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Abstract

Together with global shifts in the fields of postcolonial studies, anthropology, and history, the democratic transition of 1994 invigorated debates about Khoisan identity, politics, and representation in South Africa and elsewhere. While classical themes continue to inform Khoisan Studies research, the increasing number of people self-identifying as Khoisan and engaging in activism accordingly has brought new debates, topics, and perspectives to the fore. In this selective and annotated bibliography, scholarly works that epitomize this trend are discussed.

Introduction

The umbrella term ‘Khoisan’ refers to various populations groups who are indigenous to Southern Africa and share linguistic and cultural traits. It is common to refer to these groups individually as the San, Griqua, Cape Khoi, Nama and Korana. It is important to note that many in South Africa and beyond regard the term ‘Khoisan’ as offensive because of its provenance in colonial-era physical anthropology and racist science.\(^1\) There are various alternative collective designations in circulation, such as Khoi-San, Khoesan, and Khoi and San. Others speak of South Africa’s ‘First Nations’ or ‘indigenous people’. Some options reflect differences in spelling, others betray political standpoint (see below), or maintain a distinction between the San (sometimes referred to as ‘Bushmen’) and the Khoi/Khoikhoi (or Khoe/KhoeKhoe). There is no consensus over which collective label is most appropriate. They all come with drawbacks. Having said that, academics usually stick with ‘Khoisan’ and the term is also widely used by the people it is meant to designate.\(^2\) In addition, notwithstanding differences between Khoisan groups, notably between the San and the Khoi, they equally relate to the themes discussed in this bibliography and therefore benefit from being treated in concert at least in some respects.

Indeed, together with global shifts in the fields of postcolonial studies, anthropology, and history, the democratic transition of 1994 invigorated academic debates about Khoisan identity, politics, and representation in South Africa and elsewhere. While classical themes, such as

\(^1\) Particularly influential in this regard were: Leonhard Schultze, *Zur Kenntnis des Körpers der Hottentotten und Buschmänner (Zoologische und anthropologische Ergebnisse einer Forschungsgreise in westlichen und zentralen Südafrika)* (Jena: Gustav Fischer, 1928); Isaac Schapeera, *The Khoisan Peoples of South Africa. Bushmen and Hottentots* (London: George Routledge and Sons, 1930).

\(^2\) For more on this point, including opposing perspectives, see: Rafael Verbuyst, “Khoisan Consciousness: Articulating Indigeneity in Post-Apartheid Cape Town” (PhD diss., Ghent University, 2021), 3-4.
language, folklore, development, and rock art, continue to inform Khoisan Studies research and notwithstanding noteworthy precedents, the increasing number of people self-identifying as Khoisan and engaging in activism accordingly — a phenomenon often referred as ‘Khoisan revivalism’ — has undeniably brought new debates, topics and perspectives to the fore in the post-apartheid era.

In this selective and annotated bibliography I discuss scholarly works (i.e. monographs, journal articles, and MA and PhD dissertations) in the English language that epitomize this trend. While most authors are anthropologists or cultural critics, I did not deliberately discriminate among disciplines. I prioritized works that speak directly to the themes identified below, although case studies are well-represented. There are sizeable Khoisan communities in Namibia, Botswana and elsewhere in Southern Africa. However, I limited myself to the literature on South Africa in order to avoid that this overview becomes too lengthy. When titles seemingly only refer to the San or the Khoi (or other subgroups), they were selected because they speak to the broader themes at hand. Lastly, all bibliographical entries are placed in chronological order, starting anew with every section.

It is important to view the literature discussed below against the backdrop of the widespread notion, born out of colonial and apartheid-era thinking, that the Khoisan have become (virtually) extinct as a distinct collective. From the mid-17th century onwards, the Khoisan were decimated, dispossessed, and eventually forcefully assimilated into colonial society as ‘Coloureds’, a mixed-race category that amalgamated various African and Asian demographics yet foregrounded European lineage. By assigning ‘Coloureds’ (marginally) greater benefits than ‘Blacks’ (i.e. Bantu-speaking populations) during racial segregation, aspirations to Whiteness were stimulated by the apartheid dispensation – although never resulting in granting ‘Coloureds’ anything close to the benefits enjoyed by ‘Whites’. With lasting effects, the majority of ‘Coloureds’ distanced themselves from their African roots, including the Khoisan. Sourced from centuries of derogatory representations, the Khoisan were depicted by the colonial and apartheid dispensations as non-humans, heathens, and worse. Following the dictates of 19th century salvage anthropology and sustained afterwards by racial scientists, as well as well-meaning scholars, the supposedly remaining ‘Khoisan’ were those who, for the time being, still clung to their ‘pure’ culture in the Kalahari Desert. While these ideas have been challenged by academics and others for decades, the notion of the Khoisan as an (extinct) primitive people continues to circulate and impact how people think about them.

With this caveat in mind, I have structured the text according to three strongly interrelated themes that I believe capture the new dimensions of the post-apartheid debates on the Khoisan:

---


‘identity’, ‘politics’, and ‘representation’. Under the rubric of ‘identity’, I listed research that examines various facets of Khoisan identification in the post-apartheid era: how do Khoisan people see themselves and shape their identity? What type of work does their identity do for them? Included here as well are debates about the motivations for Khoisan identification. In the section dubbed ‘politics’ I discussed titles that examine core components of Khoisan post-apartheid politics: land, traditional leadership, autochthony and indigeneity. I have also added a few relevant works on intellectual property rights, indigenous rights and indigenous knowledge. The last section, ‘representation’, includes discussions about how the Khoisan are represented and how they represent themselves in popular culture and wider society. Entries listed in this section deal with Khoisan stereotypes and imagery, museums, cultural practices, language, tourism, as well as Khoisan representation within the field of Khoisan Studies itself.

Bibliography

Identity


Anthropologists John Sharp and Emile Boonzaier critically assess the increasing number of people self-identifying as Nama (a Khoisan subgroup) instead of ‘Coloured’ in the Namaqualand region in the Northern Cape Province in the 1990s. Writing in the tradition of ‘exposé ethnography’ (i.e. debunking notions of ethnicity and race as social constructions masking other concerns) and drawing on ethnographic data, the authors argue that identifying as Nama and claiming indigeneity are part of a ‘carefully calculated performance’, a response to shifting realities on the ground after the end of apartheid. Seeing Nama ethnicity first and foremost (though not exclusively) as a means to an end, Sharp and Boonzaier argue that it is mobilized in particular to increase local people’s leverage in the establishment of a nearby national park. It is one of the first academic commentaries on the ‘revival’ of Khoisan identities in the post-apartheid era, making it essential reading for those interested in the genealogy of debates on Khoisan identity after the democratic transition of 1994.


In this short monograph, anthropologist Hylton White takes the Kagga Kamma tourist site and nature reserve in the Western Cape Province as a case-study to investigate the politics surrounding the performance of traditionalism and ‘Bushman-ness’. White’s account draws on data gathered during ethnographic fieldwork at Kagga Kamma and traces how a few dozen ≠khomani San ceased being farmworkers in the Northern Cape Province and arrived at Kagga Kamma, among them Dawid Kruiper, who rose to fame as a Khoisan spokesperson afterwards. White also examines how they tailor their
identity to stereotypical notions surrounding the Khoisan to secure employment and placate tourists. The author also details Kagga Kamma’s day-to-day activities and its efforts to promote itself as an enterprise to ‘conserve’ the threatened ‘heritage’ of the Khoisan. Taking an explicitly social-constructivist perspective, he sees Khoisan identity as a ‘strategic response to opportunities of patronage based on the global interest in images of “traditional” Bushmen’. Critical of such dynamics, White shows throughout his work how the ‘benefits’ for the Khoisan are mixed.


This article is in large part a response to John Sharp and Emile Boonzaier’s analysis of the rise of Nama self-identification in the Namaqualand region in the Northern Cape Province in the 1990s (see entry no. 1). Anthropologist Steven Robins argues that Sharp and Boonzaier fail to appreciate how contemporary Nama identity is deeply affected by the assimilationist policies of past colonial and apartheid regimes. Rather than lacking a pure essence, Nama identity emerges in a hybrid, fragmented and inconsistent form because it is voiced by people enduring a ‘subaltern condition’. Robins recognizes that Nama identity can be a response to shifting political developments and experiences of socioeconomic marginalization, which he details at some length. However, he insists that Nama identity cannot be reduced to an opportunistic ‘performance’ to procure resources. To the local inhabitants, it is a deeply meaningful identity (‘an act of recuperation and memory’), not just in the political domain.


Anthropologist Steven Robins examines how ‘Bushman’ identity was shaped in the context of a successful 1999 land claim in the Northern Cape Province involving the ≠khomani San community. Robins briefly sketches the history and status-quo of Khoisan representation and proceeds to draw attention to the various outsiders (e.g. NGOs, curators, tourists, academics, lawyers, journalists) seeking to influence how Bushmen identity is perceived and presented. What ends up circulating most of all are ‘static and primordialist conceptions of tribal history and identity’. However, rather than sketching the ≠khomani San as passively undergoing all of this, Robins shows how they exercise their agency to ‘actively negotiate’ their identities and try to accomplish their aims. All the while, there is disagreement among the claimants about which type of identity will assist them most in coming out victorious in the land claim. Robins accordingly analyses the purported split between ‘traditionalist’ and ‘western’ Bushmen, laying bare cultural strategies, political alignments, and leadership tensions.

As the title of this brief research project outline suggests, Norwegian anthropologist Siv Øvernes (spelled wrongly here, see entry no. 26) reflects on the ‘sudden’ ‘reappearance’ of the Khoisan at the Cape, who are widely considered to be (virtually) extinct as a distinct collective. She critically interrogates this assumption, dissecting its historical roots and anticipating arguments put forward in her monograph, which appeared roughly two decades later (see entry no. 26). Øvernes pioneered ethnographic fieldwork among the Khoisan in Cape Town who supposedly did not exist anymore. Although the bulk of her anthropological analysis is reflected in her later work, which is based on her PhD thesis, this article outlines some of the main conundrums involved in thinking about this topic: the relationship between Khoisan identity and ‘Coloured’ identity; the ‘problem’ and ‘politics’ of authenticity; and the meaning of claims to indigeneity. As various titles listed below attest to, Øvernes anticipated a new line of research by focusing on ‘why it is meaningful to claim this ethnic identity in today’s Cape Town’ rather than assessing whether the Khoisan are ‘truly indigenous of not’.


Anthropologist Piet Erasmus discusses the ‘rebirth’ of the Korana in the Free State Province. After giving a brief overview of Korana history, he focuses on the re-establishment of traditional structures and customs in the region after 1994. Overall, Erasmus takes a sceptical approach and lays bare instances of ‘political opportunism, nepotism and division’ among the Korana, which he sees as negatively impacting the overall revival of Khoisan identity and culture in the province. His text draws on data collected during ethnographic fieldwork among the Taibosch Korana in the Free State Province and includes some reflections on the role of anthropologists when it comes to the ‘verification’ of the various claims made by the Khoisan. Other work by Erasmus is listed below (see no. 4 and 16).


Various arguments contained in this text to some extent appeared in previous publications by the anthropologist Richard Lee – a household name in Khoisan Studies and anthropology at large. However, this article ties these earlier arguments to reflections about (alternative) definitions of indigeneity and therefore deserves special mention, even if the more theoretical arguments fall outside of the scope of this bibliography. The article contains several observations made by the author while attending the 1997 Conference on Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage in Cape Town, a watershed event in the history of Khoisan revivalism (see no. 54). Lee’s

---

5 The term is usually spelled ‘Korana’. I have kept the original spelling in the title, but used mainstream spelling elsewhere.

observations give unique insights into early expressions of Khoisan identity and politics, including tensions and alliances between different Khoisan factions. Lee also draws on his research expertise in South Africa to reflect on the various historical and political meanings ‘indigeneity’ holds in this context. By noting parallels with Steve Biko’s Black Consciousness Movement of the 1970s, he also analyses post-apartheid expressions of Khoisan identity in terms of psychological and cultural affirmation.


Though mainly a historical analysis, roughly a third of the PhD dissertation of the late historian Michael Besten details Griqua (a Khoisan subgroup) politics during the first decade of the post-apartheid era. Taking a critical approach, he argues that, with the end of apartheid, the Griqua began to downplay their connection to ‘Coloured’ identity and embrace an international discourse on indigenous rights, self-determination and ‘African identity’ with the help of non-Griqua advisors and alliances with other Khoisan groups, principally the San, who also began ‘re-articulating’ their identities. Besten also comments in great detail on the Khoisan revivalists of Cape Town, which he dubs ‘neo-Khoe-San’, and on Khoisan-related political developments in general. Drawing mostly on media items, he pays particular attention to the Cape Cultural Heritage Development Council and the figure of Joseph Little, both of whom dominated Khoisan politics in the first decade after apartheid. Besten shows how Griqua leaders and Khoisan representatives in Cape Town and elsewhere engaged with each other – at times in conflict – and shaped the post-apartheid Khoisan political agenda with regards to land reform and the official recognition of Khoisan traditional leadership in particular. Additional publications by Besten are listed below (see entry no. 11, 62 and 63).


Unlike other Khoisan, the Griqua long managed to retain some measure of land ownership and political autonomy during colonialism and apartheid. In The Griqua Conundrum, anthropologist Linda Waldman takes the Griqua as a case study to study ‘indigenous mobilisation, politics and ethnic identity’. She details how the Griqua attempted to safeguard their relative autonomy since the 19th century by reading the political climate of the day and emphasizing their ‘Coloured’ identity (i.e. their vicinity to European ancestry) or African lineage accordingly. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork in Griquatown and elsewhere, Waldman argues that this process of identity negotiation – which brings with it various types of politicking and intra-Griqua conflict — continues in the post-apartheid era, where an international discourse on indigenous rights has entered the equation. She does not only focus on Griqua leadership, but also on the opinions of the rank-and-file, arguing explicitly against only taking a ‘social constructivist and instrumental approach to identity’.
While this article deals with the District Six museum in Cape Town and issues of postcolonial (Khoisan) representation in museums more broadly, historian Ciraj Rassool devotes some space to critique Khoisan identity and claims to indigeneity. Rassool emerges as one of its staunchest critics, fearing that Khoisan identity is mainly (though certainly not in every instance) foregrounded to revive apartheid-era conceptions of ethnicity and advance an exclusionary, tribal and racist politics (see also entry no. 28). Critiquing the manner in which ‘culture’ and ‘ethnicity’ are promoted in museums and tourist ventures across South Africa, he lauds the way in which the District Six museum relates to the concept of ‘community’. In detailing the historical experience of residents of the multicultural District Six neighbourhood of Cape Town, including their forced removal under apartheid, the museum does not emphasize ‘Coloured’ identity, but shared historical experiences that outweigh issues of race or ethnicity.

As part of a collection investigating past and present notions of ‘Coloured’ identity, this chapter by the late historian Michael Besten examines its historical and post-apartheid entanglements with Khoisan identity. He starts out with an historical overview of the assimilationist policies that shaped the Khoisan’s racial classification, culminating in the notion that they no longer exist as a distinct collective. Besten then argues that the end of apartheid made ‘Coloured’ identity less psychologically and socio-economically ‘useful’, prompting many to claim a Khoisan indigenous identity instead. While he notes that Khoisan identity can be deeply meaningful to people, he sees it as primarily a means to an end, ‘an attempt at finding identity terms that were useful for promoting broader coloured social and political concerns’. Although the Khoisan reject various aspects of ‘colouredness’, Besten argues that it inevitably reproduces some of its associated politics, most notably feelings of being superior to, or more entitled to historical justice than ‘Blacks’ (i.e. the Bantu-speaking majority in South Africa). Besten discusses this in relation to various Khoisan groupings, such as the San or the Griqua, but argues that his analysis applies in particular to the ‘neo-Khoisan’ in the Cape Provinces. More work by Besten is discussed under entry no. 8, 62 and 63.

This ethnographic and historical study investigates the ‘situational nature of ethnicity’ by examining shifts in identification among the San of the Drakensberg region of the KwaZulu-Natal Province. Anthropologist Michael Francis argues that the widespread
notion that these people became extinct is based on stereotypical conceptions of the San and ignores evidence of cultural syncretism. He shows how the San have historically adapted to changes around them, principally by assimilating into Zulu society. Francis sees this as a response to shifting political and social contexts and thereby ‘fractures’ notions of ‘pure’ or ‘singular’ San identities, which are usually based on communities in the Kalahari Desert. The author emphasizes how identities are primarily shaped in response to the environment around them, yet rendering them no less meaningful. Francis appeals to researchers to pay more attention to Khoisan communities outside of the Kalahari Desert and their consequently different ways of expressing their culture and identity. Additional work by Francis is listed below under entry no. 13.  


Anthropologist Michael Francis elaborates on his earlier fieldwork and writing on the San in the Drakensberg region of the KwaZulu-Natal Province: a people who are commonly held to no longer exist as a distinct collective due to their assimilation into Zulu society (see entry no. 12). The author previously pointed out that this notion is based on stereotypical conceptions of San identity and does not take into account various instances of cultural syncretism. He expands this argument here by looking in detail at how a group of people who recently began to claim indigeneity and San identity practice their culture and communicate their identity. The focus is on a particular ceremony containing a great deal of cultural borrowing. Rather than analysing this as an instrumentalist ‘invention of tradition’ – in reference to Eric Hobsbawn and Terence Ranger’s famous thesis — Francis argues that this ceremony is ‘an active reconstruction of a mythologised past to make sense of the present, and indeed to change it’. In the concluding section, the author offers up theoretical reflections on what this means for our thinking about ‘cultural survival’ and ‘cultural renewal’. This text is one of the first attempts to study expressions of Khoisan identity and culture without drawing direct comparisons with the San in the Kalahari Desert, which researchers have traditionally focused on. It also stands out for its focus on why the Khoisan find meaning in such displays, rather than what socioeconomic or political motivations might spur them to do so, although the author does not disregard these.


Anthropologist Piet Erasmus draws on interview data to investigate what drives people to claim Griqua and Korana identities (both Khoisan subgroups) in Heidedal, a town in the Free State Province. As in earlier work (see entry no. 6), Erasmus is sceptical of claims to indigeneity and political structures emerging within this context. The author first introduces the case of Heidedal, noting the absence of Khoisan identification in the

---

area until the 1990s. By way of case study, he then discusses two people who rejected their ‘Coloured’ identity and began self-identifying as Korana or Griqua after apartheid. Detailing their respective family backgrounds, Erasmus shows how both of his informants emphasized place of birth and upbringing as the basis of their identity and claim to indigeneity. Erasmus concludes that there is a great deal of friction between different Khoisan factions in the area, which means that Khoisan identity is likely to remain contested and manifested in various ways. Other work by Erasmus is listed under entry no. 6 and 16.


Gender scholar Pumla Dineo Gqola’s *What is Slavery to Me?* is a meditation on postcolonial memory in post-apartheid South Africa. While the book deals with the legacy of slavery and claiming slave ancestry in particular, Gqola addresses Khoisan historical memory as well. In fact, she analytically designates the Khoisan as ‘slaves’, even if they were never officially enslaved by the colonial regime. Of note for this bibliography are passages in Chapter 1 where Gqola reflects on how Khoisan identity interfaces with race. Taking the *Hurikamma Cultural Movement* of the 1990s as a case study, she argues that many Khoisan subvert the logic of racial hierarchies by simultaneously claiming Khoisan, ‘Brown’, and ‘Black’ identities. She reads the emphasis on Khoisan lineage as an anti-racist and Pan-Africanist statement, a choice to foreground and take pride in the most ‘debased’ heritage, not as a way to endorse notions of genetic purity or to disregard other lineages that historically contributed to the category ‘Coloured’.


This article builds on earlier work by Piet Erasmus on Khoisan identity in the municipality of Heidedal in the Free State Province (see entry no. 14). It gives insight into the research activities that took place at the short-lived ‘Unit for Khoekhoe and San Studies’ at the University of the Free State, founded in 2007, and more particularly on ‘the Khoekhoe and San Early Learning Centre’ (also discussed under entry no. 36). This project sought to teach residents at Heidedal about Khoisan languages and Khoisan heritage. As part of the preparatory research for this project, Erasmus and his team pooled local residents’ sense of identity, revealing that most identified as ‘Coloured’ rather than ‘Khoisan’. Various people also identified with multiple identities at the same time. Reflecting on the case of Heidedal, Erasmus pleads for more research on Khoisan identities in urban settings and away from conventional research areas such as the Kalahari Desert. These kinds of studies generate new insights into how Khoisan

---

8 The website of the University of the Free State still mentions the Unit (“Faculty of The Humanities Home/Anthropology Home.” [https://www.ufs.ac.za/humanities/departments-and-divisions/anthropology-home](https://www.ufs.ac.za/humanities/departments-and-divisions/anthropology-home)), but no additional information can be found there. Moreover, various commentators have stated that it is no longer functioning, see Rafael Verbuyst, “Khoisan Consciousness: Articulating Indigeneity in Post-Apartheid Cape Town” (PhD diss., Ghent University, 2021), 138-139.
identities are expressed and experienced. For Erasmus’ earlier work, see entry no. 6 and 14.


In this accessible and well-illustrated ethnography, anthropologist Michael De Jongh discusses the everyday realities of the so-called Karretjiemense (‘Cart People’) inhabiting parts of the Karoo desert of the Western Cape Province. While there is no overt mobilization of Khoisan identity or indigeneity among the Karretjiemense, who were classified as ‘Coloureds’ under apartheid and today remain largely unknown to most South Africans, they are of Khoisan descent. De Jongh describes in particular how they experience great socioeconomic struggles, battling poverty, unemployment and inadequate housing conditions on a daily basis. De Jongh published a similar ethnography of the Hessequa people, which is listed under entry no. 22.


Sociologist Zimitri Erasmus criticizes the rise of identity claims based on genetic ancestry in the post-apartheid era. Erasmus argues that these constitute a dangerous and erroneous conflation of notions of race, genetics and place, amounting to a biologically essentialist sense of self reminiscent of apartheid ideology. Among others, she sees this unfold in particular among Khoisan activists and their claims of indigeneity, which she is highly critical of. Erasmus argues that such claims cannot be ‘genetically confirmed’ as genetic strains do not overlap with past and present ethnic labels. Moreover, she dismisses notions of ‘indigeneity’ and ‘aboriginality’ as extending the colonial and apartheid regime’s divide and rule tactics. Erasmus concludes her article by emphasizing that identities can be sourced in countless other ways, which may prove less exclusive or divisive.⁹


Historian and Khoisan activist June Bam (also writes as June Bam-Hutchison) sketches the historical background and contemporary political agenda of post-apartheid Khoisan activism, with a focus on Cape Town and the Western Cape Province.¹⁰ Herself part of

---


¹⁰ Although falling outside of the scope of this bibliography, I want to mention two other works by Bam because of their impact on Khoisan Studies and her current position as interim Director of the Khoi and San Unit at the University of Cape Town, established in 2020: June Bam, and Bernedette Muthien, eds., *Indigenous Women Re-
this movement, she provides unique insights into its workings and discusses various prominent individuals within it, as well as watershed political developments in the 2000s. Bam argues that a rejection of ‘Coloured’ identity and a desire for identity and belonging lies at the core Khoisan activism, which finds expression in campaigns about land claims, historical justice, language rights, constitutional accommodation, decolonized education, indigenous knowledge, sacred spaces, the return of human remains, and much else. She also describes the lack of organizational capacity among Khoisan activists, the preponderance of internal disagreements, as well as the involvement of political parties such as the Freedom Front Plus and the Economic Freedom Fighters. Bam concludes by advocating for a greater inclusion of the Khoisan community in Khoisan Studies. This approach became enshrined in the mission statement of the Khoi and San Unit at the University of Cape Town, which she heads as interim Director since its founding in 2020.


Anthropologist Renée Sylvain’s work mostly centres on the San in the Omaheke Region of Eastern Namibia, but this article dissects Khoisan identity politics at large. The author draws on Khoisan issues across Southern Africa, but Botswana in particular, to tackle the Khoisan’s apparent ‘strategic essentialism’, i.e. calculated mobilization of stereotypical/essentialist images and ideas concerning the Khoisan. Such tactics are usually regarded as either misguided identity claims in the context of a politics of recognition (i.e. the state recognizing certain identities), or shrewd calculations to get the most out of a politics of redistribution (i.e. the state redistributing resources, such as land). Both perspectives ultimately view the Khoisan as ‘prepolitical’ people, who either need to be ‘preserved’ or ‘modernized’. Sylvain argues that this type of ‘unreflective deconstruction’ fails to appreciate that Khoisan identity might not always mask other interests and that not all ‘essentialisms’ are insincere. Most importantly, she argues that ‘mutually imbricating systems of racial-ethnic class inequalities that marginalize and oppress San’ remain largely unaddressed in academia.


What terms should we (not) use to designate the Khoisan (see introduction)? Anthropologist William Ellis reflects on the conundrums that this question gives rise to by looking at how the ≠khomani San relate to the term ‘Bushman’. Throughout history, the term has been used to diminish the San or emphasize their proximity to nature. In an attempt to address their complicity in this regard, academics have begun to use the terms that research participants themselves use. However, drawing on ethnographic fieldwork carried out among the ≠khomani San, Ellis shows how they regularly refer to themselves

as ‘Bushmen’, prompting academics to question why they engage in a ‘dynamic process of name selection’. Ellis argues that the #khomani San appropriate the term because it can be ‘commodified’ and help them reach ‘development needs’, including settling land claims.


Similar to anthropologist Michael De Jongh’s earlier work on the *Karretjiemense* (see entry no. 17), *A Forgotten First People* is a brief and accessible overview of the Southern Cape Hessequa in the Western Cape Province. De Jongh provides a lot of historical background on this Khoisan subgroup, but also touches on intra-Khoisan politics, heritage, land issues and claims to indigeneity.


Anthropologist Katharina Schramm investigates how Khoisan revivalists ‘substantiate’ their indigeneity by relating to ‘body casts, human remains and DNA’, as well as ‘past and present classificatory practices’ in post-apartheid South Africa, most notably the assimilation of the Khoisan as ‘Coloured’. Drawing in part on interviews with prominent Khoisan revivalists such as Zenzile Khoisan, Schramm argues that indigeneity emerges not so much as a historical reference point or as a reflection of one’s descent, but as a ‘political subjectivity’ that is explicitly chosen and claimed by linking the living to the dead ‘through a multitude of genealogical and commemorative practices’. Schramm discusses these practices in turn, noting how they are affected by colonial and apartheid-era legacies. Human remains collected by colonial and apartheid-scientists are for instance claimed by Khoisan revivalists as ancestors and genetic evidence is mobilized ‘selectively’ whenever it helps sustain their claims to indigeneity.


Itunu Bodunrin’s PhD dissertation draws on his ethnographic fieldwork among the !Xun and Khwe San youth in Platfontein, a town in the Northern Cape Province of South Africa, between 2013 and 2017. His PhD dissertation stands out as the first in-depth study of urban Khoisan indigeneity, as well as of a locale where Khoisan indigeneity is claimed with rigor, yet overt markers that are usually associated with their culture are in many ways absent. Bodunrin’s thesis also contains a great deal of researcher reflexivity, which generates invaluable insights for those undertaking similar fieldwork. The author investigated how San youth in Platfontein negotiate their identity, indigeneity, and citizenship. He terms his approach ‘decolonial’ because he does not seek to impose his own interpretation of their identity, but rather to appreciate how his
research participants shape it in creative ways, for instance by interacting on social media or making hip hop music. Bodunrin is particularly interested in how his research participants draw on the global indigenous rights discourse, historical narratives, and the existing repertoire of Khoisan representation. By describing the socioeconomic profile of the area and the everyday challenges faced by his research participants, he shows how indigeneity is claimed to regain a positive self-image. Other work by Bodunrin is discussed under entry no. 75 and 78.


The ‘Square Kilometre Array’ refers to an ‘astronomy reserve’ located in the Karoo Desert in the Western Cape Province encompassing 120,000 square kilometres. It spans (part of) the historical territory of the |Xam, a Khoisan subgroup. Many regard the |Xam to be extinct, but the authors argue that their culture in fact survived over 300 years of colonialism, ‘albeit under altered, arguably reduced, circumstances’, which include speaking Afrikaans, adopting the Christian faith and no longer practicing a hunter-gatherer lifestyle. The impoverished and neglected ‘descendants’ of the |Xam still inhabit the area. Defending their claims to the land above those of others, the authors argue that the South African San Council’s overt campaigns of having once lived in the area ‘lack substance’. Laying bare differences in how the managers of the site and the |Xam conceptualize ‘landscape’, the authors argue that the latter should co-manage the site and be guaranteed social justice in the face of further dispossession and marginalization.


Street Khoisan is the first ethnographic study of Khoisan identity in post-apartheid Cape Town. Building on her MA and PhD dissertation (see entry no. 5), anthropologist Siv Øvernes details why and how people living on the streets (‘strollers’) relate to Khoisan identity and culture. Unlike most other studies on the topic included in this bibliography, she chose not to focus on those communicating their Khoisan identity overtly, or in a political register. Øvernes engages in reflexivity and autoethnography throughout the book, relating her findings about under-communicated indigenous belonging in Cape Town to her own experiences of growing up with muted Coastal Sámi and Kven roots in Sápmi in Northern Norway, where an indigenous revivalist movement of sorts has taken place over the past few decades. Street Khoisan is filled with first-hand encounters with people claiming Khoisan identity in perhaps unexpected ways, allowing Øvernes to dissect the widespread notion that the Khoisan became extinct in the face of colonialism. She also tackles the misconception that Khoisan identity is an instrumentalist construction based on notions of genetic purity and solely source from images of and ideas surrounding the Khoisan in the Kalahari Desert.

Shanade Barnabas and Samukelisiwe Miya draw on articulation theory to analyse Khoisan identity and language activism in post-apartheid South Africa as part of a dynamic process of rediscovery. The authors examine instances of both the reclaiming of Afrikaans as a Khoisan language and the revival of the Khoisan language *Khoekhoegowab*. They detail bottom-up initiatives of Khoisan activists to revive and recognize *Khoekhoegowab* as an official language alongside the 11 ones currently recognized in South Africa. The authors also analyse the locally renowned play ‘Afrikaaps’, which seeks to reclaim Afrikaans, particularly the way it is spoken among ‘Coloureds’ in the Cape, as an African/Khoisan/hybrid language. The authors also comment on various other elements of the articulations of Khoisan identity and culture, such as Rastafarianism. Publications focusing in more detail on language and Khoisan activism — including the play *Afrikaaps* — are listed below under the section ‘Representation’ (see entry no. 72, 74, and 79).


In this article, historian Ciraj Rassool elaborates on various earlier criticisms of Khoisan identity and claims to indigeneity (see entry no. 10). Rassool still maintains that Khoisan identity claims and assertions of indigeneity represent reincarnations of apartheid-era conceptions of ethnicity and racist politics, which he details in this article. Reflecting on recent political developments, in particular the ruling African National Congress’ embrace of ‘land expropriation without compensation’ and the increased competition over historical suffering under apartheid, he doubles down on the need to critique and debunk assertions of ethnicity, not least those made by the Khoisan. Rassool advocates for a non-racialist position, which he deems necessary to dismantle the remaining vestiges of apartheid-era thinking about race and ethnicity.


Nicole Van Staden’s MA thesis examines the meaning of Khoisan identity in Kimberley in the Northern Cape Province, with a focus on the Griqua and Korana Khoisan subgroups. The author takes an autoethnographic approach, ‘raw and full of emotion’, processing her own ‘identity-crisis’ in relation to (stereotypical) notions of Coloured, Black, and Khoisan identity. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork in the area, Van Staden argues that, in the case of the Khoisan, resistance shapes identity just as much as identity shapes resistance. Khoisan identities emerge as powerful anti-colonial and decolonial responses to marginalization. Van Staden shows at length how she and her informants struggle against the widespread notion that the Khoisan no longer exist as a distinct
collective, in the process tying Khoisan identity to race, land, language, religion and unprocessed histories of injustice.


This monograph investigates why and how increasing numbers of people are identifying as Khoisan and engaging with the Khoisan past. Rafael Verbuyst takes a bottom-up perspective on Khoisan identity, drawing on interviews, observations and various types of texts, including *Eerste Nasie Nuus*, a Khoisan revivalist-authored community newspaper. Verbuyst explains in Chapter Four how Khoisan revivalists diagnose ‘Coloureds’ with an identity crisis as result of centuries of assimilationist policies. Embracing Khoisan identity is seen as the way out of this crisis, and as the remedy to various socioeconomic ills. To make Khoisan history relevant for the present, it is tied in various ways to the experience of being known as ‘Coloured’. Chapter Five shows how Khoisan identity is generally speaking open-ended and inclusive. However, its boundaries can be fiercely contested in the context of entitlement claims. In Chapter Six, Verbuyst focuses on the revival of Khoisan culture, showing how both efforts at recreating the past and deliberately introducing novel elements to Khoisan culture emerge as effective and popular vehicles of indigenous revivalism. Other aspects of *Khoisan Consciousness* are discussed in entry no. 50 and 80.

**Politics**


This article centres on the case of the so-called Schmidtsdrift Bushmen, a group of about 4,000 Khoisan from Namibia, Botswana, and Angola who were relocated to temporary housing in Schmidtsdrift army base in the Northern Cape Province and given South African citizenship in 1990 because many of them formed battalions of the South African Defense Force during the Namibian liberation war in the 1970s and 1980s. The anthropologist Stuart Douglas details how they arrived in South Africa and positioned themselves politically since, engaging with the National Party, the African National Congress and the global indigenous rights discourse in particular. Critically surveying the literature, Douglas argues that the ‘bushmaness’ of the Schmidtsdrift Bushmen should neither be foreclosed or uncritically assumed. Observing their ‘reflexive management of ambivalence’, Douglas argues that researchers should critically examine the degree to which the Schmidtsdrift Bushmen exercise their agency when mobilizing specific ideas and images that are historically associated with the Khoisan. Other titles dealing with this Khoisan group are listed under entry no. 24, 43, 75 and 78.

The historian Henry Bredekamp is often dubbed the ‘father of Khoisan revivalism’ because of the pivotal role he played in transitioning debates on Khoisan history and identity from the academy into the public domain (see also entry no. 54 and 58). This is the first academic publication that explicitly speaks of ‘Khoisan revivalism’, although the precise origins of the term are hard to locate. While Bredekamp does not define ‘Khoisan revivalism’ in this text, he is evidently pointing to the rise of people identifying as Khoisan and engaging in activism accordingly since the end of apartheid. The text provides some historical background to Khoisan revivalism, but mainly focuses on how it has become a political movement about indigenous rights in the 1990s. Bredekamp discusses San, Griqua, and Cape-based Khoisan communities in the Western, Northern and Eastern Cape Provinces. His focus, however, is on developments on the international stage and on how these have impacted policy negotiations regarding the official recognition of the Khoisan in South Africa.


This book chapter gives an overview of the rights of indigenous people in South Africa anno 2004, with a focus on the San, Nama, and Griqua Khoisan subgroups. It is co-authored by Roger Chennels, a lawyer who continues to be at the forefront of securing greater rights for Khoisan communities, particularly the San (see entry no. 47). Although there have been significant developments since 2004, the authors provide a useful summary of the status quo of Khoisan intellectual property rights, language rights, land rights, and constitutional development. The authors also discuss heritage, poverty, and the various meanings attached to indigenous and ‘minority rights’ in a South African context. Lastly, Chennels and du Toit’s contribution contains figures showing the number of Khoisan in South Africa, although these should be regarded as estimates in the absence of official statistics.


Legal scholar Karin Lehmann critically reviews the applicability of aboriginal title and indigenous rights to the South African context. After defining the various international interpretations and applications of these legal tools, she explores at length how these might inform domestic policy. Some see merit in recognizing aboriginal title as it would allow claimants to circumvent the 1913 cut-off date in South Africa’s land restitution program. However, according to Lehmann, few communities in South Africa meet its requirements of proof of contemporary ‘relationships to the land’. Moreover, black
South Africans might find themselves excluded as non-indigenous people (or as a ‘dominating majority’), a classification she deems ahistorical and detrimental to the country’s nation-building efforts. ‘Khoesan’ grievances might be more easily and meaningfully addressed by interpreting the existing constitutional ‘right to culture’ as entailing the need to protect marginalized cultures. Lehmann elaborated on these topics in a 2006 article (see entry no. 35).


An extension of earlier reflections on the applicability of aboriginal title and indigenous rights to the South African context (see entry no. 34), legal scholar Karin Lehmann comments on the definition of ‘indigenous people’ from the vantage point of South Africa. Reviewing various legal definitions from other contexts, Lehmann shows how certain international organizations (though certainly not all) have recognized Khoisan groups as indigenous. The South African government has not followed suit, however. Lehmann argues that this in part because of the ambiguity surrounding ‘indigeneity’ as an international legal concept. Among other elements contributing to this ambiguity in a South African context, she identifies the definitional challenge posed by ‘acculturated descendants’, the problematic distinction between ‘tribal’ and ‘indigenous’, the need to uphold a separate legal systems, the requirement of the continued practice of a distinct culture, as well as the commonly held view that all Africans are ‘indigenous’ to the African continent.


Anthropologist and Khoisan activist Priscilla De Wet starts off by explaining how she began to identify as Khoisan and engage in activism after being fed-up with the various stigmas associated with ‘Coloured’ identity. Detailing some of the relevant political developments of the 1990s and 2000s, De Wet notes how she joined fellow activists in campaigning for an academically-supported initiative to spread awareness about Khoisan heritage and Khoisan languages, which ultimately found expression in the ‘Khoesan Early Learning Center Pilot Project’ at the University of the Free State (see entry no. 16). After giving some background on this project, she notes how its functioning was hampered by infighting, competition over traditional leadership positions, and a lack of funds. De Wet concludes that the University of the Free State did not take ‘Indigenous knowledge and ways of doing and knowing’ seriously, thereby missing an opportunity to meaningfully connect academic research to community development and involve the Khoisan as meaningful agents in research.

Lisa Philander’s PhD dissertation centres on the so-called Rastafari Bush Doctors in the Western Cape Province of South Africa. Drawing on extensive fieldwork among these urban-based healers and their clients, as well as a theoretical framework borrowing from ethnobotany and medical anthropology, she discerns an emerging ‘ethnomedicine’ and discourse on intellectual property rights and indigenous knowledge. Philander studied how knowledge about medicinal plants materializes, and how herbs are traded and used for healing purposes. She also comments at length on how her informants view their identity and craft by combining Khoisan identity, Rastafarianism, and ‘elements of a globally recognized eco-religion’ and philosophy on societal healing and tolerance. In the process, ‘Bush Doctors’ thicken their indigeneity, give rise to a largely informal economy, and embody different ways of relating to nature and landscape.


*Settler Colonialism and Land Rights in South Africa* details the history of possession and dispossession on the middle Orange River valley. By showing how these processes have taken place over several centuries and involved various communities dispossessing one another (although the focus is on the Afrikaners in Orania and the Griqua at Philippolis), historian Edward Cavanagh argues that land and notions of property, tenure, land use and sovereignty were differently experienced and defined. In the afterword in particular, the author advances an innovative critique of post-apartheid land politics by drawing on settler-colonial studies (i.e. the study of colonies inhabited by sizeable communities of settlers, prompting specific enduring relationships with ‘natives’). Cavanagh criticizes the 1913 cut-off date in the South African land restitution program for failing to accommodate colonial-era dispossessions. He concludes that an understanding of ‘indigeneity’ that goes beyond race and is more attuned to the South African post-apartheid context is needed. For more on contemporary settler colonialism in South Africa, see entry no. 48.


*The Making of Griqua, Inc* is inspired by Jean and John Comaroff’s 2007 monograph *Ethnicity Inc.*, which discusses the commodification of ethnicity and its relation to ethnic politics and -group formation. Anthropologist Erwin Schweitzer applies the Comaroffs’ theoretical framework to the Griqua. Drawing on ethnographic fieldwork among Griqua-based organizations in the Kwazulu-Natal, Eastern Cape, Western Cape, and Free State provinces, he focuses on how the formation of Griqua identity is tied to political campaigns for land and self-determination, as well as agricultural and tourist ventures. Schweitzer details Griqua history at some length, but devotes most of this text to a thorough discussion of their post-apartheid struggle for indigenous rights with the South African government and internationally, touching on intra-Griqua frictions and developments involving various other Khoisan groups. The text also contains various
reflections on research ethics and researcher positionality, which are rare in studies like this. For further background on the Griqua, see entry no. 8 and 9.


Drawing on fieldwork among Khoisan activists in Cape Town, anthropologist and historian Rafael Verbuyst discusses their motivations and strategies for claiming land and engaging in activism. Advancing a ‘symbolic interpretation’ of several case studies, he shows how land claims are not always primarily concerned with land in the physical sense. Land claims do not have to take the form of bureaucratic legal processes to become meaningful or have serious effects, nor do they need to involve specific plots of land or economic spaces. Verbuyst believes that such a perspective is lacking in the policy negotiations regarding land restitution for the Khoisan and their potential recognition as indigenous people. The author criticizes instrumentalist approaches to Khoisan identity for failing to take into account the contexts under which the Khoisan’s supposed ‘strategic essentialism’ takes place. Analysing Khoisan activists’ own stated motivations for claiming land, he concludes that the discourse on land acts as a metaphor for their past and present exclusion. As such, land is frequently tied to issues healing, belonging, cultural rights and socioeconomic development.


Anthropologist Sarah Ives’ ethnography of the rooibos industry in the Cederberg region of South Africa lays bare how the sector is deeply affected by a politics of race and nature, which has historically governed ‘political, social, and economic hierarchies’ in the area. Drawing on fieldwork among farmers and other stakeholders in the industry, she shows how relationships to rooibos are used to substantiate the indigeneity and bolster the economic outlook of ‘Coloureds’. ‘Coloureds’ acknowledge their (partial) descent from the Khoisan and that they were the original users of the rooibos plant, but most do not embrace a primordial Khoisan identity or essentialist indigenous culture. Conversely, white residents’ belonging is asserted by their botanical knowledge and control over natural resources. Various brands selling rooibos tea also market primordial Khoisan imagery to boost tea sales, but do not acknowledge ‘Coloureds’ as the indigenous knowledge holders because of their supposed ‘mixed’ descent and the Khoisan’s purported extinction. Ives’ analysis thus lays bare a particular constellation of ‘plant, place and person’ underpinning local notions of indigeneity.

Chizuko Sato analyses the Khoisan’s position in the land debate in post-apartheid South Africa. She focuses in particular on urban-based ‘Khoisan revivalists’. Sato surveys relevant political and legal developments, particularly the brief re-opening of the land claims process in 2013, which previously ran between 1995 and 1998. Drawing on fieldwork among Khoisan activists in Cape Town, Sato shows how they lack organizational capacity and a ‘representative voice’. They distrust the South African government, but also fight among themselves in anticipation of potential benefits. Sato shows how the Khoisan claim indigeneity and land, appealing to various international legal instruments in the process. She reflects on the potential use of such legislation and concludes that the Khoisan’s land needs should be addressed through the land redistribution, rather than restitution, program.


Anthropologist Junko Maruyama examines how the framing of the !Xun and Khwe Khoisan subgroups changed from ‘displaced people’ from Namibia to ‘indigenous people’ in South Africa. Beginning in the 1960s, many !Xun and Khwe joined the Portuguese and Apartheid armies (see also entry no. 24, 31, 75 and 78). After the end of apartheid in 1994, they were temporarily relocated to the Northern Cape Province at Schmidtsdrift army base, and then to Platfontein, where the author conducted ethnographic fieldwork between 2010 and 2013 among community members, government officials, and NGO workers. Maruyama details the !Xun and Khwe’s life stories, political strategies, and daily struggles. He argues that the South African Defense Force in particular essentialized the !Xun and Khwe as ‘Bushmen’ as it was believed that this would turn them into better trackers and soldiers. This image assisted the !Xun and Khwe in reinventing themselves as indigenous people and attract international support and funding in the post-apartheid era. Murayama shows how they joined the South African San Institute, established tourist ventures and became part of the broader ‘Khoi-San revivalism’ movement, which also incorporates others who do not readily fit the mould ‘indigenous people’.


Luan Staphorst takes the case of Khoisan rock art and folklore to reflect on the notion of ownership in relation discourses of (indigenous) rights, citizenship, and heritage. Drawing on the work of Mahmood Mamdani, the author argues that the politics of indigeneity unavoidably sustains the very system it seeks to criticize by upholding the binary ‘settler/native’, reproducing essentialisms, and conceptualizing heritage as something that is ‘owned’ exclusively by people fitting a certain mould. Staphorst believes that the notion of ‘citizenship’ has more ‘transformative potential’ and embodies ‘truly decolonial paradigms and practices’ as it breaks with fraught patterns from the past and emphasizes a common humanity, ‘a complex web of relationships and responsibilities’. ‘Heritage’ thus becomes shared as part of a ‘landscape of knowing’.
and belonging, rather than something which is owned by groups or individuals on the basis of their ontology. Staphorst concludes that these democratic engagements with heritage can still be ‘underpinned by difference’, yet only when articulated within a framework of ‘critical ethicality’.


Stasja Koot and Bram Büscher critically appraise whether the land claim of the Southern Kalahari Bushmen (or ≠khomani San), which was settled in 1999, improved their socioeconomic situation. Distinguishing between a ‘genealogical’ (i.e. ‘Eurocentric’ and property-focused) and ‘relational’ (i.e. ‘engagement’ and ‘environment’-focused) ontological approach to land, the authors argue that the meaning of the reclaimed land and the claimant community have both changed over time. As a result, the return of land does not necessarily resolve the marginalization experienced by the claimant community. Koot and Büscher conclude that the land claims debate in South Africa should pay more attention to the multitude of ‘world views’ that exist about land and development, as well as how these become entangled in a politics of indigeneity.


Anthropologist William Ellis analyses Khoisan traditional leadership claims, including those emanating from Khoisan revivalists. Drawing on a varied data set, Ellis argues that Khoisan revivalist traditional leaders in many ways function like their historical predecessors, who also had a ‘situational’, i.e. improvisational, creative, and dynamic style of leadership. The author shows how Khoisan traditional leadership continues to revolve around spokespersons who are ‘leaders’ in their own right in certain settings, but embody a link to Khoisan ‘tradition’ that renders them credible ‘traditional leaders’ by their peers and followers. Ellis finds that such leaders emerge either through contact with (colonial) outsiders or by virtue of being ‘ritual specialists’, i.e. showcasing an affinity to Khoisan culture by creatively combining ‘readily available symbols and artefacts associated with KhoiSan identity’. All the while, Ellis pleads for further ethnographic research on Khoisan revivalist traditional leadership, in particular concerning the arguments that are mobilized to bolster and contest political claims and notions of ‘authenticity’.

The rooibos industry has for a long time marketed the associations between the Khoisan and the rooibos plant, which is most commonly consumed as a tea product (seen entry no. 41). However, in March 2019, an agreement was reached between the National Khoi-San Council, the South African San Council and the South African rooibos industry, which recognizes the Khoisan as the traditional knowledge holders of rooibos. Aside from envisioned and largely unspecified non-monetary benefits, the agreement entitles the San, Khoi and Rooibos farmers in the Cederberg region of the Western Cape Province, where rooibos is cultivated, to 1.5 percent of the ‘farm gate price’ (i.e. the price paid to farmers for the unprocessed product). The authors detail the negotiations leading up the agreement starting in 2010 and the challenges involved (i.e. the lack of resources, various contestations around representation, etc.). While previous benefit sharing agreements concerning Hoodia and Sceletium were reached with the San, the rooibos deal is the first industry-wide agreement involving indigenous people and responding directly to international biodiversity legislation and its emphasis on fairness and trust. As such, the authors hope that the rooibos agreement will bring unprecedented benefits to Khoisan communities and act as a legal precedent in similar contexts.


Lorenzo Veracini and Rafael Verbuyst reflect on Khoisan revivalism to analyse contemporary settler colonialism in South Africa (i.e. colonies inhabited by sizeable communities of settlers, prompting specific relationships with ‘natives’). A focus on apartheid and race has made an appraisal of contemporary settler colonialism as a distinct mode of domination in South Africa difficult and controversial. And yet, as Khoisan revivalists’ critique shows, a characteristically settler-colonial ‘logic of elimination’ is apparent in contemporary South Africa aimed at ‘dispossessing’ and ‘transferring’ the Khoisan. The authors draw on theoretical insights from the field of settler-colonial studies to analyse various ways through which the apartheid and post-1994 (or ‘anti-apartheid’) dispensations have (unwittingly) maintained settler-colonial structures of domination (see also entry no. 38). Veracini and Verbuyst conclude that the appraisal of South Africa’s settler-colonial present prompts an understanding of indigeneity that does not map onto the commonplace white-black binary in research on South Africa.


This MA thesis surveys a controversial property (re)development in Cape Town, commonly referred to as the ‘River Club’. Various Khoisan activists have been involved in both supporting and opposing the development. By drawing on newspaper articles, maps, illustrations, observations made during hearings and various types of relevant documentation and legislation, Alta Steenkamp analyses how the concept of ‘heritage’ is shaped by both those in favour of the development and those who are against it.
Steenkamp starts off with an overview of Khoisan history and Khoisan revivalism, with an emphasis on claiming/emplacing heritage in Cape Town. She then discusses the River Club site and the contestations surrounding it in some detail, showing how a heritage review process concluded that the historical presence of the Khoisan in that specific area cannot be ascertained for certain in the absence of tangible markers. This leads Steenkamp to conclude that the heritage assessment process was based on a narrow/Westernized understanding of heritage (‘tangible heritage in place’), as opposed to a framing of ‘heritage as ‘intangible place’ that might be more attune with indigenous peoples’ way of relating to cultural landscapes.


*Khoisan Consciousness: An Ethnography of Emic Histories and Indigenous Revivalism in Post-Apartheid Cape Town* draws on Rafael Verbuyst’s fieldwork among ‘Khoisan revivalists’ in Cape Town to query why and how increasing numbers of people are identifying as Khoisan and engaging with the Khoisan past. Chapters Two and Three examine the history of Khoisan revivalism and its interactions with the South African state. Relevant legislative and political developments are described in some detail, arguing that Khoisan revivalism’s historical trajectory underwent three phases: a pre-1997 phase wherein the earliest signs of Khoisan revivalism manifest themselves as anti-apartheid critiques of ‘Coloured’ identity and Khoisan history; a second phase between 1997 and 2012 whereby a cohort of ‘Coloured’ intellectuals issues demands for the official recognition of indigenous rights and Khoisan traditional leadership positions; and an ongoing phase starting in 2012, when a more direct-action oriented and broad-based mode of Khoisan activism becomes apparent. Verbuyst shows how contemporary Khoisan revivalism is spurred on by legislative developments exploring the recognition of Khoisan land claims and traditional leadership, ending his overview in 2019, when the Traditional and Khoi-San Leadership Act was signed into law. Chapter Five provides a more in-depth dissection of Khoisan revivalists’ entitlement claims, offering a bottom-up interpretation of their land claims and traditional leadership politics. In the conclusion, Verbuyst reflects on the broader political implications of Khoisan revivalism. Other aspects of Khoisan Consciousness are discussed in entry no. 30 and 80.


Drawing on Cherryl Walker’s analysis of the ‘master narrative’ of twentieth century black dispossession underpinning South African land reform, Danelle Van Zyl-Hermann and Rafael Verbuyst argue that the ruling African National Congress’ embrace of ‘land expropriation without compensation’ in 2018 has stimulated the circulation of competitive ‘master narratives’. The authors focus on two groups claiming to represent marginalized minorities whose identity and experience differ from that of black South Africans: the Afrikaner interest group AfriForum and Khoisan activists. Drawing on a wide range of sources, Van Zyl-Hermann and Verbuyst show how AfriForum deploys
discourses of rationality, expertise, and impartiality to bolster their historical narrative and resist efforts at land reform, whereas Khoisan activists emphasize prior occupancy and indigeneity to claim land. Despite various differences between these movements and their historical narratives, the authors lay bare instances of ‘rapprochement’. More research is required to ascertain the extent of such collaborations and the support they enjoy among the rank and file. However, the authors conclude that there are key intersections in their historical narratives, which might offer effective ways of capitalizing on the African National Congress’ flagging electoral dominance.

Representation


In this contribution, anthropologist and archeologist Edwin Wilmsen critiques conceptions of the Khoisan as ‘First People’. Wilmsen argues that such framings are historically inaccurate and falsely depict the Khoisan as pristine hunter-gatherers, who live outside of modern society as ahistorical people, embodying a colonial notion of ‘authenticity’. The author gives a historical overview of such representations, showing how they manifested themselves as the anthesis of modernity in the context of an existential crisis following the conclusion of apartheid and the Second World War. Wilmsen challenges the ‘conceptual isolation’ the term ‘First People’ gives rise to, noting how it obfuscates people’s living conditions and class concerns.


The exhibition Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen opened in April 1996 in Cape Town. With Miscast, Pippa Skotnes sought to capitalize on the emphasis on redemption and introspection which the end of apartheid gave rise to to lay bare the destructive and demeaning aspects of the history of Khoisan (‘Bushmen’) representation in South Africa and elsewhere. As various publications listed below attest to (see entry no. 55, 56 and 57), Miscast kickstarted an academic and societal debate on Khoisan representation and the role of exhibitions such as Miscast, laying bare various controversies. The collection listed here contains several papers tackling issues of Khoisan representation from various disciplinary angles. While the bulk of these deal with pre-apartheid developments, some contributors also comment on how the democratic transition of 1994 brought new potential issues to the fore, such as Khoisan identity politics and continuities and shifts in tourist marketing strategies.

The watershed Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage Conference held in Cape Town in July 1997 was hosted by the Institute for Historical Research at the University of the Western Cape. For the first time in the history of Khoisan Studies conferences, which were mostly held in Europe until then, the Khoisan themselves attended and participated in the gathering. The Khoisan also partook in the various cultural performances and political fora that took place in and around the conference. This is not so much reflected in the academics presentations, which were mostly delivered by the usual suspects and largely tackled conventional topics within Khoisan Studies, but in the transcripts of the opening remarks and breakaway/plenary sessions (see in particular ‘Section 1: The Politics of Khoisan Identity’). Unprecedentedly for such conferences, the Khoisan demanded to be more meaningfully included in research and receive academic support and exposure for their political aspirations. This collections contains invaluable insights into these deliberations by detailing interactions between the various Khoisan representatives, academics, and government officials in attendance. The follow-up conference held in 2001 was equally ground-breaking (see entry no. 58).


Anthropologists Shannon Jackson and Steven Robins review the exhibition Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen, curated by Pippa Skotnes in 1996 (see entry no. 53). Drawing on their own observations and on interviews with visitors, the authors argue that Skotnes’ meta-critique of Khoisan representation (‘an exhibit about exhibits’) largely failed to appeal to those for whom the colonial and apartheid-era past are very much still in the present. This primarily includes the Khoisan themselves and excludes the various academics working through feelings of historical complicity for who Miscast seems to have been intended according to the authors. Jackson and Robins also lay bare various stylistic choices that further hamper establishing the critical distance that they feel is necessary to appreciate the exhibit, such as graphically displaying the horrors of colonialism and failing to include non-white perspectives and ‘adequate contextualisation’ for non-academic visitors. Jackson and Robins point out how Miscast did succeed in kickstarting a dialogue on Khoisan representation and colonial legacies by questioning prevailing views of the Khoisan as pristine, nature-prone and near-extinct hunter-gatherers, which are also contested and mobilized by Khoisan activists.


In this article, Pippa Skotnes, responds to some of the criticism (see entry no. 55 and 57) that has been levelled at Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen, an exhibition she curated in 1996 (see entry no. 53). Skotnes also reflects more broadly on the role of museums and exhibitions in representing the Khoisan in a context of Khoisan revivalism. Most of the article details how Khoisan ‘stereotypes’ have materialized historically, paying specific attention to the so-called ‘Bushmen diorama’ that featured at the South African Museum between 1960 and 2001. While Skotnes had anticipated ‘shock, horror, sadness, anger, or wonder’ as potential responses to Miscast and she had
engaged with various Khoisan groups across Southern Africa prior to the opening, she had not expected the Khoisan to be so critical and organized politically. All the while, Skotnes notes how the response to Miscast was mixed. There was widespread disagreement among Khoisan groups over how the Khoisan should and should not be represented. Some Khoisan even told Skotnes that Miscast helped them become aware of their Khoisan identity and history. Ultimately, Skotnes looks back on Miscast favourably as one of its ambitions was precisely to stir controversy and kickstart a political discussion on past and present Khoisan representation.


Aside from discussing the literature on Khoisan representation, Elana Bregin’s article gives an overview of the criticism that has been levelled at Pipa Skotnes’ 1996 exhibition Miscast: Negotiating the Presence of the Bushmen (see entry no. 53). Interestingly, Bregin opens with a Khoisan activist group’s statement concerning Miscast, criticizing Skotnes for taking it upon herself as a white academic to exhibit the horrors of colonialism, thereby ironically (and perhaps unintentionally) extending a colonial-era tradition of Khoisan representation. The activists ask where the Khoisan perspective of those atrocities is and why it was not included in Miscast even if ‘they’ experience its legacies on a daily basis. Bregin also details some of the mixed-reactions that were voiced by the Khoisan during a public forum the day after the official opening, showing how the exhibit became entangled with a nascent politics of indigeneity.


The National Khoisan Consultative Conference held in Oudtshoorn in the Western Cape Province in 2001 is the follow-up to the 1997 Khoisan Identities and Cultural Heritage Conference, whose conference contributions are listed under entry no. 54. If the 1997 edition stood out for the attendance and participation of Khoisan delegates, the 2001 conference took things one step further by scheduling a majority of Khoisan presenters. Khoisan delegates from all over South Africa turned out in the hundreds to attend this meeting. Tackling issues such as Khoisan identity and the historical relationship between Khoisan spirituality and Christianity from a Khoisan perspective, the presentations by Khoisan activists provide important insights into their critique of history, Khoisan representation, and South African politics. It also lays bare various cornerstones of Khoisan activists’ political aspirations. Just as the 1997 proceedings, this collection also includes audience responses to the papers and other deliberations that took place during the gathering. These involve government officials as well, which discussed the Khoisan Heritage Route in particular.

If Henry Bredekamp is often referred to as ‘the father of Khoisan revivalism’ (see entry no. 32), his student Yvette Abrahams qualifies as the proverbial mother. Like Bredekamp, Abrahams is a historian. Most of her work offers revisionist perspectives on Khoisan history. In this highly reflexive ‘research diary’, however, Abrahams recounts how she struggled as a female indigenous academic, particularly in the context of her PhD research on Sarah Baartman, a 19th century Khoisan women who was paraded as an exotic specimen across Europe and whose remains were on display in a museum in France until the 1970s. Laying bare ‘the interconnections between identity, history and historiography’, Abrahams explains how her positionality and encounter with racism in academia prevented her from taking a ‘dispassionate’ approach. In doing so, she anticipates present-day debates about the uses of the past and the role of experience and positionality in historical understanding.


Taking the artwork of the Khoisan artist Garth Erasmus as a case study, Julie McGee argues that ‘appropriations of indigenous cultural forms’ have the potential to move away from the ‘paradigm of Eurocentric modernity’ and its connotations of extinction and acculturation. By discussing the soundscapes, performances and visual art of Erasmus (including his discovery, construction and playing of the ‘Khoisan bow’), McGee shows how indigeneity emerges as a present-oriented concept, in many ways lacking precise geographical and temporal determinants. Rather than seeking to replicate a historic form (‘a modernist salvage mission’), Erasmus strives for a ‘creative healing process’, interrogating ‘Western perceptions of Khoisan culture’ in the process.


Michael and Suzanne Francis show how ‘racialised caricatures and colonial imagery that freeze San imagery into a mythologised past’ are being upheld and promoted by San advocacy groups across southern Africa. This limits their advocacy to ‘development rights’, as the San are portrayed as hunter-gatherers who are ‘essentially different from the dominant groups within society’ and practice a static culture in need of outsider protection. While successful at attracting international sympathy and support, this anti-change attitude does not benefit the majority of Khoisan people who do not live in hunter-gatherer communities. Khoisan who do not embody the stereotype are either neglected or subsumed under a generic Khoisan category, obfuscating their specific grievances. The authors conclude that other framings are needed to appreciate how the Khoisan are disproportionally affected by poverty and various other socioeconomic ills.
Historian Michael Besten examines how post-apartheid history textbooks dealing with the Khoisan (‘Khoe-San’) are still plagued by colonial and apartheid-era tropes, which depict the Khoisan as ‘pre-modern, unusual, and virtually’. The work of the historian George McCall Theal (1837-1919) epitomizes this ‘colonialist-settler tradition’ and has had an enduring impact on South Africa historiography as a result. Besten sees some ‘significant changes’ in school history books beginning in the 1980s, with different terminology used to designate the Khoisan and more attention paid towards issues such as colonialization and Khoisan representation in museums. However, he concludes that many stereotypes continue to be reproduced in various works and across ideological lines. Besten emphasizes that this situation needs to be urgently addressed as it negates contemporary Khoisan identities. Other work by Besten is listed under entry no. 8, 11 and 63.

Historian Michael Besten reflects on the notion of authenticity in relation to Khoisan revivalists’ ‘self-representation’. He draws in particular on observations made while attending public events between 1996 and 2006, including tourist settings and academic conferences. Besten argues that ‘primordialist cultural stereotypes’ (e.g. wearing animal-skin headbands) are mobilized to generate (international) support for particular political agendas, thereby further entrenching them in popular imagination as features of ‘real’ Khoisan identity. However, he argues that the use of such stereotypes as aesthetic identity features in conjunction with ‘non-primordialist elements’ (e.g. elements that relate to the Khoisan’s supposed ‘colouredness’) simultaneously unsettles ‘the pervasive primordialist stereotypes which they invoke’. Other work by Besten is discussed under entry no. 8, 11 and 62.

This collection, edited by Keyan Tomaselli, details research activities that were conducted as part of the Rethinking Indigeneity project, funded by the South African National Research Foundation and the University of KwaZulu-Natal. The project investigated the relationships between ethnography, Khoisan representation, development, tourism, and socioeconomic realities on the ground. The contributions in this edited volume all speak to these themes, drawing on case studies involving San communities in the Kalahari Desert (but also in Namibia and Botswana) and, to a lesser extent, Zulu communities in the KwaZulu-Natal Province. The volume also contains various methodological and autoethnographic reflections, which focus on researcher positionality in the context of tourism studies and longitudinal ethnographic fieldwork.
Various contributors also put forward practical suggestions on how to make tourism endeavours more equitable.


John Wright and Jill Weintroub’s contribution adds to the discussions on ‘Bushman Studies’ and Khoisan representation that appeared in two pivotal issues of the journal *Critical Arts* in 2014 (see also entry no. 66, 67, 68, 69 and 70). As the title of their piece suggests, Wright and Weintroub single out what they see as the problem underlying ‘Bushman Studies’ as an intellectual field of enquiry, namely that it has not managed to break with its past to a sufficient degree. After a succinct historical account of how Khoisan representation informed Khoisan studies, they conclude that it is only since the 1980s and 1990s that scholarly work began to deconstruct images of the ‘Bushmen’ as ‘ethnic oddities’ practicing a pristine hunter-gatherer lifestyle that is fated to perish.


Introducing a two-part special issue published in the journal *Critical Arts* in 2014 on San Representation, the late Michael Wessels sketches an overview of the field, which includes both studies of how the San have been represented by others, as well as how they have represented themselves. Wessels traces the earliest relevant works in this regard to the 1980s, when a ‘critical and self-reflexive turn in the study of San ethnography, culture and representation’ is apparent. He then discusses the various contributions in the special issue – many of which are included in this annotated bibliography (see entry no. 65, 67, 68, 69 and 70) — and shows how various pressures are being placed on the field to take other topics into account and conduct research in a different manner. Key in this regard are Khoisan identity politics. Wessels explains how the journal *Critical Arts* has sought to be a conduit for such debates, trying to promote international comparisons, contemporary appraisals of Khoisan identity and more equitable research partnerships in particular.


Nayasha Mboti discusses the visual art of the late Vetkat Regopstaan Boesman Kruiper by analysing various illustrations and critically engaging the debate on Khoisan representation. Visual art among the Khoisan is not limited to (ancient) rock art, but constitutes a contemporary endeavour. And yet, according to Mboti, not everything produced by the San should automatically be regarded as ‘art’ because of the ‘glass-case effect’, a term with which he refers to the framing of the Khoisan as essentialized subjects embodying a specific ‘meaning’ for academics to ‘fix, control and manage’ as ‘exhibition material’. By discussing Vetkat’s stylistic choices, the materials he uses, and
the themes his work broaches, Mboti concludes that it resists and subverts the ‘glass-case effect’ by critiquing notions of ‘display’ and ‘container’, as well as the popular belief that the Khoisan are a vanished/vanishing people. Rather, Vetkat’s art is a way of ‘authoring citizenship’ by simultaneously affirming and refuting certain popular ideas about the Khoisan, as well as embracing both the loss and continuity inherent in Khoisan identity.


Keyan Tomaselli makes a plea for increased ‘trans-disciplinary collaboration’, discerning particular potential in the field of ‘Bushmen Studies’ (or San/Khoisan studies), which he argues some of his opponents feel is inappropriate in a post-apartheid setting. Reflecting on a recent Khoisan conference, which was attended by people from various disciplinary backgrounds, Tomaselli argues against a ‘myopic disciplinary vision’. Judging from the exchanges which took place at the conference, he sees more potential in a holistic enquiry that takes multiple (and at times contradictory) perspectives into account. This, Tomaselli argues, allows for a more in-depth understanding of a phenomenon. One of the things still standing in the way of such transdisciplinary collaborations is greater inclusion of the Khoisan as research agents. Finally, a distinct field of Khoisan Studies could act as a powerful bulwark against other spheres of society where the Khoisan are being excluded, perhaps due to the widespread belief that they are virtually extinction today.


Keyan Tomaselli draws on his long-term experience of conducting ethnographic fieldwork among San communities in the Kalahari Desert and filing grant applications at the University of KwaZulu-Natal to critically assess the notion of ‘indigenous knowledge’ and ‘intellectual property rights’. While Tomaselli acknowledges that these instruments have been conceived to prevent the unethical extraction of data and knowledge, he argues that they complicate research encounters that might benefit indigenous communities. He also finds that legal frameworks tend to negate complexities and contradictions on the ground. Tomaselli argues that the problem partially arises from overstretching the notion of indigenous knowledge, whereby every type of data-exchange that does not follow a legal framework can be cast as unethical. He also critically interrogates the notion of ‘ownership’ of stories, arguing that these are often dynamically shaped and adapted through collective oral transmission, not ‘frozen’ and exchanged by individuals under a legal framework. Establishing the origins of such ‘knowledges’ or stories is also not a straightforward task. Finally, Tomaselli asks who owns fieldwork notes in this context?

Anthropologist William Ellis reflects on the relationship between notions of ‘authenticity’ and methodology in Khoisan studies, focusing on the Bushmen in particular. Ellis concludes that the search for authenticity ultimately fails. Reviewing theoretical approaches to authenticity, the author turns the gaze back on the researcher. He argues that the preoccupation with authenticity is rooted in a modernist nostalgia. Taking the Kalahari Desert as a case study – an area ‘overrun with researchers from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds’ — Ellis claims that anthropologists often do not seek to study the ‘real’ Bushmen (which do not ‘exist’ as culturally pure subjects anyway), but its ‘representational category’: ‘anthropologists can only recover fragments of the original’ and cannot escape ‘simulacral failure’. Many informants moreover ‘refuse to be represented’ and disengage from anthropology and anthropologists. Ellis shows how they practice agency through their ‘withholding’, given the entanglement of Khoisan representation with Khoisan politics, tourism, and socioeconomic development.


Hylton Howard Arnolds investigates the increasingly popular *rieldans* – a dance with strong Khoisan roots — dance competitions hosted by the *Afrikaanse Taal en Kultuurvereniging* [Afrikaans Language and Culture Society] since 2006. Drawing mostly on ethnographic fieldwork, Arnolds discusses the origins of the *rieldans*, as well as people such as Elias Nel who were key to its revival and how they came to partner-up with the ATKV. He also analyses why people are interested in *rieldans* (dance competitions), concluding that it generates ‘a sense of belonging and group identity… by linking the present to the past in a celebratory mood’. Arnolds argues that the annual ATKV-sponsored competitions can therefore address feelings of marginalization experienced by ‘Coloureds’ and help re-instate a ‘threatened cultural heritage’. The author also reflects at some length on the competition’s tourism potential.


Sociolinguists Justin Brown and Ana Deumert analyse Cape Town-based Khoisan activists’ language activism by drawing on a wide range of sources, most of which were collected through ethnographic fieldwork. Brown and Deumert begin with a brief historical overview of the ‘Khoisan resurgence’, touching on various intellectual and cultural influences. The authors then discuss the revival of the Khoisan language Nama (or *Khoekhoe*), as well as efforts to redefine and imagine Afrikaans as a language with strong Khoisan roots, using the hip-hopera *Afrikaaps* as a case study (See also entry no. 27, 74, and 79). Brown and Deumert show how these two types of language activism
stem from the same ‘deep-seated desire for an identity’. Purity, in-depth knowledge or fluency are not key to this process. Rather, as an example of ‘heteroglossic language revitalization’, Khoisan activists exercise their ‘creative agency’ by combining various linguistic and aesthetic resources without imposing strict boundaries. Crucially, Brown and Deumert show how this does not diminish ‘linguistic authenticity’, but rather makes Khoisan activism more appealing to potential followers.


Drawing on various examples, some from the 1990s, others the 2010s (particularly the destruction of a bench depicting Krotoa, a 17th century Khoisan interpreter and mediator), Duane Jethro argues that Khoisan revivalism should be understood as a religious and ritualistic ‘act of recovery’. The author casts colonialism as ‘a project of ruination’ with devastating impact on Khoisan heritage and life. However, as the destruction is never total, ‘ruination allows for creative processes of remaking’. Khoisan revivalists have undertaken such creative processes since the 1990s, operating through ‘civic organizations’, a particular indigenous aesthetic, and ‘reinvented religious rituals’. Jethro shows how Khoisan revivalists are not the only ones contesting Khoisan heritage and engaging in the politics of belonging. The South African state is equally involved, albeit for purposes of national identity formation, which do not always align with the motivations of Khoisan revivalists.


Anthropologist Heike Becker analyses the politics and visual and musical aesthetics embodied in the ‘hip-hopera’ Afrikaaps, a 2010 play involving Khoisan activists from Cape Town and the Western Cape Province (see also entry no. 27, 72 and 79). Drawing on interviews, a 2011 documentary about Afrikaaps, and other data, Becker argues that Afrikaaps should be understood as a South African postcolonial heritage project, whereby ‘Coloureds’ and their purportedly ‘non-standard’ way of speaking Afrikaans in Cape Town are the main protagonists. Afrikaaps subverts popular understandings of Afrikaans as a European language/’the language of the oppressor’ by ‘reclaiming’ it as a creole language with various Asian and African roots. And yet, the Khoisan origins of Afrikaans are foregrounded in the play’s historical representations, leading Becker to conclude that Afrikaaps also paradoxically flirts with notions of cultural essentialism and identity politics.

Anthropologist Itunu Bodunrin analyses hip hop culture and ‘practices of language digitization’ among the !Xun and Khwe Khoisan subgroups in Platfontein, Northern Cape Province. The paper draws on the author’s fieldwork among the !Xun and Khwe youths between 2013 and 2018 (see also entry no. 24 and 78). After introducing the case of Platfontein, which is where the so-called ‘Schmidstdrift Bushmen’ were relocated to in 2004 (see entry no. 24, 31, 46, 74 and 78), Bodunrin shows in ethnographic detail how through producing hip hop music, his informants ‘digitize, preserve and strengthen’ their ‘endangered’ indigenous languages and cultures, participate in a ‘global culture’, as well as ‘influence and negotiate their restrictive urban spaces’. He also lays bare intergenerational differences in terms of relating to indigenous culture. Bodunrin concludes that hip hop and social media have ‘decolonial’ features, as they allow the !Xun and Khwe to exercise their agency and reinterpret notions of indigeneity and indigenous identity from ‘the bottom-up’. They are ways of adapting ancestral storytelling practices to the current era, highlighting the ‘complexities of being indigenous in late modern times’.


Shanade Barnabas and Anna-Marie Jansen van Vuuren critically review the South African made and internationally acclaimed biopic *Krotoa* (2017), which centres on Krotoa, a 17th century Khoisan woman who mediated and interpreted for Dutch colonialists. Krotoa’s story has been told countless times, mostly by relying on scant and heavily Eurocentric archival records. The authors show how *Krotoa* is in many ways exemplary of broader shifts in post-apartheid representation as it presents the protagonist as a strong women exercising her agency. And yet, it fails to depict precolonial Khoisan life in detail and sticks in many ways to stereotypical representations. Barnabas and Jansen van Vuuren especially lament the movie’s subliminal and gendered emphasis on nation-building and reconciliation (i.e. Krotoa as ‘a heroic foremother of Afrikaans-speaking South Africa’) as it detracts from showing colonial violence and ‘the nuances of power, oppression and perseverance foundational to Krotoa’s life story’.


Anthropologist Julie Grant critically surveys Khoisan representation at the ‘Origins Centre’, a museum founded at the University of the Witwatersrand in 2006. While the name of the museum suggests a focus on the origins of humankind, the majority of the displays deal with rock art and San traditions – although some materials on Khoi and Bantu-speaking groups are also on show. Grant lays bare various instances where she deems the Origins Centre has fallen short, despite having noble intentions and succeeding in several important respects to break with the past: it does not position itself adequately in the fraught and exploitative history of Khoisan representation and racist science (of which the university hosting the museum also took part in); it implies that the Khoisan no longer exist in South Africa; and reifies a depiction of the Khoisan as
living fossils. The Origins Centre consulted with various Khoisan communities, but Grant argues that these consultations should have involved a more diverse group (including Khoisan revivalists) and brought more tangible benefits to such communities.


Anthropologist Itunu Bodunrin builds on his earlier work on the !Xun and Khwe Khoisan subgroups in Platfontein in the Northern Cape Province (see entry no. 24 and 75). Drawing on data collected during ethnographic fieldwork in the area between 2014 and 2018, the author explores how youths in Platfontein deal with their socioeconomic marginalization, appropriate modern popular cultures (such as hip hop and social media), and critically engage with Khoisan stereotypes that are thrust upon them to shape their identities and express a sense of political activism. In exercising their creative agency in this way, they generate a locally meaningful sense of urban indigeneity and lay bare instances of ‘modern acculturation’, which research operating with the image of the Khoisan as passive pristine hunter-gatherers seldom accounts for. This happens in the virtual absence of traditional culture, which leads Bodunrin to conclude that his informants seek to present themselves as ‘distinct but modern people’ in a rapidly changing world.


This article theorizes how a group of Cape Town-based language activists critique and disrupt the ‘white settler colonial’ ‘language-race-land complex’ underpinning the discourse on ‘Coloured’ identity and the Afrikaans language. The authors focus on long-term engagements with the ‘verbal art, aesthetics, and performances of South African hip hop artists’ (one of whom is included as a co-author and ‘cultural theorist’ in the text), as well as the 2010 hip-hopera Afrikaaps, which highlights the African/Khoisan roots of Afrikaans, particularly through the supposedly ‘substandard’ form spoken by ‘Coloureds’ in Cape Town (see entry no. 27, 72 and 74). By reinventing the relationship between language, race, and land, hip hop artists pursue decolonial futures and raise consciousness in their communities surrounding ‘indigenous knowledge systems’. The authors conclude that the artists thus move beyond a politics of reconciliation and highlight the necessity of expedited land reform and overall ‘redistribution and reorganization’.
In *Khoisan Consciousness: An Ethnography of Emic Histories and Indigenous Revivalism in Post-Apartheid Cape Town*, anthropologist and historian Rafael Verbuyst investigates why and how increasing numbers of people are identifying as Khoisan and engaging with the Khoisan past. In Chapter Two, the author details a ‘Khoisan extinction discourse’ by drawing on the insights of various others scholars and surveying Khoisan representation across colonialism and apartheid. Khoisan revivalism constitutes an assertion of agency as it refutes the idea that the Khoisan and their culture are extinct. Chapter Six in particular contains various examples of Khoisan revivalists asserting the vibrancy of their culture and adapting it in innovative ways. Verbuyst offers a theoretical interpretation of these dynamics in Chapter Seven. He argues that many Khoisan revivalists simultaneously reject, appropriate and disregard the Khoisan extinction discourse, thereby giving shape to a ‘subversive authenticity’ because it subverts the boundaries of what that authenticity ought to look like. What is most ‘authentic’ to Khoisan revivalists is that which is most effective in advancing their revivalism, not that which adheres or does not adhere to top-down conceptions of authenticity. Other aspects of *Khoisan Consciousness* are discussed in entry no. 30 and 50.