

**IMPACT EVALUATION OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES FOR  
THE SAN COMMUNITY IN OMAHEKE AND OHANGWENA REGIONS**

A research paper submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Public Policy and Administration

Of

The University of Namibia (UNAM)

Faculty of Economics and Management Science Department of

Political and Administrative Studies

And

The Institute of Social Studies (ISS)

By

Mr. THOBIAAS T. THOBIAAS

April 2007

Supervisors: Dr. V. Winterfeldt (UNAM)

Prof. J. Bjorkman (ISS)

## **ABSTRACT**

The study focused on the San community which is the most marginalised ethnic group in Namibia to establish their current economic status.

The study sought to assess the effectiveness and impact of the poverty alleviation policies and programmes that are in place to respond to the plight of the poor, specifically the San.

Primary data was collected in Omaheke and Ohangwena regions through structured questionnaires or interview guides, and field observations. Secondary data was collected from existing literature and research done on poverty in Namibia by organisations like Legal Assistance Centre (LAC) and the National Planning Commission (NPC). The target groups interviewed were the San, three NGOs, namely, WIMSA, LAC, NRCS and five government offices Ministries of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development (MLGHRD), Health and Social Services (MOHSS), Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW), Emergency Management Unit (EMU) in the Office of the Prime Minister, and the National Planning Commission (NPC).

Research findings indicate that the socio-economic status of the San community has shown little improvement since 1995. Hence, the majority is still marginalised, vulnerable and the dependency cycle continues.

Most of the San community in Namibia finds it difficult to adapt to changing society and they lack productive resources relative to other tribes.

The study concludes with recommendations based on the findings that there is a need for effective coordination amongst the government, private sector and Non-Governmental

Organisations (NGOs) to avoid duplication and ensure that poverty alleviation programmes directed towards the San reach all of them across the country.

## CONTENTS

<b>ITEM</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>Chapter 1: Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	1-5
1.2 Statement of the problem	5-14
1.3 Objectives of the study	14-15
➤ Significance of Research	15
1.4 Literature Review	16-28
1.5 Methodology	28
➤ Data Collection	28-29
➤ Limitation of Research	30
➤ Data Analysis	30
➤ Reasons for Choosing Omaheke and Ohangwena	31
 <b>Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework</b>	 <b>32</b>
2.1. Introduction	32
2.2. Education and Social Exclusion	32-33
2.3. Impact Evaluation Concept	33-36
2.4 Indicators of poverty and Criteria for Measuring Poverty	36-40

<b>Chapter 3: Overview of Poverty Alleviation Programmes and Policies in Namibia</b>	41
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Policies and Programmes on Poverty Reduction in Namibia	41-42
3.2.1 SWAPO Party Manifesto	42
3.2.2 Vision 2030	43-44
3.2.3 Transport and Manufacturing Policies	44-45
3.2.4 Education	45-46
3.2.5 National Population Policies for Sustainable Development	46-47
3.2.6 The National Agricultural Research Plan	47
3.2.7 Affirmative Action Loan Scheme	47-49
3.2.8 Labour-Based Works	50
3.2.9 Grant-Based Transfers	50-51
3. 2.10 Decentralisation	51-52
<b>Chapter 4: Research Findings</b>	53
4.1 Introduction	53
4.2 Government Offices/Ministries/Agencies	53-58
4.3 San Community in Ohangwena Region	58-59
4.4 San Community in Omaheke Region	59-61
4.5 The Role of the NGOs in poverty alleviation	61-64

<b>Chapter 5: Assessment of the Impact of Poverty Alleviation</b>	
<b>Programmes in Namibia</b>	65
5.1 Introduction	65
5.2 Policies and Programmes targeting the poor	65-67
5.3 Effectiveness of poverty alleviation programmes	67-68
5.4 Funding	68-69
<b>Chapter 6: Conclusion and Recommendations</b>	70
6.1 Conclusion	70-71
6.2 Recommendations	72-73
<b>LIST OF REFERENCES</b>	74-78
<b>INTERVIEW GUIDE (ANNEXURE A)</b>	79-86
<b>LIST OF INTERVIEWEES (ANNEXURE B)</b>	87-89
<b>PICTURES (ANNEXURE C)</b>	90

**LIST OF TABLES**

Table 1.1: San population by area in Namibia	7
Table 1.2: San in schools in 1994 and 1998	8
Table 1.3: Key socio-economic indices by language group- 1998	9
Table 1.4: Selected Human Indices for Namibia by Language	11
Table 3.1: Affirmative Action Loan Scheme: Full-time Farmers 1992-2001	49
Table 3.2: Affirmative Action Loan Scheme: Part-time Farmers 1992-2002	49

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to thank God Almighty for blessing me with the wisdom and strength to undertake this noble task. My sincere gratitude also goes out to Dr. V. Winterfeldt and Prof. J. Bjorkman, my first and second supervisors respectively, for their time and guidance.

My thanks further goes to UNAM/ISS Management for the opportunity and programme put in place which granted me the opportunity to pursue this degree.

I am also grateful to my late father Mr. Abner Thobias who passed-away in February 2006 for the support and inspiration. My family, especially my mother, for the continuous support and motivation. Special thanks go to my brother and friend, Mr. Ludwig Oubaas Musati. Thanks for believing in me.

Finally, the typing of this paper was not going to be complete without the assistance of my colleague and friend, Ms. Esther Rugam, I'm indebted to you.

**DECLARATION**

I Tobias Tuyen Tobias, hereby declare that this dissertation is the result of my own investigation and research and has not been submitted in any part to any other University

.....  
SIGNATURE

.....  
DATE

**ACRONYMS**

AALS – Affirmative Action Loan Scheme

BIG - Basic Income Grant

CCPB – Child Care and Protection Bill

CDC – Centre for Disease Control

EMU – Emergency Management Unit

EWS – Early Warning System

FAO – Food and Agriculture Organisation

HIV/AIDS – Human Immune Virus/ Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome

HPI – Human Poverty Index

LAC - Legal Assistance Centre

LARRI – Labour Research Resource Institute

MDG – Millennium Development Goals

MGECW – Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare

MLGHRD – Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development

MOE – Ministry of Education

MOHSS – Ministry of Health and Social Services

MP – Member of Parliament

NDP – National Development Programme

NGO - Non- Governmental Organisation

NHIES – National Housing Income and Expenditure Survey

NIED – National Institute for Education Development

NNF – Namibia Nature Foundation

NPC – National Planning Commission

NPRAP – National Poverty Reduction Action Programme

NRCS – Namibia Red Cross Society

OMA – Offices, Ministries and Agencies

PMO – Prime Minister Office

PRS – Poverty Reduction Strategy

PTE – Programme Theory Evaluation

SADC – Southern African Development Community

SWAPO – South West Africa People’s Organisation

UNDP – United Nations Development Programme

UNICEF – United Nations International Children’s Fund

VSO – Voluntary Services Overseas

WIMSA – Working Group for Indigenous Minority in Southern Africa

## **CHAPTER 1**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Introduction**

This study seeks to review the current poverty alleviation programmes in Namibia and their impact on the poor concentrating on the San community.

Chapter 11 of the Namibian Constitution contains principles on social welfare. Article 95 of the Namibian Constitution deals with the Promotion of the Welfare of its people and states that the State shall actively promote and maintain the welfare of the people by adopting, inter alia, policies aimed at:

*“ensurance that senior citizens are entitled to and do receive a regular pension adequate for the maintenance of decent standard of living and the enjoyment of social and cultural opportunities.*

*enactment of legislation to ensure that the unemployed, the incapacitated, the indigent and the disadvantaged are accorded such social benefits and amenities as are determined by Parliament to be just and affordable with due regard to the resources of the State”.*

Similarly, Namibia is signatory to several United Nations (UN) covenants and conventions in which the rights of indigenous people are addressed indirectly, and which the San could use to lobby for their interest. These are amongst others the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights; and the International Convention on Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination. The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights makes provisions for people to “freely pursue their economic and social development and to freely dispose of their natural wealth and resources” (Roulet 1999: 83).

More significant from the San perspective is Article 27 of this Covenant, which guarantees the right of ethnic minorities to enjoy their own culture, religion or use own language.

Moreover, Namibia’s Vision 2030 (2004) report alludes to the provisions in the Constitution. It envisions that poverty by 2030 is reduced to the minimum, while the pattern of income distribution and access to services is equitable, disparity is at the minimum, there is an intensification of employment creation and HIV/AIDS infection is reduced.

In this respect, the Government of Namibia has since independence put in place various redistributive policies aimed at bridging the gap between the rich and the poor in its poverty reduction efforts. Prominent among these are Social Transfers such as a pension scheme for the elders, the Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS) and Land Reform aimed at improving the economic status and well-being of the previously disadvantaged

groups. Policies such as investment in primary education, rural infrastructure, and access to productive assets like credit and land were put in place to increase income generating opportunities for the poor and break the vicious cycle of poverty (Poverty Bulletin 2005).

As stated by Armatya Sen (quoted by Chen 1990), the overarching goal of development is to maximize people's capabilities; their abilities to lead a better life.

AALS was meant to partly address the socio-economic inequalities and Namibian history of discrimination by making land available to the previously disadvantaged population.

Sixteen years after independence, however, the scheme still has not resolved the land issue as the majority of commercial farms remain in the hands of white farmers.

Namibians won freedom of political emancipation and national liberation but the bulk of the poor remains in the absence of transformation of economic ownership and control. The struggle to overcome inequalities, poverty and unemployment, while ensuring that the economy is diversified and internationally competitive, has generated distinct sets of winners and losers. A small group of black elites (winners) are much better off than the majority blacks (losers) in the country.

The rate of unemployment in Namibia stands at 34% and poses a great challenge for the government (Bank of Namibia Annual Report, 2005). About 54% of the population aged 15 years and above are part of the labour market in Namibia but not all these individuals are employed.

The burden of poverty is exacerbated by the limited number of well-schooled Namibians.

One-fifth of the population of school-going age and above has never attended school in rural areas compared to 8% in urban areas. About two-thirds or 70 per cent of Namibians live in rural areas according to the 2001 Population and Housing Census.

At independence people in Namibia anticipated that more employment opportunities and better living standards would occur. However, the pre-independence expectation amongst black people remains largely unfulfilled as the Namibian economy fails to sustain adequate levels of growth (Klerck 2002:17).

The 2005 resource book on the introduction of the Basic Income Grant (BIG) in Namibia presents the welfare situation of the country. Empirical evidence also shows that poverty and inequality in Namibia are evident right at the periphery (shacks and informal houses) of the capital city, Windhoek.

On the other hand, Namibia in the near future confronts a difficult dilemma due to the limitation of its agricultural resource base, and maturity of the mining sector. This makes it hard on how the country can thrive unless it successfully develops some new, non-resource-based niches in which it can be competitive in the regional and global marketplace. Similarly, the initial base is too small for manufacturing to have an immediate impact on poverty. Hence, for the short- and medium term, Namibia will have to rely on multitude of income generation and safety nets initiatives from a diverse variety of segments of the of the economy, both private and public.

## **1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

Empirical evidence indicates that the level of poverty in Namibia continues to escalate. Continued deprivation and inequality of a number of Namibians remain socially indefensible and economically inefficient. According to the *Namibia Poverty Bulletin* (2005), there are wide disparities in infrastructural development between the impoverished northern parts of the country where the majority of the population lives, and urban areas. Similarly, quality education and health services are poor in rural areas of Namibia. The Namibia Demographic and Health Survey (2000) show that about one-quarter of households live within 10 kilometres of a government health facility.

Partly a legacy of the country's colonial past, Namibia represents a typical dual economy where abject poverty exists alongside extremes of wealth. The income

distribution in the country remains highly unequal, showing huge discrepancies with a Gini coefficient of 0.6. This is despite the fact that the figures from the recent survey shows that Namibia has improved from 0.7 to 0.6 (NHIES 2003/4).

Regarding the target group (San) of the study, observation indicates evidence of marginalisation among them. According to Suzman (2001), Southern Africa's San population is made up of diverse self-identifying groups which, being indigenous to the region, shared a distinct and identifiable cultural "deep structure" that most commonly manifests in language, social organization, economic activity, religion and historical experience. There is no collective regional label for the various peoples known at one time as the "San", "Bushmen", "Basarwa", "Ovakwankaala", or "Ovakuruha". San groups have traditionally identified themselves according to individual group labels and languages such as "Ju/'hoansi", "Naron" or "Bugakxoe". Contemporary San population belongs to three major language groups, generally classified as northern, central and southern languages (Suzman 2001:3).

The San community makes up 4 229 households which is 1.2 % and 33 000 of the total Namibian population (2001 Namibia Population Census). Table 1 presents the location of San community in Namibia:

Table 1.1: San populations by area -1971 to 1991

ENUMERATION AREA	# SAN 1991	# 1981	# 1971
Commercial farming areas			
Omaheke (Gobabis District)	4132	4837	5212
Otjozondjupa (Grootfontein District)	3878	4461	3815
Outjo District	487	1827	1347
Oshikoto (Tsumeb District)	3838	3506	3888
Otjiwarongo District	291	444	0
Other commercial districts	295	844	890
<i>Total San population in commercial farming areas</i>	(47.5%) 12921	15908	15152
Communal areas (San majority)			
Tsumwke District (former East Bushmanland)	3350	2245	459
Eastern Kavango and West Caprivi	3471	2 7384	92
<i>Total San in communal area majority populations</i>	(25%) 6 821	4983	551
Communal areas (San minority)			
Ohangwena Region	1684	2790	1814
Otjozondjupa (former Hereroland West)	654	627	219
Kavango	2434	2672	3778
Omaheke (former Hereroland East)	2431	1734	711
<i>Total San in communal area minority populations</i>	(26.5%) 7203	7823	6522
Other communal areas	284	727	561
<b>TOTAL SAN IN COMMUNAL AREAS</b>	<b>7487</b>	<b>8550</b>	<b>7083</b>
Other areas (urban, etc.)	284	0	0
<b>TOTAL SAN POPULATION</b>	<b>27 229</b>	<b>29 441</b>	<b>22 786</b>

Source: Marais 1984; CSO 1994 (1991 census data)

The standard indices indicate that the San are the least healthy people in Namibia with an average life expectancy of 48 years. The most pervasive illness of the San is Tuberculosis (TB). The diseases that affect them are attributed to extreme levels of poverty and food insecurity (UNDP 1999).

According to the UNDP Human Development Report for Namibia (quoted by Suzman 2001), the San lack formal education. Adult literacy levels are at 16% and fewer than one in five San of school-going age currently attend school. Similarly, San school drop-out rates remain very high and only 1% of San who have enrolled for Grade 1 has

proceeded to senior education level. Table 1.2 below show the school enrolment amongst the San for 1994 and 1998

**Table 1.2: San in schools in 1994 and 1998**

Year	Lower Primary	Upper Primary	Junior Secondary	Senior Secondary	Total
1994	1707	279	54	10	2100
1998	2723	803	193	19	3526

Sources: EMIS

Suzman (2002) further states that Namibia's San community is landless, relatively impoverished underclass and depends on a range of opportunist economic strategies to survive. In the 1990s, they were worse-off than any other language group in Namibia across a spectrum of human development indices. There is a clear link between an individual's identification as a San and a marginal social and economic status. Between 17 000 and 22 000 San currently depend on food aid (Suzman 2002). Table 1.3 below compares the socio-economic status of the San with other tribes in Namibia.

**Table 1.3: Key socio-economic indices by language group - 1998**  
**Source: UNDP 1998**

Language group	Life expectancy	Life Expectancy Index	Literacy %	School enrolment	Education Index	Income N\$	Income index
Afrikaans	67.2	.703	91	91	.91	13995	.960
Damara/Na	56.6	.560	63	80	.687	2404	.57
English	66.9	.698	97	93	.957	21708	.965
German	75	.833	100	92	.973	30 459	.986
Oshiwambo	61.3	.605	64	91	.73	1707	.386
Otjiherero	64.1	.652	58	77	.643	3077	.747
Rukavango	55.9	.515	56	81	.643	1652	.372
San	48.1	.385	23	21	.223	1315	.283
Silози	56.6	.527	73	86	.773	1692	.382
Setswana	61.7	.612	70	81	.737	5326	.909
Namibia whole	61	.609	66	83	.717	3608	.887

According to Suzman (2002: 130), San in Namibia are marked by:

- “an almost universal lack of de jure land rights or equitable access to natural resources
- extreme poverty and dependence on welfare programmes, food aid, piecemeal labour and begging
- very low level of basic literacy and numeracy compounded by poor school attendance and high drop out rates

- poor basic health care, squalid living conditions, a high incidence of social ( in particular alcohol related) problems and life expectancy considerable lower than national averages
- weak representation in political structures, or administrative structures and limited capacity to advocate their own interest at national, regional or local level
- a sense of extreme social and political alienation from the mainstream compounded by social discrimination and prejudice”.

Despite some improvements in the living conditions of the Namibian people in general, the San community remains at the bottom of society being its most vulnerable group (Suzman 2001: 6). This is illustrated by table 1.4. They provide cheap labour, especially in the agricultural sector.

**Table 1.4: Select Human Poverty Indices for Namibia by Language Group**

Language Group	Non-survival up to 40	Illiteracy	Population without safe water	No health facilities	Nutrition, water and health	Over 80% income on food
Afrikaans	11.9	3.9	0.3	25.0	8.4	0.9
Lozi	27.0	20.1	11.5	45.0	18.8	5.2
English	12.4	1.4	0.0	10.0	3.3	0.0
German	3.8	0.6	0.0	29.0	9.7	0.0
Damara>Nama	24.1	28.9	1.9	51.0	17.6	8.6
Oshivambo	20.1	17.2	29.4	50.0	26.5	7.8
Otjiherero	16.2	27.7	5.6	55.0	20.2	16.5
Rukavango	28.1	27.2	38.3	35.0	24.4	19.5
San	40.2	84.0	10.4	36.0	32.1	28.7
Tswana	19.5	19.0	2.1	38.0	13.4	0.0

**Source:** UNDP Human Development Report 2000.

In Ohangwena Region, for instance, the San-speaking people were considered particularly vulnerable, because they lack productive resources and have difficulties to adapt to the monetized economy. Since law prohibits hunting, their livelihood totally depends on the availability of wild fruits, crafts and working on other people's farms during the rainy season, thereby depending on good rains and other people's need for their labour.

The process of identifying San as a social category or class is highly problematic, not least because many of the people who we now consider and who consider themselves to be San did not share a common identity in the past. The category "San" or "Bushman" was in fact imposed from outside on the diverse indigenous inhabitants of southern Africa following the in-migration of pastoralist and agrarian Bantu-speaking societies, and later white colonials (Suzman 2001:2).

According to Suzman (2001), San identity is fluid and highly context-bound in its definition. The groups which currently identify themselves as San characteristically speak either Khoe or San languages, depended until recently on hunting and gathering as their primary mode of subsistence, and share a common deep structure. Most critically though, what they have in common is that they were constituted by other groups, both black and white, as belonging to a distinct class or race. Thus, while some groups are incontrovertibly San in terms of self-definition and definition by others, there are other groups for whom application of this label is less straightforward.

According to the Namibian Household Income and Expenditure Survey (NHIES) Report (2003/2004), the gap between the rich and the poor is set to widen even further in the near future. In a country as sparsely populated as Namibia with the population set to rise just over 2 million, the gap between the rich and the poor might not appear to pose an insuperable challenge, but the interplay of natural resource led growth, sparse population, geographical remoteness from other markets, and the peculiar dynamics of

apartheid economy together have led to the emergence of a formal economy with very limited employment generating potential (Technical Paper for Preparation of Poverty Reduction Strategy for Namibia 1997).

Finally, limited growth in the formal labour sector force means that conditions of the labour market deteriorate for the more vulnerable sectors of society. Unless Namibia can identify and implement a workable strategy to reduce poverty, increased population pressure in the northern regions could cause a rise in rural distress, accelerated migration, rising stress on urban infrastructure, and growing urban dysfunction.

In order to carry out an exploratory study on the impact of poverty alleviation programmes in Namibia, the central question will be: **What impact has the current poverty reduction policies and other empowerment programmes in Namibia on the poor, particularly the San community?**

The sub-research questions are:

- Which policies and programmes currently target the welfare of the poor in Namibia?
- What are the current sources of social funding in Namibia?
- How effective have poverty alleviation programmes been since independence?

Effectiveness refers to an output of specific reviews that measure the achievement of a specific goal or degree to which an institution can be expected to achieve specific

requirements. It is different from efficiency, which is measured by the volume of output or input used. Effectiveness is further defined as a measure of the extent to which a specific intervention, procedure, regimen, or service, when deployed in the field in routine circumstances, does what it is intended to do for a specified population ([www.qualityresearchinternational.com](http://www.qualityresearchinternational.com)).

As a primary measure or criteria for the success of the poverty programmes implemented by the Government clear indicators and evidence with respect to the San basic needs like food security, water and shelter; education levels, health status, ownership of assets such as land, livestock, vehicles etc should be observed.

### **1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The objectives are:

1. To summarize the current situation and policy responses to poverty reduction in Namibia.
2. To examine and assess the current legislative framework on poverty reduction strategies in Namibia.
3. To conduct a study on the San community in Omaheke and Ohangwena Regions and the impact of poverty alleviation programmes on them.

**Significance of the Study**

Poverty alleviation is not a new topic but still attracts interest because of rising trends of poverty and marginalization of communities in the world. The United Nations (UN) Millennium Goals bear testimony to this as their first goal is aimed at eradicating poverty.

Namibia is no exception as the socio-economic status of the previously disadvantaged people lags considerably behind.

One may argue that poverty situation in Namibia is not as extreme as in other developing countries in Africa. However, the concerns expressed by the Namibian government in the media and public statements of political leaders show that there is a need to take measures aimed at alleviating poverty amongst vulnerable communities like the San.

This study will give guidelines of the measures government or stakeholders may take to assist the San community. The benefit to be derived from this study will, therefore, contribute or give direction to stakeholders in Namibia to make informed and intelligent decision in addressing the social plight of the poor.

## 1.4 LITERATURE REVIEW

The condition of poverty is complex and cannot be thought of as a simple problem with a simple solution. Race, gender, familial status, age, and place of residence are some but not all of the characteristics that enhance the risk of living in poverty. Measuring poverty is difficult because poverty is a complex issue (Atkinson 1989:198).

One of the few points of agreement in the international academic debate on poverty is that poverty is a contested concept; but it is contested with good reason. Arguments over how poverty should be conceptualized and defined go beyond semantics and academics (Paper on Conceptualizing, Defining and Measuring Poverty 2004). It is therefore vital that the concept and definition of poverty, as well as being theoretically robust, is appropriate to the society to which it is to be applied. A definition of absolute poverty was given at the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen (1995) as follows: *“a condition characterized by severe deprivation of basic needs, including food, safe drinking water, sanitation facilities, health, shelter, education and information. It depends not only on income but also on access to social services”*.

On the other hand, relative poverty is defined directly in relation to income distribution in a particular society in addition to taking in account basic needs. It interprets poverty in relation to prevailing living standards of a given society and stresses economic

inequality as the primary indicator of poverty (Poverty Monitoring Workshop Report 2004).

Furthermore, poverty according to Sen (as quoted by Mufune & Mulinge 2003:362) can also be defined in relation to social exclusion. It stems from the idea to fully take part in the society's affairs due to lack of capabilities and entitlements and not simply material possessions. It is quite a prescriptive concept which indicates an unacceptable state of affairs where people become poor, excluded and marginalised.

Lesetedi (2003) also states that poverty is the most widespread and long-standing problem facing governments and populations throughout the world. It is a complex, persistent and multifaceted problem, which governments and policy makers grappled with for many decades. Lesetedi (2003) further state that the concept of poverty can be defined in various ways depending on the approach and purpose to which the information is put. Poverty may include material deprivation, that is, low income and consumption levels, as well as lack of access and control over productive assets. Vulnerability to natural disasters like floods and famine and economic phenomena such as inflation are further characteristics of poverty. Simply put, poverty refers to a basic lack of the means of survival, inability of a person to feed and clothe him or herself properly and death as a consequence. Within the African context most governments have had poverty eradication on their development agenda since independence, yet the proportion of those living under poverty continues to rise.

In addition to Lesetedi, Rankhumise (2003) reiterates that poverty can be conceptualised as a point of social and economic relations such as deprivation or food insecurity, or it can be seen as a failure to acquire the means of sustenance, pointing to a causal mechanism through which poverty is reproduced. Poverty reduction strategies can be put on a continuum from livelihood protection to livelihood promotion. Poverty itself can also be put on a continuum from chronic to transient, and the interventions tallying with these range from those that deal with access to economic assets to those that are welfare transfers. This is a paradigm being used in some African countries like Malawi.

On the other hand, Macquire (2002) put emphasis on the fact that poverty strips the human spirit of two indispensable prerequisites, namely, respect and hope. Respect is the recognition that our humanity is valued, that others recognise that humanity is a shared glory and our possession of it is acknowledged. Further that living under poverty depersonalizes individuals.

According to Townsend (1979:31) as quoted by the Paper on Conceptualization, Defining and Measuring Poverty, individuals, families and groups in the population can be said to be in poverty when they lack the resources to obtain the types of diet, participate in activities and have the living conditions which are customary, or at least widely encouraged or approved, in societies to which they belong. Their resources are so

seriously below those commanded by the average family or individual that they are in effect excluded from ordinary living patterns, customs and activities.

In South Africa, poverty is conceived as characterised by the inability of individuals, households or communities to command sufficient resources to satisfy a socially acceptable minimum standard of living. Poverty is perceived by poor South Africans themselves to include alienation from the community, food insecurity, crowded homes, usage of unsafe and inefficient forms of energy, lack of jobs that are adequately paid and/or secure, and fragmentation of the family. In contrast, wealth is perceived to be characterized by good housing, the use of gas or electricity, and ownership of a major durable good such as a television set or fridge (Poverty and Inequality in South Africa Summary Report 1998).

In the SADC region, the San communities remain vulnerable and are subject to the same marginalization in terms of socio-economic, political, language, and cultural indicators.

The absence of data for each country where the San live makes it difficult to make comparisons in different countries with a qualitative framework, but available evidence suggests that their socio-economic status in each country is sufficiently similar for broad generalization. Poverty is a clear index of the status of San in the region (Suzman 2001:9).

In Namibia, according to the NHIES report (1993/94), households are defined as “relatively poor” if they devote over 60 per cent of their expenditure to food and “extremely poor” if such expenditure rises to 80 per cent or more. Based on this definition and according to the NHIES report, 47 per cent of Namibian households are relatively poor and 13 per cent were extremely poor in 1994. The San community falls in the last category (extremely poor) of all language ethnic groups in Namibia.

This according to Suzman (2001) shows that the gap between the San and other linguistic groups in the region is portrait better by the situation in Namibia. Despite the fact that San per capita income is below half of the national average, their 1998 Human Poverty Index (HPI) of 58.1 is almost three times higher than the average in Namibia.

The HPI is calculated from data covering access to safe water, illiteracy, life expectancy, proportion of income spent on food and poor living standards.

Further, poverty is not a static condition. Individuals, households or communities may be vulnerable to poverty as a result of shocks and crises and long-term trends such as racial and gender discrimination, environmental degradation and macroeconomic trends. Vulnerability to poverty is, therefore, characterized by an inability to devise an appropriate coping or management strategy in times of crisis. Poverty also involves social exclusion in either an economic dimension or a purely social dimension.

On the other hand, the definition of poverty and theories that explain it as Bradshaw (2006) states are deeply rooted in strongly held research traditions and politically values, reinforced by encompassing social, political and economic institutions that have a stake in the issue. Thus, purely objective explanation of poverty is displaced by a proliferation of socially defined issues and concerns from both liberal and conservative perspectives. Moreover, no one theory of poverty has emerged that either subsumes or invalidates the others (Blank, 1997). Explaining poverty remains a lucrative field for academics, policy makers, book publishers, and ideologues, and as a consequence the range of explanations has proliferated.

According to Bradshaw (2006), poverty in its most general sense is the lack of necessities. Basic food, shelter, medical care, and safety are generally thought necessary based on shared values of human dignity. Bradshaw (2006) reiterates further that regardless of how the science of poverty is looked at, it is essential to retain the focus on the fact that the definition of poverty and the policies addressing it are all shaped by political biases and values. This disparity make poverty research an inescapable political act. It is an exercise of power, in this case an educated elite to categorise , stigmatise, but above all to neutralise the poor and disadvantaged through analysis that obscures the political nature of social and economic inequality (Bradshaw 2006:12).

At this stage the researcher discuss poverty based on five theories of poverty in contemporary literature as considered by Bradshaw. These theories are poverty caused

by individual deficiency; poverty caused by cultural belief systems that support sub-cultures of poverty; poverty caused by economic, political, and social distortions or discrimination, poverty caused by geographical disparities; and poverty caused by cumulative and cyclical interdependencies.

### **Poverty caused by Individual Deficiency**

This first theory of poverty is a large and multifaceted set of explanations that focus on the individual as responsible for their poverty situation. Political theorists blame individuals in poverty for creating their own problems, and argue that with hard work and better choices the poor could have avoided their problems. Other variations of individual theory of poverty ascribe poverty to a lack of genetic qualities such as intelligence that are not easily reversed (Bradshaw, 2006:6).

Community development practice, embedded in decades of welfare and social policy, deals with programmes aiming to remedy poverty based on individual deficiency theories. Explicitly or implicitly, individual deficiencies have been an easy policy approach not always carefully explored as they get implemented. The key initiatives nowadays are to push the poor into work as a primary goal, a move that should be accompanied by an increasing emphasis on ‘self help’ strategies for the poor to pull themselves from poverty (Maskovsky as quoted by Bradshaw 2006:7).

**Poverty caused by Cultural Belief Systems that Support Sub-Cultures of Poverty**

The second theory of poverty roots its cause in the culture of poverty which is sometimes linked with the individual theory of poverty. This theory suggests that poverty is created by the transmission over generations of a set of beliefs, values, and skills that socially generated but individually held (Bradshaw, 2006:8). Individuals are not necessarily to blame because they are victims of their dysfunctional subculture or culture.

From a community development perspective, if the theoretical reasons lies in values and beliefs, transmitted and reinforced in subcultures of disadvantaged persons, then local anti-poverty efforts Bradshaw (2006) argues need to help change culture through socialisation as a policy.

**Poverty caused by Economic, Political, and Social Distortions or Discrimination**

The third theory of poverty is advocated by a progressive social theory. Theorist here do not look to individual as a source of poverty, but to the economic, political, and social system which causes people to have limited opportunities and resources with which to achieve income and well being (Bradshaw 2006:10).

Much of the literature on poverty now suggests (Bradshaw 2006) that the economic system is structured in such a way that poor people fall behind regardless of how competent they may be. The problem of the working poor is seen as a wage problem linked to structural barriers preventing poor families from getting better jobs, complicated by limited numbers of jobs near workers and lack of growth in sectors supporting lower skilled jobs.

According to Bradshaw (2006) if the problem of poverty is in the system rather than the poor themselves, a community development response must be to change the system. This is easy in theory which explains why policy programmes revert to attempts to change individual behaviour. Bradshaw (2006) then pose questions such as how could one get more jobs, improve schooling for the poor, equalise income distributions, remove discrimination, bias from housing, banking, education, and employment, and assure equal political participation by poor persons to provoke the debate on the issue of poverty. None of these tasks are easy as they all requires interventions in the system that create the barriers that block poor people from getting the benefits of society.

### **Poverty caused by Geographical Disparities**

Rural poverty, urban disinvestment, third world poverty, and other framing of the problem represent a spatial characterisation of poverty that exists separate from other theories. While these geographically based theories of poverty build on the other

theories, this theory calls attention to the fact that people, institutions, and cultures in certain areas lack the objective resources needed to generate well being and income, and that they lack the power to claim redistribution. As Shaw (quoted by Bradshaw, 2006:12) states that geography of poverty is a spatial expression of the capital system.

A geographical theory of poverty implies that responses need to be directed to solving the key dynamics that lead to decline in depressed areas while other areas are growing. Instead of focusing on individuals, businesses, governments, welfare systems, or cultural processes, the geographical theory directs community developers to look at places and processes by which they can become self-sustaining. Very few disadvantaged communities as Bradshaw (2006) has found around the world are finding their way out of poverty and show that it can be done. No matter how badly buffeted by geographical forces, community development programmes attempt to help communities to identify their assets and address their condition. Many governments and NGOs programmes have assisted in this effort. Several approaches have been taken to build stronger geographical areas. They are amongst others;

- Improve local industry competitiveness through cluster development building creative communities
- Enterprise zones, redevelopment and other tax based incentive programmes for economic development and channeling private investment
- Inclusionary zoning, affordable and housing similar programmes that place conditions on development

- Downtown revitalization and civic improvements that increase amenities and make areas more attractive, hoping to stimulate employment and tax revenues
- Infrastructure investment, including interstate highways, parks, water, waste disposal, schools and other public facilities
- Community organising
- National and regional reinvestment that shifts funds from one area to another (Bradshaw 2006:13-14).

### **Poverty caused by Cumulative and Cyclical Interdependencies**

The previous four theories have demonstrated the complexity of the sources of poverty and the variety of strategies to address it. In the final theory Bradshaw (2006) discuss the most complex and to some degree builds on components of each of the other theories in that it looks at the individual and their community as caught in the spiral of opportunity and problems, and that once problems dominate they close other opportunities and create a cumulative set of problems that make any effective response nearly impossible (Bradshaw, 2006:14). The cyclical explanation explicitly looks at individual situation and community resources as mutually dependent, with faltering economy, for example, creating individuals who lack resources to participate in the economy, which makes economic survival even harder for the community since people pay fewer taxes.

The complexity of the cycle of poverty means that solutions need to be equally complex. Poverty is not just one cause but many others; while antipoverty efforts seem to focus on only part of the solution. Community developers are specialists in appreciating the interdependence of different parts of the community and their solution is to try and address issues like poverty from a multi faceted approach.

Steps taken to break the cycle of poverty are not necessarily complex, but they are better solution to poverty than most single factor efforts, and it is embedded in some of the neighbourhood revitalising projects, and other efforts linking grass-roots problem solving with diversified organisational management.

Furthermore, Bradshaw (2006) reiterates that helping poor people achieve self sufficiency is an increasingly significant phase in poverty reduction. A full step from poverty requires six interdependent elements of self sufficiency that can be identified and tracked. These are;

- Income and economic assets
- Education and skills
- Housing and surrounding (safe, attractive)
- Access to health care and other needed social services
- Close personal ties, as well as networks to others
- Personal resourcefulness and leadership abilities

A key piece of this comprehensive approach to help individuals from poverty is that there is no way the public can do all of this for every person without first increasing social capital among communities or subcultures of the poor (Bradshaw 2006:15-16).

Finally, the fact that poverty theory addresses individuals, their culture, the social system in which they are embedded, the place in which they live, and interconnection among the different factors suggest that different theories of poverty look at community needs from quite different perspectives. The diversity and complexity of causes of poverty allow for these multiple points of view. How one frames the question of community development determines who gets what types of services and who gets left out (Bradshaw 2006: 17)

## **1.5 METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY**

### **Data Collection**

The research is confined to Omaheke and Ohangwena regions and is exploratory. It used secondary data (document analysis) of research studies conducted by institutions like the NPC, EMU, and LAC. Primary data (field survey) were collected through an interview guide from 35 heads of households of the San-speaking communities in Omaheke and Ohangwena regions to establish how they have benefited from poverty alleviation programs.

Similarly, one staff member each from the Ministries of Health and Social Services (MOHSS), Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW), Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development (MLGHRD), EMU and NPC, at management level, stakeholders of the Namibia Red Cross Society (NRCS), Legal Assistance Centre (LAC) and the Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern Africa (WIMSA) were also interviewed. These officials were asked to indicate the impacts of social welfare programmes Namibia and their roles as stakeholders from 1995-2005.

The interview guide was divided into three Sections. Section A questions were directed to the respondents in government while Section B looked at the role of identified NGOs (namely, LAC, NRCS, and WIMSA) in poverty alleviation in Namibia. Section C was directed to the San community in Omaheke and Ohangwena Regions. During the interview with the San, respondents were asked to state their full names, age, and number of households. A copy of the interview guide is attached as Annex A.

Variables that are likely to describe individual and households characteristics and thus influence household living standards or poverty levels were considered. These are age, gender of head of household, household size, geographical location and education.

**Limitation of Research**

The researcher had difficulties in securing appointments with all the respondents in government as well as NGOs as the respondents were either out of office or busy. Hence, the research was confined to the institutions mentioned in this report. Also worth mentioning is the time-frame given from 16 October 2006 to 13 November 2006 to have the research paper ready was difficult to fulfill.

**Data Analysis**

The data collected from the San head of households were summarised briefly and highlights issues pertaining to their socio-economic conditions, education levels, age, size and gender of the households, their geographical location as well as poverty alleviation programmes that are in place. An analysis was also made to present findings on social and institutional capacities in this case government offices in implementing poverty alleviation programmes. The findings were scrutinized to identify the gaps and shortcomings of the Government poverty alleviation policies. Triangulation of data and information in this assignment was used.

Confidentiality of the obtained information was observed. No details about informants or interviewees were disclosed.

**Reasons for Choosing Omaheke and Ohangwena Regions**

According to the Regional Poverty Profiles, Omaheke and Ohangwena Regions ranked amongst the poorest regions in the country. The population of the San in the two regions is over ten thousand out of a total population of 33 000, making it appropriate for generalisation.

## **CHAPTER 2**

### **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

#### **2.1 Introduction**

The objective of chapter 2 is to present a theoretical framework regarding the measurement and the different causes of poverty. Poverty reduction efforts are influenced by policies, structures, and capacities of institutions as well as the benefits allocated for the implementation of these programmes by government or the private sector. This involves formation of partnerships against poverty through mobilisation and allocation of financial and human resources towards pro-poor activities that are likely to stimulate economic growth.

The chapter begins by looking at the role of education and social exclusion in relation to poverty. The impact evaluation model in relation to the review of poverty alleviation programmes in Namibia is also considered as well as indicators of poverty and criteria for measuring poverty.

#### **2.2 Education and social exclusion**

According to Mufune & Mulinge (2003), education has a great impact on the society's well-being in general. Its significance is recognised in Article 28 of UNICEF Charter, to which Namibia is signatory. In Namibia it is a gateway to formal employment, especially if one goes beyond secondary level. Education can also be a social exclusion

if schools are only accessed by the rich in urban areas. This means that an illiterate person has no capacity to read and write nor is this person able to associate with especially well-schooled group because of the education gap. This group of people remains isolated in the community.

Social exclusion according to Sen (quoted by Mufune & Mulinge 2003) has to do with failure to participate fully in the affairs of society due to the lack of capabilities and entitlements and not simply material possessions. Sen argues that social exclusion like poverty is a prescriptive concept indicating an intolerable state of affairs. This suggests that the concept is multidimensional. It describes disadvantage and deprivation along the lines of low income, indignity, poor nutrition, vulnerability etc. (Mufune & Mulinge, 2003:363).

The concept of social exclusion has its origin in Western countries so applying it to African countries may pose conceptual problems. According to Mufune & Mulinge (2003), the San seem to live on a different planet from the rest of Namibians in terms of social exclusion and poverty. This exclusion starts at an early age and continues throughout their youth into adulthood.

### **2.3 Impact evaluation concept**

Outcome specification in an impact evaluation mainly consists of two dimensions: desirability and plausibility (Chen and Rossi 1980 as cited by Chen 1990). The

desirability dimension reflects the anticipated or worthiness or benefits generated by the programme. The plausibility dimension concerns the broader more realistic questions of the potential impacts of the programme. Most goal statements reflect questions pertaining to desirability dimension; for example, what good could this programme do instead of what outcomes will actually be generated by the programme.

From the above text, the researcher observed that programmes including poverty alleviation programmes that are implemented need to yield specific result through targeting the vulnerable section of the society. But in some cases the envisaged outcomes are not always met as stakeholders only look at what they wanted to achieve and not the actual result and also to question why it is so.

In the context of this research, stakeholders are defined as individuals or organisations that stand to gain or lose from the success or failure of a system (Nuseibeh 2000). In other words, stakeholders are those who are impacted by or have an impact on the project or programme being implemented. For this study, stakeholders refer to government and its line ministries, civil society organisations, private sector and foreign donor organisations.

Customarily, any programme that an organisation or institution plans and implement, is done with an expected outcome in mind. Evaluation in this regard plays the role of looking at the outcome.

Stakeholder involvement in planning, formulating, and implementing a programme tends to have their mindset in line with the normative outcome theory. Hence, an evaluator emphasising the use of the social science approach to construct a normative outcome theory may deal with the plausibility dimension but miss some key concerns of the stakeholder in the desirability dimension (Chen 1990:169).

Generally speaking, in carrying out an impact evaluation, an evaluator should be concerned not only with assessing whether goals are achieved but also with discovering what actually happened as a result of the programme. Critics such as Mushkin (1973) urge that evaluators, in order to enhance policy relevance, broaden the scope of evaluations by investigating both intended and unintended consequences (Chen 1990:168).

It is argued that poverty is a social problem that affects communities and individuals. In theory, impact evaluation is in a position to identify the cause of an outcome as it goes beyond the expected outcome and establish what the real outcome of the programme is.

Over the years, evaluators of social programmes have developed a number of theories which set out from some kind of “theory” of how a programme works or should work. Nowadays, for many in the evaluation community, as phrased by Pawson and Tilley (1997:56-57), “the careful enunciation of programme theory is prerequisite to sound evaluation”. In this sense, evaluators have used terms like policy theories, programme

theories, intervention theories or theories of change. The common element that unites these ‘theory-oriented’ approaches is the reconstruction of a causal model (the programme theory) on the basis of different sources of information in order to arrive at the understanding of how programmes intend to bring about a number of intended and unintended outcomes. Programme theory evaluation (PTE) refers to the process of reconstruction of the theory as well as an assessment of the validity of the reconstructed theory vis-à-vis multiple benchmarks.

#### **2.4 Indicators of poverty and Criteria for Measuring Poverty**

The level of poverty from which one can conclude that a specific community like the San lives in poverty can be contested. Universally, it is assumed, for statistical purposes, that vulnerable communities in developing countries are those who live on less than US\$ 1 per day. There are two conceptual models as alluded to in this paper that can be used to differentiate the poor from the non-poor (Poverty Monitoring Workshop Report in Namibia 2004).

##### **The physiological deprivation model- the income/consumption approach**

- It identifies households as poor, if they lack access to economic resources to acquire commodities that satisfy basic material needs such as food, shelter and water.

### **The Social Deprivation Model**

This is a much broader approach to measuring poverty which includes dimensions such as social exclusion, participation, access to services etc. The social deprivation model is appropriate for assessing, evaluating and measuring poverty. In addition, there are two types of poverty lines:

- **Relative Poverty line** defined directly in relation to income distribution in a particular society without taking into account basic needs. It interprets poverty in relation to prevailing living standards of a given society and stresses economic inequality as the primary indicator of poverty.
- **Absolute poverty line** uses the basic needs approach where households are classified as poor if their earnings were insufficient to buy the necessities for the maintenance of physical efficiency. For the purpose of this study, living below US\$ 1 per day should be considered as very poor.

For the purpose of this study, one of the variables to measure poverty was the size of the household. The head of the household who has many dependents and no secure job may find it hard to sustain the family.

Empirical evidence has shown that most of the poor live in rural areas where access to government provision of goods and services such as education, health and infrastructural development are limited or non-existent. Hence, geographical location will also be a good measure in this regard.

Sources of income determine the buying power and ability to acquire basic needs. On this basis, one can gauge the ability of the community's self reliance. Food insecurity can also serve as measure of poverty. If about 80 per cent of a community is dependent on food aid that is a sign of adverse poverty. Buying power can also be determined by ownership livestock, land for crop farming. This may assist to trade in return for cash or specific needs.

Also, poverty may lead to communities being susceptible or vulnerable to certain illnesses; therefore, a measure of health status may also give an indication of the poverty level. Other measures of the San's well-being in the society such as life expectancy, lack of health facilities were used.

In summary, poverty is such a complex concept that is interpreted differently by developed and developing countries. Variables that are used to identify the poor may differ in these respective countries. Namibia being a developing country, there are so many needs that are negatively impacting on the poor. Hence, in this study basic needs like food and shelter; education, health etc gives an indication of the extent of poverty on the San and Namibia in general.

Similarly, the physiological and deprivation models measures the level of poverty among the San in this study

Further, given that the study also looks at the review of poverty alleviation programmes in Namibia, the outcome and results of these programmes needs to be assessed especially to see whether they have made an impact especially on the target group, the San.

While Namibia is now officially a non-ethnic state, there still remains a strong continuity between ethnic and socio-economic or political class. Despite living in different areas, speaking different languages or dialects and articulating discrete identities, most San share a common underclass status. Where San speakers once identified themselves primarily by their local group identity, all-encompassing labels such as “San” or “Bushmen” are now ascendant. This reflects a newly evolving sense of collective identity that draws as much on their shared marginal socio-economic status and shared perceptions of alienation and disenfranchisement as it does on their common socio-linguistic, economic and genetic heritage (Suzman 2001: 6).

Suzman (2001) reiterates further that, although living conditions for the majority of Namibians have improved tangibly as a result of positive developments since independence, San communities have made very little progress. Most significantly, the majority of San in Namibia remain almost entirely dependent on cheap labour exchange in an economy where employment in the agricultural sector is declining and where there is little other employment available for unskilled workers in rural areas. Economic dependency, political marginalization, negative perceptions of others, low self-esteem,

cultural and adaptive problems, social trauma and poverty all combine autocatalytically to reproduce San marginalization and dependency. To be sure, some ambitious external interventions have been undertaken in an attempt to break this cycle of dependency, but these have not been uniformly successful.

## **CHAPTER 3**

### **OVERVIEW OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES AND POLICIES IN NAMIBIA**

#### **3.1 Introduction**

This chapter provides an overview of the policy framework regarding poverty reduction programmes in Namibia over the years. It looks at the programmes and policies that the Namibian Government has put in place to ensure that poverty is alleviated in the country. Appropriate policies which would encourage stakeholder participation in poverty alleviation and stimulate economic development would be a pre-requisite for successful poverty alleviation programmes.

This chapter relies mainly on information from the Summary Report on the Review of National Poverty Reduction Action Programme (NPRAP) for Namibia.

#### **3.2 Policies and Programmes on Poverty Reduction in Namibia**

Poverty reduction in Namibia is premised on the SWAPO Party Manifesto, the overall development framework of Vision 2030, National Development Programmes (NDP), the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) and the National Poverty Reduction Action Programme

(NPRAP), the Decentralization Policy, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS).

These frameworks are aimed at mitigating the prevalence of hunger amongst the poor and support the reduction in income inequalities.

### **3.2.1 SWAPO Party Manifesto, 2004**

The South West Africa People's Organisation (SWAPO) was the first political party that formed the post-colonial government in 1990 and continues to rule to date. Its philosophy revolved around its driving force: "commitment to peace, unity, security progress, economic growth, sustainable development and prosperity with equity and social justice" (SWAPO Manifesto 2004:6). In addition the manifesto intends to economically empower previously disadvantaged Namibians; addressing youth unemployment; economically empowering the Namibian women.

The policies enunciated in the manifesto focused more on economic growth, which on its own has not guaranteed poverty alleviation. Though economic independence by implication mean reducing poverty levels countrywide, this is not clear in the manifesto. The manifesto fails to outline a realistic strategy and framework for implementing poverty alleviation activities.

### **3.2.2 Vision 2030, 2004**

When Namibia became independent in 1990, the economy was stagnant, growing at an annual rate of 1.1 per cent in the 1980s. Its distribution of wealth remains highly skewed, with 5 per cent of the population enjoying close to 80 per cent of wealth in the country. Today, there is still widespread poverty and high unemployment. Access to basic services such as supply of clean water, health services etc remains extremely out of reach for the majority of the population (Vision 2030 2004:61).

The economic policy of Namibia after independence intended to break the vicious cycle of poverty, skewed income levels and high unemployment, and to build a foundation for self-sustaining economic growth and development. According to Vision 2030 report, the main policy focus was to ensure macro-economic stability for economic growth, poverty reduction and increased employment.

In December 1998, the Government of Namibia adopted a Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) for Namibia with emphasis on the following:

- Equitable and efficient delivery of public resources in the context of Namibia's commitment to regional decentralization for poverty reduction countrywide
- Accelerate equitable agricultural expansion, including the consideration of food security and other crop development options
- Option for non-agricultural economic empowerment, with emphasis on informal and self-employed options.

In addition, the PRS contains strategies that are crucial in reducing poverty in Namibia such as turning Namibia into an industrialised nation, investing in health and education for all Namibians and generating income for poor communities.

### **3.2.3 Transport and Manufacturing Hub Programmes and Policies**

According to the NPRAP (2005) summary report, actions that have been implemented under this theme consist of drafting investment plans and enabling policies necessary to consolidate the infrastructure development for Namibia to serve as a transport and manufacturing centre in the region. These are:

- The National Transport Development Plan
- The National Transportation Master Plan
- The Transport Plan, and
- The New Road Traffic and Transport Act.

In addition to the formulation of relevant policies, labour-based road construction and maintenance works have been adopted as a means of employment creation and poverty reduction, in line with the White Paper on Labour-based Works which has been in place since 1998. It is, however, not clear how many employment opportunities for poor people were created through these programmes as the bulk of the population remains poor.

Plans and policies for development of transport infrastructure seemed to focus on big projects at the expense of improvement of rural feeder roads and market infrastructure that could have met the needs of the poor people in the rural areas for increased accessibility to service centres. It can be deduced from the assessment above that there are still imbalances in regional coverage, especially in rural roads infrastructure.

### **3.2.4 Education**

According to the NPRAP summary report, education programmes are aimed at improving the quality of, and access to, education by addressing regional disparities, the establishment of staffing norms, teacher training, curriculum reform including introduction of life skills, as well as the development of an approach to vocational education.

Curriculum reform for primary and lower secondary has been completed, various donors have supported teacher training and life skill facilitators and life skill teachers were also trained in career guidance and pupil counseling.

Despite these improvements considerable constraints remain. It is problematic, for example, to find qualified teachers and many schools in rural areas still have inadequate facilities. Disbursement of funds is also often delayed. Further, enhanced enrolment does not guarantee better learning outcomes as school completion especially in rural areas are still below enrolment targets set.

Progress according to the NPRAP summary report in terms of an approach to vocational education is also variable. Although no clear modalities for pre-vocational and vocational training, institutional arrangements have been made in order to assist school leavers to work placement programmes in the private sector. Further, Trade Advisory Committee has been established to provide training curricula and to liaise between the Ministry of Education and the private sector.

### **3.2.5 National Population Policy Plan and National Population Policy for Sustainable Development**

The Namibian government has made progress in the development of the National Strategic Plans and the establishment of the institutional frameworks. The National Population Plan of Action and the National Population Policy for Sustainable Development have also been developed. These policies under the Ministry of Health and Social Services are all designed to take into consideration issues of poverty, capacity-building, gender, HIV/AIDS, decentralisation, and regional disparities in the resource allocation. The National Social Development Welfare Policy, which provides a framework for the support of those infected and affected by HIV/AIDS, is not yet in place (NPRAP Summary Report 2005).

Benefits being derived from these policies include amongst others:

- Decline in infant mortality
- Establishment of Anti-retroviral drugs

- Access to safe water, and
- Access to sanitary services

With respect to other policy objectives such as access to primary health care services, there are disparities in the provision of health services. Communities in remote areas of the country do not have access to health facilities.

### **3.2.6 The National Agricultural Research Plan**

The Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry has implemented a number of actions. The National Agricultural Research Plan has been implemented in conjunction with the five-year strategic plan for the provision of Agricultural Extension that led to the establishment of Agricultural Development Centres and communications networks (e-mail networks at 75 research and extension centres) and decentralisation of extension centres.

However, the needs of marginalised and vulnerable farmers residing in remote areas and female headed homes according to the NPRAP summary report are not well addressed by the agricultural extension programme.

### **3.2.7 Affirmative Action Loan Scheme (AALS)**

In 1992, the government introduced the 'Affirmative Action Loan Scheme' to support communal farmers who wanted to buy land in a commercial farming area. The scheme is

administered by the Agricultural Bank of Namibia. Loans at low interest rates are given to full-time communal farmers. However, such farmers need to have at least 150 cattle or 800 goats or sheep (LARRI, 1999:5).

The loans given under the affirmative loan scheme are not meant to cover the full amount. Communal farmers still have to pay about 10 per cent of the price themselves. Given the high price of farms, this condition prevented many communal farmers from buying a commercial farm. In addition, farmers from the northern areas were not allowed to bring their animals across the 'red line' (veterinary fence) which separates the northern areas from the rest of the country. This meant that farmers from the North had to sell all their animals if they wanted to move to a commercial farm.

The Affirmative Loan Scheme seems not to have resolved the burning land issue in Namibia. During the first three years of the scheme only 82 loans were given to communal farmers to buy commercial farms (LARRI, 1999:6). In 2002, only 368 previously disadvantaged Namibians of both part-time and full-time farmers benefited from the scheme (Werner 2002). See tables 3.1 and 3.2 below for details.

**Table 3.1: Affirmative Action Loan: Full time Farmers 1992-2001**

Macro Region	No. of loans	Ha. Purchased	% of total	Amount granted	% of total
South	47	412,640	31	21,152,338	13
North	184	918,131	69	138,371,797	87
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>1,330,771</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>159,524,135</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Agribank 2002**

**Table 3.2: Affirmative Action Loan: Part time Farmers 1992-2002**

District	No. of loans	Ha. Purchased	% of total	Amount granted	% of total
South	30	249,203	33	9,806,916	12
North	107	509,016	67	74,280,200	88
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>758,219</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>84,087,116</b>	<b>100</b>

**Source: Agribank 2002**

The majority of commercial farms still remain in the hands of white farmers and the land issue is still one of the most debated topics. Generally, whereas Namibia has made provision for Affirmative Action measures to promote the previously disadvantaged section of the citizenry, this policy framework have not redressed the efforts of the marginalised ethnic group like the San.

### **3.2.8 Labour-based Works**

With regard to the harmonisation of labour intensive public works programmes, no progress has been made with the establishment of a Labour Based Works Forum. Different ministries are involved in the implementation of various Food for Work and Cash for Work Programmes. Their overall coordination lies with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry. Feeding of the vulnerable people in society falls under the Emergency Management Unit (EMU) in the Office of the Prime Minister, whereas school feeding is implemented by the Ministry Education. The Ministry of Works Transport and Communication implements labour intensive infrastructure projects.

All Food for Work and Cash for Work programmes were initially designed as short term measures for purposes of relief. However, now they are recognised as long term poverty reduction interventions, providing income to the poor and vulnerable groups through activities like road construction, of schools and teachers' houses and community centres.

### **3.2.9 Grant-based Transfers**

A draft policy on social welfare has been completed but not yet approved as it is partly seen as a duplication of the Poverty Reduction Strategy and National Population Policy. In addition, the Basic State Grants Bill was finalised, Children's Grants were transferred to the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGECW) while the Child Care and Protection Bill (CCPB) which takes into account issues related to the support of orphans is still pending.

Concerning the number and complexity of grants, in particular children's grants, these have not been reduced according to the review. The coverage of grants has, however, improved with 89 per cent of intended beneficiaries receiving a pension which has now been raised from N\$ 300 to N\$ 370. However, these benefits do not reach the remotest vulnerable people who like the San community are desperately in need of these grants.

Pension serves as a source of income for 9.2 % of the Namibian households (NPRAP, Summary Report 2005). It contributes significantly to household income, particularly in Karas, Ohangwena, Kunene, and Caprivi regions. The N\$ 370 given to the senior citizens may not be enough compared to R 800 received by their peers in South Africa. Despite this, Namibia is better off than other African countries that do not have such programmes in place.

### **3.2.10 Decentralisation**

The Decentralisation Act was passed as part of the decentralisation process. Regional Development Coordinating Committees have been put in place and are functional (NPRAP summary report 2005). The process is rather being carried out slowly because sectors lack the capacity or incentives to develop decentralisation action plans. Further, the way in which the process has been implemented has hampered the regional planning process as regional priorities for development and poverty reduction have been overlooked by sector ministries. The Regional Development Coordinating Committees (RDCC) in addition is slow in promoting public participation.

The capacity to raise the five percent contribution from the property tax has varied from region to region. Poor regions are not able to raise this percentage.

## **CHAPTER 4**

### **RESEARCH FINDINGS**

#### **4.1 Introduction**

This chapter presents a summary of the main findings. The data were collected through an interview guide with open-ended questions which targeted some selected government officials in ministries that have a stake in poverty alleviation programmes, with NGOs involved in poverty alleviation as well as the San community in Ohangwena and Omaheke Regions. Respondents or officials in government were asked to indicate what impact government programmes made towards alleviating poverty among the San community, while the NGOs respondents were asked to state their role as partners in this programme. Respondents of the San community were asked to indicate whether they have benefited from the government poverty alleviation programmes or not. A list of interviewees is attached as Annex B.

#### **4.2 Government Offices/ Ministries/ Agencies (OMAs)**

Respondents in the different OMAs indicated that there are generally programmes or policies that are directly or indirectly aimed at reducing poverty and improving the welfare of vulnerable communities including the San.

The **Ministry of Health and Social Services (MOHSS)** has policies and programmes such as primary health care, prevention of children illnesses with 60% focus on orphans

and provision of social services with the aim to improve the livelihoods of the old aged. It also has a draft policy based on the developmental model which includes both economic and social programmes guided by Vision 2030 and NDP 2. Most of these programmes derive their funding from the Ministry's budget allocations while development partners such as UNICEF, WHO, VSO volunteers, UNDP, Centre for Disease Control (CDC), Embassies of Finland, Japan and USA also provide funding for the health services.

Generally, the Ministry aims at ensuring equal access to Health Services and therefore does not have a specific programme for the San community as such, apart from the appointment of a volunteer San member this year (2006) based in Tsumkwe to assist with health services.

The **Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare (MGE CW)** is responsible for coordinating a project on the construction of the Crafts centres where the disadvantaged San Communities comes together to do craft works that enable them to generate their own income to improve their livelihoods.

The programme is geared towards attaining the long term objectives of Vision 2030, according to the respondent, where poverty reduction is the main target. The Ministry used the rural poverty profiles of each region to identify the poor. Four regions namely, Otjozondjupa (Tsumkwe), Oshikoto (Tsintsabis), Ohangwena (Okongo) and Kunene

(Opuwo) regions have so far benefited from the Ministry's programmes. Funding is mainly derived from government coffers according to the respondent and is not enough.

The Ministry also operates the Country Development Programme (Income Generating Activities). Eight of the 136 projects funded were for the San in the regions such as the Caprivi, Ohangwena, Okongo, Omusati and Otjozondjupa.

This year, twelve projects have been declared self-sustainable/ self-supporting, one in Caprivi, one in Hardap and ten in the Kavango Region. None of the eight projects for the San communities appears as self-sustainable.

The **Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development (MLHRD)** has as one of its objectives the promotion and support of sustainable improvement in the living conditions of the rural population with the main focus on participation of the poor and empowerment of women. Given its objective, the Ministry; according to the respondents, plays a pivotal role through the Food/Cash-For-Work and Food Security and Nutrition Programmes by creating temporary employment. These programmes are funded by the Government of Namibia with technical assistance from the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), Government of Norway, UNDP and WHO.

There is a programme known as Empowerment of the San Community for Household Food Security which started running in 2004 in three regions, namely Otjozondjupa,

Caprivi and Kavango. Provision is underway to extend the programme to other regions such as Ohangwena, Oshikoto, and Omaheke where the San are found.

The **Emergency Management Unit under the Office of the Prime Minister** is responsible for the distribution of food relief to the poor during drought periods. Funding for these programmes comes from both the government and donor agencies. The poor, without any exception of the San community, are identified, screened and registered through existing government structures such as traditional leaders, councilors, teachers and church leaders.

The San according to the respondent benefited from the livestock programme in Tsumkwe and Gobabis districts, small-scale gardening and free food distribution since 1995. Sadly, the San community who benefited either sold or slaughtered these animals for consumption.

The Poverty Reduction and Equity Sub-division at the National Planning Commission Secretariat under **the National Planning Commission (NPC)** has a mandate to monitor poverty reduction efforts and track progress of development and their impact on the well being of the Namibian people.

As part of its mandate, the NPC has conducted Participatory Poverty Assessments across the 13 Regions of Namibia to determine and identify the nature of poverty from

the perspective of the poor people, especially in the rural areas. Despite this, there was no special programme specifically for the San as the programmes are meant to promote the general welfare of all the poor people in the country and not necessarily the San community only.

According to the respondent, NPC has since 1995 formulated and implemented three strategies, namely, the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS), National Poverty Reduction Action Programme (NPRAP) and Poverty Monitoring Strategy (PMS). These strategies were implemented with the funds from government, UNDP and UNFPA. The respondent indicated that the results of the research done through Participatory Poverty Assessment might change the way government use to plan for the poor by involving them as key partners in planning and development.

However, these programmes are yet to make an impact. NPRAP was implemented 2001 and reviewed in 2004. The review according to the respondent shows that there are gaps in strategies and actions implemented as some social and development issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS are not adequately mainstreamed in the strategies. It also needs to target specific beneficiaries or vulnerable members of society like the San, persons with disability and orphans to make a meaningful impact.

As for the Poverty Monitoring Strategy, this was launched in June 2005, hence, not much has been achieved so far, the respondent indicated.

### **4.3 San Communities at Uuholamo and Elundu Informal Settlements in Ohangwena Region**

Uuholamo informal settlement is home to about 80 San households. Their ages range between six months to seventy five years old. None of the adults including women at this settlement has ever been formally employed. Some of them do piecemeal jobs by serving as cattle herders or working on the crop fields. They live in small structures built with tree logs and covered with blankets. These small structures are known as 'Omapundo' in Oshikwanyama vernacular meaning 'tiny huts'.

In terms of material possession, they are poor and depend heavily on government support for food, blankets etc. They have access to clean drinking water from a nearby pre-primary school, where about 15 San children out of 45 are enrolled.

Observation suggests that most of the San population between the ages of 25 years and above have never attended school while the ones below dropped out while still at primary school. The respondents indicated that they have access to health facilities and acknowledged the good treatment and service they receive from health officials. The nearest hospital at Eenhana is about 2.5 km from Uuholamo informal settlement where they live. Apart from socialising through boozing homebrewed beer, the respondents indicated that they do not participate in social events including culture and politics.

Most of them above the age of eighteen (18) possess voters' cards but only three of the respondents of 20 indicated that they actually vote. About 95% of the respondents indicated that their relationship with other tribes in the village and region in general is satisfactory; hence there is a fairly good inter-tribal relationship. The other 5% indicated that they get along fairly well. Basic needs, namely, food, clothing, shelter and money remains part of their main needs according to the respondents.

The situation is the same at the Elundu informal settlement situated about 25 km from the regional capital Eenhana and home to about 50 San households. Here, they have no access to clean water. The nearest clinic is located Eenhana, 25 kilometres from their settlement. Their housing structures are similar to the ones at Uuholamo settlement. They also lack any productive resources such as land and credit. They depend heavily on government for their livelihoods.

#### **4.4 San Communities in the Omaheke Region (Drimiopsis and Skoonheid)**

During the tour to the Omaheke Region, the researcher visited resettlement areas at Drimiopsis, which is 50 km from Gobabis, and Skoonheid, a further 50 km from Drimiopsis. Here the San community was resettled at centres with well-built brick housing units for each household. The number of occupants ranges from two to about seventeen family members in a house depending on the size of the household. The Community has access to clean drinking water and sanitary facilities and although the nearest clinic or hospital is at Gobabis about 50-100 km from the two settlements areas

respectively, the MOHSS provides transport to and from these health facilities for the sick family members.

Observation suggests that the resettled San communities are fairly better-off than in the Ohangwena region. In terms of employment about 80% of the respondents indicated that they were employed on communal or commercial farms in Omaheke region either as cattle-herders or domestic workers while 20% had never been employed. They also lack skills to be employed in other job categories.

The main source of income amongst the heads of the households is pension for the elderly (60 years and above). About four out of the ten respondents interviewed receive this monthly benefit which is 40%. Except for the houses which were provided by the state, the respondents had few tangible assets. Eighty percent indicated that they did not have any tangible assets while 20% indicated that they own at least one chicken each. This was an indication that poverty still persist among this community despite government efforts to curb it.

With regard to education, the households interviewed counted 23 school children of which 60% attend school, 26% are drop-outs and 13% never attended school in their entire life.

It also emerged from this study that the San community participates to a certain extent in social activities interacting with other local communities. According to the respondents politics play a role only during the election period.

All respondents appreciated government efforts in ensuring that their livelihoods are improved but still felt that government needs to provide them with food regularly and if possible money, livestock for them to become self-sufficient/ reliant. According to the respondents, no NGOs are involved in addressing their plight.

Generally, there seems to be a consistent attitude of expecting help from outside the community, perhaps underestimating the importance of self-reliance or self-help. This may be interpreted as a cultural effect of destitution and poverty.

#### **4.5 The role of the NGOs involved in poverty alleviation programmes**

Three NGOs, namely the Working Group for Indigenous Minorities in Southern African (WIMSA), Legal Assistance Centre (LAC), and Namibian Red Cross Society (NRCS) were interviewed by the researcher.

In addressing the plight of the poor in Namibia according to the respondent, **WIMSA** is involved in directing the implementation of poverty related projects aimed at making vulnerable Communities in Namibia better-off and self-sustainable. WIMSA also supported 20 San speaking students at tertiary level with funding to study further and

has a pre-primary school programme for the San in Tsumkwe. WIMSA also provides advocacy programmes in human rights and legal issues to the San Community in partnership with the LAC.

In terms of coordination with other stakeholders like the government and private sectors, WIMSA works closely and widely with government OMAs such as PMO, MGECW, MOE, NIED, MHLGRD and NPC. It also coordinates its activities with NGOs such as LAC. Its funding is dependent on donors both local and foreign. Foreign donors give support of about 51% of the total costs of the programme to cover the operating expenditures of WIMSA while 49% is secured from local donors such as the Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF).

WIMSA is of the opinion that the Namibian government is doing better than other African countries with strong support from the Deputy Prime Minister Office (PMO) in addressing the plight of the San Community.

On the other hand, the role played by the **Legal Assistance Centre (LAC)** focuses more on advocacy programmes by giving legal advice, information to the San Community mainly in the Omaheke Region, East and West Tsumkwe in the Otjozondjupa and West Caprivi. The researcher established that LAC does not coordinate any poverty alleviation programmes with government for the San or any other vulnerable

communities as government declined to collaborate with them. However, LAC works together with WIMSA by providing legal advice.

LAC also indicated that the situation in terms of alleviating poverty among the San Community has not changed much in comparison to five years back. There has been scant progress. Also the deputy Prime Minister Office's San development programme which run with a budget of N\$ 300 000 per annum may not make any impact on this group according to LAC.

**The Namibian Red Cross Society's (NRCS)** involvement with the San community includes a programme that provides agricultural starter packs to grow vegetables in gardens. This is designed to reduce risk to this group mainly in the Kavango, Caprivi and Otjozondjupa as the priority areas. NRCS also provides training in gardening as part of capacity building for the San.

Regarding coordination with the government, the researcher established that NRCS has an important function of implementing government projects for vulnerable communities which government identifies especially through the Early Warning System (EWS).

It is also involved in training the private sector in first aid classes. NRCS commends government as the umbrella body for what it has done in the attempt to alleviate poverty, especially among the San community. For instance, in Tsumkwe, government has

established a good infrastructure such as roads and telecommunication networks which facilitates accessibility to this area, according to NRCS.

## **CHAPTER 5**

### **ASSESSMENT OF THE IMPACT OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES**

#### **5.1 Introduction**

This chapter examines the impact that government programmes and policies made so far.

#### **5.2 Policies and programmes targeting the poor in Namibia**

It is evident from the findings that not all poverty alleviation programmes are specifically meant for the San community as many communities in the country are poor. Hence, government projects are shared amongst them. Little was done to implement any significant programme for the San communities at Uuholamo and Elundu apart from the supply of food. It can also be said that the San at Uuholamo and Elundu are socially excluded. They are not represented at any forum that discusses and decides upon various aspects of community development in their areas. Further that they are not represented on any decision-making bodies in the Region including drought relief organising committee which they benefit from. The study also found that they lack access to information than other groups as they do not attend community or public meetings. They do not have any right in deciding on how much they should be remunerated when they help with ploughing the crop fields, the discretion lies with those who give them the work.

The study further found that, provision of education for the San children is difficult. Most of them either refuse to attend or drop out of school. During the field study, the researcher found that five (5) primary school-going San who were supposed to be at school at that time were at home. This creates an impediment for the government and stakeholders involved in trying to improve the livelihoods of the San children in future. Representation and leadership of San in government structures also remain poor which makes it difficult for their voices to be heard. So far, they have one representative in Parliament, a SWAPO MP.

Further, there is a conflict of policy when it comes to land. On land allocated to the San, other historical disadvantaged groups especially, Damara>Nama speaking communities are also resettled there. This robs them of their rights to own land.

Poverty alleviation in Namibia has a multi-sector dimension. It requires good coordination amongst the government OMA and stakeholders involved in poverty alleviation programmes to avoid duplication of efforts. This would ensure that funds targeting the San Community are harmonised to reach all of them. The status of the San at Uuholamo and Elundu informal settlement is a case in point.

Regrettably, empirical evidence gained during this research suggests that many San tend to misuse what they have, whether money or food provided by government. These as

Suzman (2001) states are deep-rooted cultural barriers and attitudes that are difficult to break.

Observation shows that alcohol abuse is rampant. Income or cash from the old age pension and other sources is not always put to good use. There seems to be a high spending on alcohol instead of food and other basic needs. This is a serious concern as about half of the San households that were interviewed had a high number of children that need to be fed.

### **5.3 Effectiveness of poverty alleviation programmes**

Empirical evidence shows that government has tried to alleviate or reduce poverty but failed to reach all affected San Communities. There is a clear contrast between the San Community in the Ohangwena Region and the resettled San Communities in Omaheke Region where the former are better-off than the latter. Hence, government has not really reached out fully to all the San Communities in the country. This shows that the physiological and social models can be related to the San community especially at Uuholamo and Elundu settlements in Ohangwena region where they still live under deplorable conditions.

With reference to the respondents, government programmes so far seem to have failed to address some of the basic needs such as housing, water and sanitation of this group in

Ohangwena Region. Apart from the pension money given to the elderly, the group lacks other sources of income.

All in all, it can be stated that the San community remains subjected to socio-economic discrimination even 16 years after independence.

It is evident from the research conducted that the aspect of class is practiced amongst the blacks in Namibia. The San community in this context is looked at as low-class by other black ethnic groups in the country. Their rights are being infringed upon as they are used to do labour work for the other ethnic groups like Oshiwambo, Herero, Setswana speaking groups at very low wages or simply for food or alcohol. Regrettably, the little they earn is spend on alcohol or home-brewed beers.

#### **5.4 Funding**

Funding of poverty alleviation programmes comes mainly from government coffers, which puts a burden on government that has been running a deficit over the years. Donor funding is sector-specific or project specific; hence money cannot be redirected to other programmes without their approval. Poverty alleviation requires capacity in human, physical as well as financial resources.

So far government performance in poverty alleviation programmes shows that little has been achieved. Specifically, increased spending of the budget figures since

independence has not shown any improvements in the living conditions for most of the San as most of them still live in abject poverty.

## **CHAPTER 6**

### **CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

#### **6.1 CONCLUSION**

From the foregoing study, the government still has to do more to make a significant impact on the livelihoods of the San community. This illustrated in pictures in Annex C.

When assessing the social exclusion variable, the San community still does not have adequate representation in regional, local and traditional institutions. In both Omaheke and Ohangwena about 95 % of respondents indicated that they are not represented by their own people at the regional or local level.

The San community is highly dependent on government to meet their basic needs. Between 17 000 – 22 000 San currently depend on government food aid (Suzman 2001). There is a low level of health and fitness of individuals who could be taken up for formal job opportunities. Many San also lack other skills needed outside the agricultural sector where they have been employed for years.

The resettlement areas at Drimiopsis and Skoonheid in Omaheke Region for the San and their crop fields are yet to make a lasting impact on the livelihoods of the San. The researcher agrees with Suzman (2001) that long after independence, the impact beyond the provision of accommodation and food aid to the farm workers is yet to be achieved.

It is also clear from the researcher's side that many of the San community do not see the essence of politics and democracy despite the fact that they are not involved.

This study shows that normative goals are good in theory yet difficult to achieve in practice.

The theories of poverty discussed in Chapter one under Literature Review can to certain extent be ascribed to the situation of the San community. In terms of individual deficiency, San community has over the years of civilization adopted a dependency syndrome of not attempting to create food for they rather wait to be provided with.

Similarly, the question of cultural beliefs also contributes to the suffering of the San community in Namibia. Set of beliefs and values passed on from generation to generation of them (San community) being the victims of civilization and society make them believe that it is correct to beg and be supported by others.

However, the San community and other poor people in Namibia are certainly victims of poverty caused by the systems economic, political and social discrimination. It is a well known fact that it is difficult for lower class people that are unskilled to reach a stage of being well off.

Geographical disparity is also a cause for poverty amongst the San community as they do not have needed resources and services at their disposal.

## 6.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Given the situation as presented in the study, the status of the San has not changed much. Hence, some of the actions that need to be taken are as follows:

- Harmonisation of donor funds is crucial in order to implement specific programmes for the San according to set priorities or needs of the San in each region
- Identifying real needs of the San community; capacity-building and empowerment remain pertinent to reduce their susceptibility to alcohol abuse and misuse of pension funds and other income
- Promotion of public participatory frameworks, especially for the San to participate fully in identifying their real needs
- Preserving their traditions, and encourage them to put them to good use. Training on how to utilize facilities at their disposal without changing their culture is also needed, but this may need long term planning' especially with current upcoming generation
- The Constituent Councilor who heads the Constituent Development Committees should ensure that ethnic groups including the San in their constituencies are represented in their forums to address their concerns during meetings.
- Monitoring mechanism of poverty alleviation policies and programmes need to be intensified after implementation so that shortcomings are identified and dealt

with head-on. The National Task Force on Poverty Reduction (NTFPR) needs to strictly reinforce its supervisory role.

- Conservancies that seem to be working for other communities in the rural areas could be introduced at the localities where the San lives. A community campsite could be established in different localities where tourists would come to view traditional life of the San people for a fee. In areas where there is game or wildlife for them to establish self supporting projects for tourism purposes which may include game viewing, photo safaris and trophy hunting.

## H. REFERENCES

Agribank of Namibia *Annual Report. 2002*

Atkinson, A.B. 1989. *Poverty & Social Security*. Harvester Wheatsheaf

Bank of Namibia *Annual Report. 2005*

Blank, R.M. 1997. *It takes a Nation: A New Agenda for Fighting Poverty*. Princeton NJ:  
Princeton University Press

Bradshaw, T. K. 2006. *Theories of Poverty and Antipoverty Programme in Community  
Development*. University of California

Chen, H. T. 1990. *Theory-Driven Evaluation*. Sage Publications: Beverly Hills

Cousins, J.B & Whitmore, E. 1998. *Understanding and Practising Participatory  
Evaluation, New Directions for Evaluation*. Jossey-Boss: San Francisco

Education Management Information System (EMIS) 1999. *Education Statistics*.  
Windhoek: Ministry of Basic Education and Culture

Haarmann, C. & Haarmann, D. 2005. *The Basic Income Grant in Namibia Resource Book*. Windhoek, Namibia

Jauch, H. 1999. *LARRI Paper on Human Resource Development and Affirmative Action: A Trade Union Perspective*.

Klerck, G.2002. *Trade Union Responses to the "Flexible" Workforce in Namibia*, *African Sociology Review* 6(2): 54-58

Lesetedi, G.N. 2003. 'The Urbanisation of Poverty: Lessons from a Dichotomous Poverty Alleviation Strategy in M. Mulinge & P. Mufune (eds) *Debt Relief Initiatives and Poverty Alleviation*, pp. 56-88. African Institute of South Africa: Pretoria

Macquire, D.C. 2002. *Population, Poverty and Sustainable Development*. [http://www.religiousconsultation.org/population\\_poverty\\_sustainable\\_dev.htm](http://www.religiousconsultation.org/population_poverty_sustainable_dev.htm)

Marais et al. 1984. *Research on the Bushmen Population Groups in South West Africa (The Brand Report)*. Windhoek: Development Directorate, South West Africa Administration

Mufune, P. & Mulinge, M. 2003. *Debt Relief Initiatives and Poverty Alleviation: Lessons from Africa*. African Century Publications: Pretoria

*Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey Report.1993/1994*

*Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey Report.2003/2004*

*2001 Namibia Population and Housing Census Report. 2003. Central Bureau of Statistics: Windhoek*

*Namibia Vision 2030 Report: Policy Framework for Long-Term National Development. Office of the President: Windhoek. 2004*

*National Poverty Reduction Action Programme for Namibia: Summary Report. 2005*

Nuseibeh, E. 2000. *Requirement Engineering: A Road Map*. ICSE- Future of SE Track

*Paper on Conceptualization, Defining and Measuring Poverty in South Africa. 2004*

Pawson, R & Tilley, N. 1997. *Realistic Evaluation*. Sage Publications: Thousand Oaks

*Poverty and Inequality in South Africa: Summary Report. 1998*

*Poverty Bulletin: Namibia. National Planning Commission.2005*

*Poverty Monitoring Workshop Report, Swakopmund.* National Planning Commission Secretariat. 2004

Rankhumise, P. 2003. *Poverty and Insecurity in Post Colonial Africa* in M. Mulinge & P. Mufune (eds) *Debt Relief Initiatives and Poverty Alleviation*, pp. 243-253. Africa Institute of South Africa: Pretoria

Suzman, J. 2001. *Regional Assessment of the Status of the San in Southern Africa.* John Meinert Printing: Windhoek

Suzman, J. 2001. *An Assessment of the Status of the San in Namibia.* John Meinert Printing: Windhoek

Suzman, J. 2002. *Difference, Domination and Underdevelopment- Notes on the Marginalisation of Namibia's San Population.* Windhoek: UNAM Press

*Technical Paper for Preparation of Poverty Reduction Strategy for Namibia.* 1999. The World Bank

*The Constitution of the Republic of Namibia.* 2000

UNDP. 1998. *Namibia Human Development Report.* Windhoek: UNDP

UNDP. 2001. *Human Development Report*. New York: Oxford University Press

*Namibia Vision 2030 Report: Policy Framework for Long-term National Development*,  
2004

Werner, W. 2002. *Background paper on the current state of land reform in Namibia:  
Some facts and figures*

World Summit for Social Development Paper. 1995

[www.qualityresearchinternational.com](http://www.qualityresearchinternational.com). Accessed 20 November 2006

**ANNEX A****INTERVIEW GUIDE****Interview guide to conduct an Impact Evaluation on Poverty Alleviation Programmes in Namibia**

The government of Namibia has since independence (1990) directed its efforts towards improving the socio-economic status of previously disadvantaged Namibians and put in place various policies and resources to alleviate poverty. Notwithstanding these policies, poverty levels continue to increase especially among the most vulnerable people in the society.

In view of the above, you are kindly asked to answer the following questions, which will contribute to my research studies and findings as well as conclusions.

Note that the questionnaire is divided in three sections.

*Information provided will be treated with confidentiality it deserves.*

**Details of Interviewee (Optional)**

Name.....Dept/Ministry.....

Region.....Work Experience.....

Position.....Contact No.....

**Section 1      Government Officials**

1.      What role has your Office played so far in reducing poverty among the poor communities in the Namibian society?

.....  
.....  
.....

2.      What policies or strategies in your Ministry/Dept. were formulated and implemented to address the plight of the poor?

.....  
.....  
.....

3.      Who was responsible for the funding of these programmes, if any?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

4.      What criteria do your Ministry/Dept. use in identifying the poor or marginalized communities?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**5.** Has there been any specific or special programme for the San community since 1995?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**5.1** If yes, what are the programmes and how did the San community benefit

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**6.** Do you think your dept/ministry needs to do more? Elaborate

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**7.** What could be the way forward in addressing the problem of the San

.....  
.....  
.....

8. Any other comments related to the subject matter?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Section B      NGOs involved in poverty alleviation programmes**

1. What is your role in addressing the plight of the poor in Namibia?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2. As a stakeholder in this very important undertaking, how do you coordinate your activities with that of the government, other NGOs and the private sector?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- 3. Do you think the government has done or is doing enough to address the plight of the vulnerable people in the society?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**Section C San community (head of the household)**

- 1. Are you or have you ever been employed. If yes, give details of employer. If no, how do you survive or sustain your family?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

- 1.1 What other sources of income do you have?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

2 Where do you live and what is the number of your household members? ( Assess the dwelling place via observation and take pictures)

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

3 Do you have access to clean water and other sanitation facilities? If yes, how far is it from your house?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

4 Do the kids in your household attend school? If yes, which grades are they and what is their age ranges?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

5 Do you have access to health facilities? How far is the nearest clinic?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

6 Are you involved in any social or political affairs in the community?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

7 How do you get along with other tribes in your village or constituency?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

8 Do you have any material possession or assets such as cattle, land etc?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

9 What type of assistance do you receive from the government or NGOs?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

10 Are you satisfied with the assistance provided? If not what are your expectations from the government?

.....  
.....  
.....  
.....

**ANNEX B****LIST OF INTERVIEWEES****Ministries, Offices and Agencies (OMAs)**

Gabriel Kangowa: Deputy Director, Emergency Management Unit (EMU), Office of the Prime Minister 10 November 2006

Angela Kambende: Chief Development Planner, Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare. 31 October 2006

Manfred Menjengwa: Deputy Director, Ministry of Local Government, Housing and Rural Development. 10 November 2006

Laura Cronje: Programme Manager, Human Security and Prevention Programme, Ministry of Health and Social Services

Nambala Kalimba: Economist, National Planning Commission (NPC). 01 December 2006

**Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs)**

Paulus Ngolombe: National Coordinator: Food Security, Namibia Red Cross Society (NRCS). 29 November 2006

Shadrack Tjiramba: Legal Assistance Centre (LAC). 9 November 2006

Ben Begbie: Project Unit Support Manager, WIMSA. 10 November 2006

**San Community at Uuholamo and Elundu informal settlements in Ohangwena Region**

Haimbodi Shikongo, male 43 years

Kafita Mwetuhanga, male 61 years

Veiko Hambabi, male 67 years

Veiko Mbada, male 64 years

Ephraim Haikali, male 45 years

Haikali Kamanya, male 65 years

Gabriel Shindume, male 54 years

Timotheus Shikangala, male 61 years

Mariam Shingenge, female 68 years

Sofia Shalongo, female 44 years

Matheus Haikali, male 42 years

Selma Shilongo, male 61 years

Moses Kafeu, male 33 years

William Mwatilile, male 45 years

Gabriel Hamatundu, male 53 years

Mbedi Kambilikiti, male 63 years

Haimbodi Fillemon, male 63 years

Matheus Hambeinge, male 55 years

Samuel Mofuka, male, 69 years

**San Community at Drimiopsis and Skoonheid informal settlements in Omaheke Region**

Pieter Geelbooi, male 64 years

Samson Afrikaner, male 32 years

Marthin Agas, male 47 years

Geheana Afrikaner, male 63 years

Atie Britz, male 65 years

Abraham Beukes, male 77 years

Hans Gous, male 67 years

Whisky Kous, male 62 years

Patrick Bekker, male 68 years

Fannie Kous, male 73 years

Kevin Rooi, male 58 years

Johannes Bayer, male 44 years

Pieter Gun, male 42 years

Manfred Putsie, male 37 years

Rosie Rooinasie, female 42 years

ANNEXURE C

