

SUPSI

Review of Wikipedia Articles

The review is meant to facilitate further improvement of Wikipedia articles. Suggestions about the quality of a Wikipedia articles can be found at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Featured_article_criteria.

Please send your review in pdf and .doc format to Marta Pucciarelli: pucciarelli.marta@gmail.com.

Name of the reviewer	Sven Ouzman
Affiliation	Centre for Rock Art Research + Management, University of Western Australia
Title of the article	San People

1. Quality of the Summary

Is the summary of the article a complete, thorough, and concise introduction to the topic? How do you think the summary could be improved? Which meaningful data are missing? Is there something that you find too much detailed for a general overview of the topic?

The summary is good, though it - and much of the rest of the entry - falls into the trap of categorising San as 'hunter-gatherers' and not making clear that that is how they used to live but that today - and for perhaps the last 50 years at least, they have been integrated successfully as well as problematically into the wider southern African economy.

It might be an idea to address the summary chronologically by inserting a short section that says the San and their ancestors lived as gatherer-hunters throughout southern Africa, making some of the world's earliest art, producing stone tools, experimenting and doing chemistry at 100,000 years ago (the finds at Blombos Cave for example) and that they also existed in a great diversity of groups and traditions. Then, maybe 2500 years ago, they came into physical contact with migrating African farmers and probably also Khoekhoe ('Khoi') herders and their lifestyles adapted to this contact and did so again with the arrival of Europeans and again with the attainment of independence of all the southern African countries. See also specific comments on the 'San people' entry on the 'sticky notes'.

2. Structure and style of the article

Is the article properly presenting the topic for a general public? Does the article provide a complete and easy-to-navigate structure? Which paragraph would you add, unify or split into different parts? Please provide a list of suggestions. Is the article well written and understandable at a high school level?

The structure is generally sound but the section on San deep history or archaeology is too brief. This is where the images of rock art, stone tools, archaeological sites should go and a page or so of information on what archaeologists and anthropologists think San lived thought etc. The section on genetics - some of which is erroneously placed under 'mass media' (see sticky note comment), should come here.

Also, the section on 'Society' makes very little mention of what San society is like today and the recent past. It focuses rather on the 'ethnographic present' and creates the impression San are still gatherer-hunters in some way. This is classic 'othering' in the anthropological sense. The images here too need to be varied to show not just staged photos of San in traditional dress, but San as they live throughout the region today.

There is then a big jump to section 4 on land rights in Botswana. Rather have a section on San early history/archaeology and then 'San today' under which issues of land rights, media representation etc fall. The section (4) is also skewed heavily toward Botswana and while very important, this section does need a paragraph or two contextualising San land rights throughout southern Africa.

3. Content

Is the article comprehensive of major facts related to the topic? Is the article adequately placing the subject in context? What does it miss? Please provide a list of topics you think should be included in the article (suggestions must be related to bibliography). Do you find that some arguments are not meaningful or representative of the topic for a general public. What should be deleted? Please explain why.

See also comments in part 2, above, and sticky note comments on entry pdf.

The major omission is a short intro that contextualises San early history (see comments in Part 1) and then moves to the modern day. More emphasis should also be given to San egncy and things they are doing to cope with the modern world like Ratelgat and !Khwatlu cultural centres in South Africa, Wildebeestkuil; rock art sites. The archaeology section is poor and new finds at Blombos, Diepkloof and so on show San ancestors to have been cognitively modern and advanced. The Kalahai Revisionist Debate is missing and should receive space in the early history section.

Wikipedia Primary School: Providing on Wikipedia the information necessary to complete the cycle of primary education in the languages used by the different education systems. Document updated 29 January 2015.

This work is under a Creative Commons attribution share alike license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

Also, a discussion of modern identity politics could be useful in terms of the 'secret San' - people who have been brought up and/or claimed non-San ancestry who are now reclaiming San ancestry. . The mass media section is relatively uncritical and should talk about Indigenous Intellectual Property Rights and WIMSA's research and media contracts, for example.

4. International and local dimension

Is the article neutral (it presents general and acknowledged views fairly and without bias)? Is the article representative of the international dimension and consolidated research about the topic? If applicable, does the article feature examples from all over the world (no localisms)? Please draft a list of what is missing with related references.

See section 3 for comment.

The section on Botswana land rights could be seen as a crusade against the Botswana government. I think the referencing makes the points made well, but it would be wise to contextualise the land rights issue more widely.

Again, the main issue is not to present San as only existing in the past, or as being helpless victims.

5. References (essential to allow the articles to be improved)

Is the list of publications comprehensive and updated? Does it list the fundamental monographs and papers? Please provide primary/generic and secondary/original resources which need to be included and suggest the list of publications which should be removed.

References by keyan Tomaselli and colleagues - the special issue of Critical Arts published in 2014 would help with media representation.

A great many archaeological references are needed and Peter Mitchell's *The Archaeology of southern Africa* is a good place to start.