).

14. Peter Anyang 'Nyong'o, "An African Perspective on Peace and Development," *International Social Science Journal* 110 (1986): 576.

15. See Wolf, *Europe and the People without History;* Hitchcock and Holm, "Bureaucratic Domination."

16. Robert K. Hitchcock and Hassan Hussein, "Agricultural and Non-Agricultural Settlements for Drought-Afflicted Pastoralists in Somalia," *Disasters* 11:1 (1987): 30–39.

17. Lloyd Timberlake, *Africa in Crisis.*

18. David Anderson and Richard Grove, *Conservation in Africa: People, Policies, and Practice* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

19. Richard Lee, *The !Kung San: Men, Women, and Work in a Foraging Society* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1979); Richard Lee and Irven DeVore, *Kalahari Hunter-Gatherers: Studies of the !Kung San and Their Neighbors* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1976); Colin Turnbull, *The Forest People* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963); idem, *The Mountain People* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972); idem, *The Mbuti Pygmies: Change and Adaptation* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1983).

20. Ibid., 137.

21. See Wolf, *Europe and the People without History;* Hitchcock and Holm, "Bureaucratic Domination."

22. Elizabeth Colson, *The Social Consequences of Resettlement: Impact of the Kariba Resettlement upon the Gwembe Tonga* (Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1971).

23. Turnbull, *The Mountain People.*

24. Pierre Pradervand, *Listening to Africa: Developing Africa from the Grassroots* (New York: Praeger, 1989); Alan R. Durning, *Action at the Grassroots: Fighting Poverty and Environmental Decline,* Worldwatch Paper 88 (Washington, DC: Worldwatch Institute, 1989).

25. Neil Parsons, *A New History of Southern Africa* (London: Macmillan, 1982); J. D. Omer-Cooper, *History of Southern Africa* (London: James Currey, 1987); Leonard Thompson, *A History of South Africa* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 1990).

26. Revil J. Mason, *Prehistory of the Transvaal: A Record of Human Activity* (Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 1969); Martin Hall, *The Changing Past: Farmers, Kings, and Traders in Southern Africa, 200–1860* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1987).

27. Isaac Schapera, *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa: Bushmen and Hottentots* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1930); Richard Elphick, *Kraal and Castle: Khoikhoi and the Founding of White South Africa* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1977); Richard Lee, *The !Kung San,* 35.

28. Edwin N. Wilmsen, *Land Filled with Flies: A Political Economy of the Kalahari* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 17.

29. Hall, *The Changing Past.*

30. Shula Marks, "Khoisan Resistance to the Dutch in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries," *Journal of African History* 13:1 (1972): 55–60; Also Elphick, *Kraal and Caslle,* 231–34.

31. Robert K. Hitchcock, *Kalahari Cattle Posts* (Gaborone, Botswana: Government Printer, 1978).

32. Elphick, *Kraal and Castle;* Thompson, *History of South Africa.*

33. See Schapera, *The Khoisan Peoples,* 233–34; Margo Russell, "Slaves or Workers? Relations between Bushmen, Tswana and Boers in the Kalahari,"

Journal of Southern African Studies 2:2 (1976): 178–97.

34. Omer-Cooper, *History of Southern Africa*; Thompson, *History of South Africa*.

35. Parsons, *A New History of Southern Africa*; Thomas Tlou and Alec Campbell, *History of Botswana* (London and Gaborone, Botswana: Macmillan, 1984).

36. Marks, "Khoisan Resistance"; Elphick, *Kraal and Castle*.

37. Marks, "Khoisan Resistance"; Elphick, *Kraal and Castle*.

38. Thompson, *History of South Africa*.

39. Parsons, *A New History of Southern Africa*.

40. William McDowell, "Hadza Traditional Economy and Its Prospects for Development," and "A Brief History of Mangola Hadza," *Report to the Rift Valley Project* (Mbulu, Tanzania: District Development Directorate, and Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania: Ministry of Information and Culture, Division of Research, Government of Tanzania, 1981).

41. James Woodburn, "Social Organization of the Hadza of North Tanganyika" (Ph. D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1964) and "An Introduction to Hadza Ecology," in Lee and De Vore, *Man the Hunter*, 49–54; D. K. Ndagala, "Attempts to Develop the Hadzabe of Tanzania," *Nomadic Peoples* 18:17 (1985): 17–26.

42. McDowell, "Hadza Traditional Economy," 26.

43. Ibid.; Ndagala, "Attempts to Develop the Hadzabe of Tanzania," 67.

44. McDowell, "Hadza Traditional Economy," 9.

45. Anderson and Grove, *Conservation in Africa*.

46. McDowell, "Hadza Traditional Economy" and "A Brief History of Mangola Hadza."

47. See idem, "Hadza Traditional Economy."

48. Durning, *Action at the Grassroots*; Pradervand, *Listening to Africa*; Hitchcock and Holm, "Bureaucratic Domination."

49. Swift, "The Future of Nomads in Africa"; Stephen Sandford, *Management of Pastoral Development in the Third World* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1983).

50. Parkipuny, "The Indigenous Peoples Question in Africa."

51. Paul Harrison, *The Greening of Africa: Breaking Through in the Battle for Land and Food* (London: Paladin [Grafton Books], 1988); Durning, *Action at the Grassroots*; Pradervand, *Listening to Africa*.

52. Garth Owen-Smith and Margaret Jacobsohn, "Involving a Local Community in Wildlife Conservation: A Pilot Project at Purros, Southwestern Kaokoland, SWA/Namibia," *Quagga* 27 (1989): 21–28.

53. Clay, "Organizing to Survive"; Hitchcock and Holm, "Bureaucratic Domination."

54. World Commission on Environment and Development, *Our Common Future* (Oxford, England: Oxford University Press, 1987).