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4 Autoethnography and power in a tourism researcher position
A self-reflexive exploration of unawareness, memories and paternalism among Namibian Bushmen

Stasja Koot

Introduction

It must have been around 2004. I lived at the Tsintsabis resettlement farm, Namibia, and worked on a community-based tourism project called Treesleeper Camp, an eco-oriented camp site with various activities focused on the local indigenous culture of the Hai//om Bushmen. The traditional authority of Tsintsabis came to my door and asked me why he could not get another family member into the project. A few months earlier, we had signed a contract in which we limited the number of family employees to a maximum of two, and his family had already reached that maximum. I reminded him of the contract, even showing him all the trustees’ signatures, including his own. He responded by reading out the date, saying: ‘That was long ago, I feel different now. This is now.’

This type of incident is not unusual for ethnographers, but in this case I was working in the field of tourism, to become an ethnographer later. As Edward Bruner noted, working in tourism enables an ethnographer ‘to study tourism from the inside […] participating, observing, talking, traveling, eating and sightseeing with the tourists’ (2005: 1). Of course, the above example about a contract does not highlight an interaction with a ‘guest’, a tourist, but with one of the ‘hosts’, a local Bushman leader. Nevertheless, this chapter also shows the importance of working in tourism: it is an analysis of my personal relation with the Bushmen as hosts in particular. The example about the contract shows the difference in perception about the importance of the legislation that the community and myself had created for the Treesleeper Camp tourism project. Based on rules and agreements originating in ideas of tourism as a development strategy, I often rationalised that my aim at the farm was solely to build up Treesleeper Camp. Therefore, I considered many suggestions by the local Bushmen that were not in line with this aim – such as ignoring contract agreements – to be a distraction from my main reason for being there.

In these early days, the name baas – which literally means ‘boss’ and is further explained in the following discussion – was given to me for fun for a
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while by three Dutch interns who went on to help out at Treesleeper. As a group of young and idealistic fieldworkers, we were often surprised to experience the Bushmen’s humbleness (shown to us and, especially, to local white farmers). We believed they did not need to behave in such an inferior way as they often did. However, we were unaware then of the deep sense of paternalism in the region and our own relatively strong positions of power.

While I acted as a community member or 'insider' in various ways, I was simultaneously disconnected - functioning as an 'outsider' - in other ways. More than anything, my position of power created personal struggles when working for Treesleeper Camp. Therefore this chapter is also a methodologi cal and epistemological exploration that analyses the knowledge I gained from holding different positions (insider/outsider/researcher/tourism development fieldworker), and examines how this knowledge was built up and changed over the years. I use autoethnography as a methodology - a type of ethnography that involves self-observation and reflexive investigation by the researcher; personal and cultural issues become blurred and are experienced as continually interconnected (Ellis and Bochner 2000: 739; Maréchal 2010).

Autoethnography enables academics to tell their personal research stories to professionals and other, non-expert people, including, for example, Bushmen communities ( Tomaselli 2012a: 6–7). Using autoethnography in relation to a group of Bushmen, the chapter builds on earlier work by Tomaselli (2007, 2012b) and Tomaselli et al (2013). In these works, the researchers' relation(s) with the 'other(s)', or the researched, in particular the South Kalahari Bushmen, is also problematised, mostly in tourism settings. It is important to note that in tourism there are many other relevant relations in which researcher positionality needs to be critically and self-reflexively analysed, such as the connections that can exist between the researcher and the private tourism sector, in which relations of power and paternalism play a crucial role (e.g. Koot 2016, 2017a, 2017b; Tomaselli 2017). Moreover, critical self-reflection and analyses of paternalist relations are important in the relationship with the 'other' and can also be applicable beyond community-based tourism.

Paternalism is a subject par excellence for such an autoethnographic analy sis because 'authors use their own experiences in the culture reflexively to bend back on self and look more deeply at self-other interactions' (Ellis and Bochner 2000: 740). Consequently, the chapter adds three under-analysed but essential and interconnected elements of autoethnography: power, unaware- ness and memory. I argue that, despite the absence of any awareness of doing research, my experience as a development fieldworker nevertheless created important and useful knowledge. However, this unawareness also implies an autoethnography that is retrospective. Memories are crucial to it. As ethnographers tend to have 'rather poor memories', I heed Hunt and Ruiz Junco's call for an 'ongoing consideration of memory among ethnographers' (2006: 371). This leads me to conclude that what I dub an 'open retrospective analy- lytic autoethnographic experience' contains important epistemological value,


lematic because they are problematic. But also to acknowledge that memories are problematic because they are subject to change and decay. Memories, in my view, need serious consideration in autoethnography. By using my own memories in this tourism project, it becomes clear that I perpetuate my earlier acquired power as a development fieldworker in my 'new' role as an ethnographer.

First, I describe how I built up a body of knowledge during my different stays in Tsintsabis. The first stay was in 1999, when the idea for starting tourism was initiated. Next, I provide memories from the years 2004–2007 when I lived in Tsintsabis working for Treesleeper Camp. Specifically, I investigate events that relate to development and power among this marginalised indigenous group. In the methodological analysis that follows, I reflect on the value of such a retrospective autoethnography, how this adds to analytic autoethnography, and the value of the fact that I was unaware that I was 'doing research', which, I conclude, created an 'open' research experience but simultaneously perpetuates power relations.

Living in Tsintsabis

Care, books and becoming baas

I have been connected with the Haillom of Tsintsabis since 1999, when I conducted fieldwork there for six months as an MA student. In those days most inhabitants were Haillom, but today the population has become more hybrid. Then I often strolled through the dusty gardens, doing interviews and exploring the farm and its many socio-economic and cultural happenings. I learned about its different churches, the school, the history of Tsintsabis, the Haillom's historical connection with the famous Namibian tourist attraction Etosha National Park, and lots more. I also participated in many joyful moments with community members, attended soccer matches and nightly healing sessions, and regularly drank a few beers in the local shebeens. In that way, I participated, observed and learned. I also started to care for the people with whom I was living and after the fieldwork, I began to develop a proposal to start community-based tourism in Tsintsabis (Koot 2013: 309–311), which in the 1990s flourished – often as one of the main pillars of larger community-based natural resource management programmes – in southern Africa. This type of small-scale tourism aims to empower marginalised communities, taking their needs and wishes as the starting point. Moreover, community members themselves should control, plan, own, manage and initiate the project (Giampiccoli and Nauright 2010: 52–53).

Many evenings were spent reading books by candlelight. Two books in particular influenced my ideas in those days. First, I was struck by the philosophical novel Lila, in which the anthropologist Dussenberg says of his relationship with native Americans that '[t]he only way to find out about Indians is to care for them and win their love and respect' (cited in Pirsig 1991: 43). Reading Lila made me realise that I had to let go of my quest for
lematic because they are, need serious consider-
ations in this tourism project, d power as a development
ledge during my different hen the idea for starting from the years 2004–2007 er Camp. Specifically, I power among this margin-
ysis that follows, I reflect hy, how this adds to anana- i was unaware that I was n’ research experience but
sabis since 1999, when I A student. In those days nulation has become more dens, doing interviews and und cultural happenings. I - history of Tsintsuba, the namibian tourist attraction rticipated in many joyful over matches and nightly the local shebeens. In that arterial to care for the people tgan to develop a proposal not 2013: 309–311), which illars of larger community- - in southern Africa. This marginalised communities, nt. Moreover, community agage and initiate the project
andelight. Two books in i was struck by the philo-
ussenberry says of his ly way to find out about id respect’ (cited in Pirsiag d to let go of my quest for
tivity; it was fine – even inevitable – to develop feelings of care for the people one studied. Second, this growing empathy was stimulated by a feeling for the ‘victimisation’ the Bushmen had experienced, as I realised from reading Gordon’s Picturing Bushmen (1997). This book made me ‘realise more and more how important the views of other people have been, concerning the contemporary situation of the Bushmen’ (Koot 2002).

Today, approximately 20 years later, my ideas have become more nuanced, but my concern for the Bushmen has never left me. This raises its own questions. Exactly which Bushmen do I care for? Does caring not imply a certain level of patronisation? Although I do not have all the answers, I feel that my concern for the people was the start of my becoming a baas, a word often used in Afrikaans-speaking areas, especially on farms, for the white authority. A baas is usually white and male (cf. Sylvain 2001). Since Tsintsuba has been surrounded by commercial farms for many years, people are deeply rooted in the social construct of baaskap (see also Plotkin 2002: 5–7). In this southern African patron–client relationship, beliefs about white superiority play a crucial role. This does not necessarily mean that it is only a top-down structure; in a relationship of interdependency between the patron and his clients, there is often also support for beliefs and assumptions ‘from below’ (Van Beek 2011: 40–41). The underlying assumptions of baaskap date back to the start of Western colonization. The phenomenon is based on a family ideology: the patron is the father (baas) of his ‘immature’ children, who are seen to be in need of development. Edification, care and protection are essential elements that also provide important benefits to the clients in return for their labour, such as transport, medical assistance, basic education and a place to live (Gibbon et al. 2014; cf. Rutherford 2001). Early signs of my authority were visible already in 1999, when the first ideas for Tressleeker Camp began to develop. Tourism was then seen as a panacea for development. The local development committee had had plans for tourism to stimulate the area’s economy since 1993. The request for a tourism project originated from within the community, but under my influence this changed from an idea to build a luxurious lodge to plans for a community-based campsite. I had lived among the people for a few months already and simply could not see them running a lodge or any other type of upper-class tourism enterprise. So, as an MA student, I began to influence the plans and ideas of the community according to what I myself deemed good for them. I was a young baas in the making.

I went back to Namibia in 2002/03 for another six months to explore the possibilities for the project. This was the start of what would become Tressleeker Camp (Hüncke 2010; Hüncke and Koot 2012; Koot 2012, 2013, 2017a; Troost 2007). From January 2004 until June 2007 I lived in Namibia, mostly in Tsintsuba itself, initially with a friend of mine, Ferry Bounin (January 2004 until November 2005). Our job was to support the founding of Tressleeker physically and institutionally, and to manage the project for the first few years.

In 2008, when I had been back in the Netherlands for more than a year, I started writing a book chapter about Tressleeker (Koot 2012). This initiated
the idea for the PhD that I worked on between 2009 and 2013, including half a year of fieldwork in southern Africa and return visits to Tsintsabis in 2010. In this research, my stay in Tsintsabis and working for Treesleeper provided crucial sources of knowledge. Since 2007 I have stayed in contact with various people living in Tsintsabis, via email or Facebook.

The meaning of living in Tsintsabis for fieldwork

My long-term stay as a development fieldworker in a community-based tourism project can be compared with Karine Rousset’s (2003: 18) stay of three years in West Caprivi, northeast Namibia, as an NGO facilitator. As she explains:

[This] has given me the opportunity to familiarise myself with conservation and development issues from a practical, on-the-ground perspective. I am fully cognisant that my immersion in a development-focussed NGO world may also cloud my understanding and interpretation of events. But I believe this is balanced by the advantage of an extended period of time in West Caprivi that has allowed for a more in-depth understanding of attitudes and local politics than would have been possible had I only spent six weeks there.

Similarly, Thekla Hohmann stayed in Tsumkwe West, east Namibia, for 16 months, combining scientific and developmental work. This gave her ‘the privilege to engage in participatory observation and to follow the discussion about community-based natural resource management in the field from different angles’ (Hohmann 2003: 209). I experienced similar advantages from my years in Tsintsabis. In relation to my PhD fieldwork, I could draw on my ‘general knowledge’ of and ‘feel’ for the people. I learned to speak Afrikaans, which turned out to be crucial for my PhD fieldwork. Although the Treesleeper staff usually spoke English, I spoke Afrikaans to elderly people in the community and to white farmers. This not only improved my ability to communicate, it also infused my authority with the colonial legacy associated with Afrikaans.

For example, for my PhD I have strolled through the South African Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park with the local Bushman tour guide Toppies Kruiper, who would draw things in the sand to illustrate his stories. The Haiom of Tsintsabis also often illustrated stories in the sand, usually not having any pen and paper available. But there was an additional element to the practice. A South African local respondent, Belinda Kruiper (cited in Dyll 2009: 55) asserts that ‘NGOs should let the Bushmen draw in the sand to explain how they feel and what they want’. Laurens Dyll observes that ‘bly encouraging Western methods of communication only, [...] development workers are in fact denying the validity of local methods and knowledge, and in so doing gain only a superficial understanding of people’s development needs and
...and 2013, including half a stay at Tšintsabis in 2010. For Treesleeper provided a community-based tour's (2003: 18) stay of three NGO facilitator. As she rise myself with conservation-on-the-ground perspective, development-focused NGO interpretation of events. But an extended period of time in-depth understanding of that had only "east, Namibia, for 16 work. This gave her the to follow the discussion in the field from different advantages from work, I could draw on my trained to speak Afrikaans, work. Although the Treesleeper to elderly people in the proved my ability to committal legacy associated with the South African KG-our guide Toppies Kruiper, is stories. The Haiman of usually not having any pen element to the practice. A (cited in Dyll 2009: 55) the sand to explain how that "by encouraging development workers are in knowledge, and in so doing a development needs and requirements" (2007: 122). Bushmen, I learned, often communicate by means of the things at hand. They also refer to elements such as the wind, the sun, the rain or a stone in order to explain things. When I asked what day of the week an event happened, I might be told that it was on the day when the wind blew hard. When I asked for directions, I might be advised that "that round stone you go that way" or "where the trees become higher" or "where the bushes were eaten by a kudu". Today communication has become hybrid and people also use Western reference points (e.g., Tuesday 21 September) and equipment (e.g., pens, pencils, mobile phones and computers), but that does not mean that this "other, more traditional" communication has disappeared.

Memories of development and paternalism at Treesleeper

Being baas

Bouin and I established the Tšintsabis Trust in 2004, which became the local (community-based) legal owner of the Treesleeper tourism project. Since registration of this body needed to be done in the capital, Windhoek, it was almost impossible for local people to do this, as they lacked the transport and means. This gave Bouin and myself the power to decide what would be in the deed of trust. Local trustees (some of whom were illiterate) only needed to sign before we returned the documents to the Master of the High Court in Windhoek. It took time for the older generation, especially, to accept and understand the structure and vision of Treesleeper. As some schoolboys explained:

They [parents and grandparents] were afraid that the white people [Bouin and I] were going to claim their land, like white people did during colonisation and the apartheid regime. [...] After several meetings with Stasja and the [Tšintsabis] trust, they started to understand that the camp site was meant to help develop them. (Troost 2007: 66)

People did not necessarily distinguish us – young white male Europeans – from local white Namibians. Although most people remembered me from my MA fieldwork in 1999 and we arrived with a story about ‘development’ based on the principle of community participation in tourism, most of the elders also associated our being there with land theft, colonialism and apartheid. Moreover, the tourism industry in southern Africa is heavily white-dominated, meaning that ownership of tourism businesses (and their economic benefits) as well as decision-making processes were mainly done by whites.

Bouin and I started as trustees of the Tšintsabis Trust for pragmatic reasons. For example, we were in a position to open a bank account. While local people made up the majority of the trust, Bouin and I exerted a great deal of influence. An ex-employee and trustee said about me in 2006, a few months
before I was to leave Tsintsabis, that she did ‘not think it is a community project, but it is Stasja’s [...] project. [...] he takes most of the decisions and he can lay his opinion on the members of the trust and the personnel of Treesleeper’ (cited in Troost 2007: 58). Organisatorically, Bounin as I acted from a position of power. We controlled the funds in the beginning. Although it was a community-based tourism project, I was the de facto baas. It was not only that people regarded me as a baas based on colonial associations and skin colour, it was practically true as well. Despite the bottom-up principles of community-based organisations, external NGOs such as ours often inadvertently create top-down structures because they take many of the decisions relating to the projects they run (cf. Hüncke 2010: 100).

Although there were similarities with baasskap, my position at Treesleeper also exhibited essential differences from it. For example, when I spoke to white businesspeople in the area, they tended to be amazed (and occasionally even disgusted) when I said that I lived in Tsintsabis. The boundaries between white farmers and their black workers on the commercial farms were rigid. When I visited a farm in the area – on which another Bushman tourism project (not community-based) was set up – in 2003 with a young Hai/om man, I was not allowed by the white farmer to stay overnight with the Hai/om man’s family. The farmer insisted that I sleep in the farmhouse. Later, when I lived on the Tsintsabis’ resettlement farm ‘with the people’ this was often regarded as strange. Although I was not engaged in research as such, I consider those years a crucial and meaningful ethnographic experience for my later writings. The experience went far beyond acclimatisation: I became acquainted with a multitude of social and power relations and cultural practices, and learned a language, Afrikaans. Because of this lengthy stay, I experienced the daily realities of the people I lived with, which helped me later when I began ‘real’ research fieldwork for my PhD.

I lived in the Treesleeper office. I often chatted to the cleaner, a young woman, about Treesleeper and the local dynamics of Tsintsabis. In this way, I easily found out about issues on the farm. These included different perceptions about a failed bakery project, family intrigues, controversial leadership questions and, last, but not least, different opinions in Tsintsabis about Treesleeper. People who visited the young woman while she cleaned added their own stories and perceptions – they might be family members who would help with the cleaning, or neighbouring villagers who just came over for a chat. Treesleeper employees would also visit regularly, and I held many conversations with them. I discussed national politics, local politics, Bushman traditions and strategies for Treesleeper with the camp manager, Moses //Khumib. Some employees would come over in the evenings to watch soccer on my television. On trips along the dirt road to Tsumeb (about 60 kilometres away), I had lengthy conversations with the villagers to whom I gave lifts. There would be friendly talks, requests for assistance or even malicious gossip. In addition to contacts with local people, I was also connected to the many outsiders that Treesleeper would bring in, such as NGOs, donors, some tourists, volunteers and student researchers.
It was not always easy. An important element of the learning process involved the harsh realities of marginalisation in rural Africa. I was shocked when I heard that a young man had hung himself one night. He was found by my neighbour, who also worked for Treesleeper. I witnessed hunger, unemployment, rape, drunken fights, the beating of women (including a Treesleeper tour-guide student who had to leave the project as a result), illness (I sometimes drove sick people to the clinic), and the spread of HIV/AIDS.

Another difficulty arose from the fact that a Dutch NGO, Kune Zuva, became interested in supporting 'spin-off' projects, often related to Treesleeper. I began to be seen as a cash cow who could be approached for funding for many different projects. I was also asked for managerial and organisational support to start these projects, as the local Bushmen did not consider themselves able to start them. Much of this could be attributed to their inexperience, but it also betrayed a belief in ‘white superiority’. Some people even stated directly that it was impossible to start anything without a white man. I had become a key figure on the Tsintsabis resettlement farm, not unlike the baas on a commercial farm. When outsiders came to Treesleeper, whether Europeans or local farmers, they usually approached me first. One black farmer from the area even asked if I could send over a few of ‘my boys’ to his farm so that they could build a beautiful tourist campsite for him as well.

More NGO paternalism

After June 2007, when I left Tsintsabis, the NGO Voluntary Services Overseas supported the project for almost two more years by sending a volunteer. The position of project manager was handed over to the local camp manager //Khumub. The volunteer’s job was to assist him. Although //Khumub valued what the volunteer brought to the project, he found working with a white (European) man in his fifties challenging. In the rural areas of a country where apartheid’s traces are still highly visible, an older white man in a Bushman community is almost automatically considered an authority. Most local people listen to white people more than they do to others. This undermines local leaders. //Khumub observed to me in 2010 that ‘there is lots of involvement of different organisations, and not at the positions that they just advise but they are also directly sometimes involved in management to say things must be done this way and this way’. He believed not enough attention was being given to the communities’ feelings and ideas, which fostered top-down development and paternalism. Similarly, in the early and mid-1990s in the Nyae Nyae Conservancy where the Ju’hoansi Bushmen live, Elizabeth Garland noticed strong paternalist behaviour by many of the white expatriates working for the Nyae Nyae Development Foundation of Namibia. This NGO – also with a strong focus on tourism as an important element of community-based natural resource management – was regarded as ‘indigenous’ but was ‘white-driven’ in practice, and some of the expatriates’ assumptions were influenced by notions of white superiority. The Bushmen were
regarded as not altogether ready for modern life. Agriculture and democracy were considered crucial tools for their economic and political development (Garland 1999: 83–85).

This sort of paternalism was also exhibited in Tsintsabis by the Connected to Namibia Foundation (CTNF), a small Dutch initiative that supported Treesleeper with a financial donation of about €3,000 in 2005. A CTNF member from the Netherlands planned to visit Tsintsabis at a time when I would be absent. //Khumub and I decided it would be appropriate to take her to the Etosha National Park in the project’s car. //Khumub would be in charge of the trip, but members of camp management would join her on the visit. Upon my return I learned that the woman and the camp management had visited several other tourist places in northern Namibia. //Khumub explained that the woman had wanted to visit these destinations and said she had not felt comfortable restricting her to visiting Etosha. She was an older, white woman, after all, and a potential donor as well. More members of this same foundation visited Treesleeper in 2011. Although they had had no prior involvement in the project, they reported as follows:

Our foundation has been heavily involved in setting up Treesleeper. Today Treesleeper has become a well-run community campsite and the foundation can withdraw. During our short visit last Sunday the future plans of Treesleeper turned out to be highly ambitious. There are big and luxurious lodges and a swimming pool being built at this stage. [...] The current staff will, regardless of their good intentions, simply not be ready to handle this. [...] These people have good intentions, but they do not have what is necessary for this.

(CTNF 2011, my italics and translation)

This not only demonstrates how organisations can boast about a project in which they have only played a minor role, but it also exhibits a Eurocentric, derogatory and paternalistic attitude towards the project’s staff. These people never even spent a night in Tsintsabis. Their attitude, however, is comparable in some ways to my own behaviour as an MA student when I dismissed the idea of building a tourist lodge and argued for a community-based campsite instead. At least, by that time, I had stayed in Tsintsabis and Namibia for a few months.

In general, Bushmen in Tsintsabis show dependency on others (often NGOs) to help them obtain a better future. In their self-perception, they are subordinate to people who position themselves as superior to them (such as white farmers), and they ascribe to whites the ability to solve problems and fulfill their needs (Häncke 2010: 102–105, cf. Koot 2015). These attitudes are transferred to NGO workers, including myself when I lived in Tsintsabis. The NGO workers unduly influence decisions because of their ‘higher education’ and ‘greater knowledge’ of the ‘outside world’. Of course, not all NGO fieldworkers are white, and throughout history Bushmen have maintained patron–client relationships with various black groups as well (cf. Wilmsen 1989).
Agriculture and democracy
and political development

Tsintsabis by the Connected
th initiative that supported
€3,000 in 2005. A CTNF
Tsintsabis at a time when I
d be appropriate to take her
ar. //Khumub would be in
ment would join her on the
and the camp management
thereamong Namibia. //Khumub
ese destinations and said he
ge Etosha. She was an older,
well. More members of this
ough they had had no prior

setting up Treesleeper. Today
ty campsites and the founda-
i: Sunday the future plans of
is. There are big and luxur-
t at this stage. [...] The cur-
ions, simply not be ready to
ions, but they do not have

1, my italics and translation)
an boast about a project in
also exhibits a Eurocentric,
project’s staff. These people
ke, however, is comparable in
t when I dismissed the idea of
y-based campsites instead. At
amibia for a few months.
pendency on others (often
heir self-perception, they are
is superior to them (such as
bility to solve problems and
ot 2015). These attitudes are
en I lived in Tsintsabis. The
of their ‘higher education’ and
se, not all NGO fieldworkers
we maintained patron-client
f Wilmsen 1989).

Methodological analysis: open, retrospective, analytic autoethnography
in tourism

The question that I wish to raise here concerns the value of my experiences in
the field from an autoethnographic point of view. Autoethnography has been
heavily dominated by so-called ‘evocative or emotional autoethnography’ that
is distanced from analytic and realist ethnographic traditions. Anderson
(2006), though, developed the idea of an ‘analytic autoethnography’ which
rests on three main pillars: the researcher must be a full member of the group
or setting that is being studied; s/he should be present in her/his publications;
and s/he should work within an analytic research agenda in order to improve
theoretical understandings of wider social phenomena (ibid.: 373–375).
Whereas the first two pillars do not necessarily distinguish analytic auto-
ethnography from the evocative tradition, the third does. While Ellis and
Bochner stress that an autoethnographer needs to gaze ‘outward on social
and cultural aspects of their personal experience’ (2000: 739), thereby
emphasising the importance of the connection between the researcher’s
personal experience and a wider, socio-cultural analysis, Anderson claims that
evocative autoethnography ‘seeks narrative fidelity only to the researcher’s
subjective experience, [while] analytic autoethnography is grounded in self-
experience but reaches beyond it as well’ (2006: 386, emphasis added). It
might, for example, use in-depth interviews and other kinds of data. Ande-
son can be understood as emphasising the possibilities of a mature auto-
ethnographic methodology, one which can provide for realist ethnographies
that take social settings and problems into account. Evocative ethnographers,
on the other hand, continue to emphasise ‘writing from the heart’ since ‘we
enact the worlds we study’ (Denzin 2006: 422–423). I researched and analysed
paternalism and tourism as a development strategy in my PhD and later
research, although the ideas I developed were strongly influenced by my prior
working experience in community-based tourism at Treesleeper. My research
was analytic insofar as it embedded paternalism in a wider historical and
political economic context. I gathered new data as well, along with a MA
student (Hüncke 2010), and conducted three more in-depth interviews during
my fieldwork in 2010. However, the core findings that formed the basis of the
PhD were derived from a retrospective analysis rather than from an ‘analytic
agenda’ (Anderson 2006: 386–388). I had no research agenda when I worked
as a development fieldworker in tourism. In that sense, these experiences were
completely ‘open’.

Memories, unawareness and power

The fact that my research was based on prior experience of working as a
development fieldworker (functioning as a community member in some ways
while remaining an outsider in others) gave it three important characteristics.
First, my writing was based on memory. A PhD student, Sylvia Smith, once
wondered when embarking on an autoethnography: ‘I haven’t been keeping notes or anything, [...] Where would I start?’ (cited in Ellis and Bochner 2000: 750). This question acknowledges the complexities of a retrospective approach. It is perhaps inevitable, therefore, that my current perspectives have influenced my memory. Thoughts and feelings appear, disappear and reappear, and not necessarily in a chronological or linear way (Ellis and Bochner 2000: 751–752). Arguably, the analytic process that went into my PhD retrospectively changed my experience of working in tourism in Tsintsabis. When I started my PhD I was still working at a Dutch NGO, which changed my views about development and paternalism, not least because of the visibility of the power relations that prevailed between myself and my colleagues on the one hand, and the people among whom we worked on the other. Retrospective autoethnography is inevitably clouded. The least one can do is acknowledge this – something I neglected to do in my PhD dissertation (see Koot 2013: 309–311; cf. Hunt and Ruiz Junco 2006: 371). The past, it is worth emphasising, is ‘a social construct that only emerges referentially and selectively, inevitably formed and transformed by means of re-experience and interpretation’ (Argenti and Röschenthaler 2006: 33), in which ‘memory allows us to structure the past in relation to the present’ (ibid.).

Second, the fact that I was unaware that I was ‘doing research’ while living in Tsintsabis proved epistemologically valuable and ethically problematic. In relation to the latter, my unawareness automatically creates an unawareness on the part of the research subjects as well. Therefore there has been no possibility to build up informed consent (cf. Tolich 2010). Epistemologically, the knowledge generated through the manifold experiences of everyday life is very different from that gained from a specific research perspective. Working in the community meant that I held an important social position, one that was very different from that of researcher. My experiences of the community were very broad. I was ‘open’ to reality as I encountered it, working on a tourism project together with the people. Although in autoethnographic contexts social scientists are usually members of the group being studied, they also identify as researchers. These multiple foci set them apart from their subjects (Anderson 2006: 380). I stood outside the group in Tsintsabis in some ways, but not because I was a researcher. I was oblivious of the danger Anderson (2006: 389, italics added) warns researchers against:

[T]he researcher must exercise extreme caution not to let his or her research focus fade out of awareness in the face of other pressing and enticing engagements in the field. Furthermore, the autoethnographer must not allow herself or himself to be drawn into participating heavily in activities in the field at the expense of writing field notes.

In this line, Maréchal insists that the researcher should retain ‘a distinct and highly visible identity as a self-aware scholar and social actor’ (2010: 44, italics added). Such warnings did not apply to my situation. I was able to turn my experience into an interesting ethnographic analysis based on ‘openness’
and 'broad knowledge', rather than on awareness and field notes. I disagree, therefore, that an ethnographer should not 'participate heavily' in the life of the community and prioritise field notes instead — it is the participation itself that forms the core of the creation of knowledge in the first place. Despite their importance, field notes are secondary; they are a result of participation. And, in my case, memories proved more meaningful than field notes. The knowledge I acquired was broader than it would have been if I had followed an analytic agenda. Furthermore, this knowledge proved to be 'fluid in time'; it was influenced and changed by my later experiences. This leads me to the third and final point: power.

Because of the autoethnographer's central position — in the end her/his memories are decisive — a situation arises in which the relation between the autoethnographer and the 'other' is always asymmetrical. In my case, I moved from one such asymmetrical, negotiated power relation (development fieldworker in tourism) to another (tourism researcher) (cf. Tomaselli et al. 2013). If I had followed an autoethnographic approach from the outset, with a focus on my own experiences and memories, I might easily have neglected the voices of the Bushmen with whom I lived (cf. Koot 2017b). Nevertheless, using the retrospective autoethnographic approach that I relied on led to different forms of exclusion. The voices of the Bushmen in Tsintsabis who were not part of the Tseesleeper tourism project were arguably less 'visible' in my research than those of my former Tseesleeper colleagues. Using my experiences as a development fieldworker as the basis of my tourism research has afforded me insights into baasskap from an emic point of view — something that is very rare. Despite the limitations of my approach, it has produced important knowledge about social situations that could not have been arrived at in a different way. Such knowledge of people who have worked in (sustainable) tourism can be crucial to bridge the gap that, according to Noel Salazar (2017), so often exists between (critical) tourism studies on the one hand, in which tourism itself is analysed, and the practitioners' side on the other, in which tourism management strategies are being developed to make tourism work. In addition, I argue that such knowledge is equally crucial to bridge the gap between ethnographers and development workers.

Conclusion

While engaging in development work in community-based tourism among the Haiom in Tsintsabis, Namibia, I learned that paternalism is a widespread phenomenon among them, resulting from (often unconscious) assumptions about white superiority. There is a tendency among outside experts (young or old, male or female) to disregard local knowledge and systems, and assume a position of authority. The process is also supported 'from below': many Bushmen allow whites to do this.

This analysis of NGO paternalism towards Bushmen would not have been possible without my working experience as a development fieldworker, which
gave me an ‘overwhelming advantage of allowing me to be the closest I could come to studying tourism from an ethnographic perspective’ (Bruner 2005: 2). I experienced working in community-based tourism both as a community member and as an outsider. I was in a position of power in the community. Even after I had become a ‘real’ self-aware researcher, using autoethnography, I acted from a position of power. Memory, unawareness and power are important issues in autoethnography, and various scholars (e.g., Anderson 2006; Maréchal 2010) argue that one should stay aware of one’s position as a researcher in autoethnography, but this raises the question of what to do when this is impossible. In this chapter, I have shown that the value of experiences of power based on memories lies in the fact that they can create ethnographically enriching insights. Hopefully, many more retrospective analytic autoethnographies will appear in the future.

Notes

2 Resettlement farms have been set up by the Namibian Government after independence (1990) with the aim of redistributing white-owned commercial farms to the benefit of the larger black population as a base to start various development initiatives, mostly agricultural production and social welfare (Gargallo 2010).
3 The various Bushmen groups in southern Africa use ‘click sounds’ in their different languages. These are written as ‘/h’, ‘/t’, ‘/t’ and ‘/x/’.
4 The term ‘Bushmen’ is understood by some to be derogatory and/or racist. It was dropped in favour of the term ‘San’, which itself has a derogatory meaning. People in Tantsabis themselves mostly prefer ‘Bushman’. The continued use of ‘San’ by some academics seems to further mystify the people who in Namibia are called, by most people, ‘Bushmen’. There is no reason to pretend that the change of a term would reduce the invidiousness and racism that exists in the various relationships with other cultures, which is where the terms derive their emotive content (Gordon and Sholto Douglas 2000).
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