Tourism and the heritage of atrocity

Ashworth, Gregory J.

Published in:
EPRINTS-BOOK-TITLE

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2004

Citation for published version (APA):
Ashworth, G. J. (2004). Tourism and the heritage of atrocity: managing the heritage of South African. In *EPRINTS-BOOK-TITLE* s.n..

Tourism and the heritage of atrocity: Managing the heritage of South African apartheid for entertainment.

G.J.Ashworth, University of Groningen, NL

Combining the uncombinable : enjoying the uncomfortable.

The focus of this book is on tourism's persistent search for novelty which has come to include an ever widening search for tourism products and experiences to satisfy a restless and fickle market. As part of this search, the extremes in human experience are being utilised for the tourist who attains a gratification as participant or spectator, with the line between the two being frequently blurred.   Atrocities contain many elements of such extremes which can be used to create marketable products from human cruelty and trauma. The heritage of atrocity concerns the deliberate infliction by people of suffering on people. The use of this in tourism, a discretionary activity pursued for entertainment, seems an inherently improbable phenomenon. Indeed the relating of these two human activities may be viewed as at the very least bizarre and probably even as distasteful for atrocity heritage introduces a tone of seriousness into entertainment while tourism threatens to trivialise the serious.

However, the exploitation of the heritage of the suffering of others for pleasure through the development of tourism products and experiences is not particularly new and is now relatively commonplace in tourism in some form or other. The enormous range of events, sites and historic associations that attract tourists include many that commemorate or recall unpleasant or traumatic occurrences from the past. The justification for this chapter is that the use of such heritage poses distinctive issues and requires careful management based upon an understanding of the phenomenon.

Approaches

Although many elements of atrocity have a mass appeal such tourism can be classified, within the broad category of 'special interest', which is an amalgam of many quite different interests. From the side of the commodified site or event, atrocity tourism overlaps with many such specialised 'adjectival tourisms' such as 'war tourism', 'battlefield tourism', 'disaster tourism' and even 'killing-fields tourism' or 'hot-spots tourism' (i.e. visits to currently or recently well publicised places of conflict). Secondly, it can be incorporated into a categorisation that relates to the disposition of the tourist or the sort of satisfaction obtained from the experience. Atrocity heritage tourism can be considered as one more narrowly defined aspect of the 'dark tourism' of Lennon & Foley (2000) and the 'thanatourism' of Dann and Seaton (2003). These encompass many motives (Dann, forthcoming) from a pilgrimage of penance and repentance for an assumed complicity (a 'mea culpa tourism'), through a quest for identity ('roots tourism'), a less personally engaged search for knowledge, understanding and enlightenment ('edutourism'), a social mission to shape more desirable or responsible futures ('lest we forget' or 'never again tourism'), to much darker and less socially acceptable emotions where gratification is obtained from violence and suffering, becoming in its extreme form a 'sado-masochistic pornographic tourism'. Finally, the much broader field of heritage interpretation has long had to confront the difficulty of managing the large quantity of

the remembered and memorialised human past that involves atrocity (Uzzel, 1989). Tourism is not the only, and rarely even the most important, market for the consumption of interpretations of such a 'dissonant heritage' (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996) from a history that may hurt, confuse, or marginalise someone in some way.

The selected cases

The long sad chronicle of human history provides no shortage of cruelty from which cases could be selected and the possible range of atrocity sites is as wide as human creativity. The past is so full of acts of collective physical violence imposed on others by governments, ideologies and social groups that it is possible to interpret not only every battlefield and war museum but also every castle, ruler's palace, cathedral, merchant's house, country house, plantation or factory as an atrocity site. However, the possibility for successful commodification for tourism can be limited by a requirement that the event itself has four main characteristics.

First, there must be a human perpetrator and a human victim so that people, as tourists, can identify, or are identified by others, with people as perpetrators or victims. Secondly, the perpetrator must be engaged in a conscious, deliberate action and the victims must be innocent, thus not contributing significantly to their own condition, for it is the knowing consciousness of the perpetrator in an intentional act that renders it an atrocity. Thirdly, atrocity implies an extraordinary seriousness, whether of scale, however difficult that may be to quantify, or unusualness that is out of the ordinary for it is this bizarreness which draws the attention of the observer to the event that transforms routine cruelty into atrocity. Fourthly, an atrocity is an event that is known and remembered which requires knowledge and memorability. A secret, unknown or forgotten atrocity can only be potentially usable. This memorablity stems not only from the inherent nature and circumstances of the event, but also from the way knowledge of it is promoted and subsequently used. There is a need for the event to capture the imagination of others at the time and later. This would seem to suggest that recentness is an advantage not only because of the surviving human memory of those directly involved but also the efficiency of modern global information distribution techniques.

Three episodes in modern history seem to fulfil these requirements: two of which have been studied in this way and thus can serve as precedents for a focus here upon the third. The Holocaust of the Jewish people in Europe from 1933-45 as a culmination of a much longer persecution, and the pursuit of the Atlantic Slave Trade from the sixteenth to the nineteenth centuries, have both the necessary multimillion scale and multi-century longevity. Both are memorialised through many specific sites, occurrences and individuals and both have powerful contemporary implications for personal and group identities and for political nation and state building. Both are currently used in part for tourism although tourism was not, and remains not, the main motive for heritage interpretations in either case. Finally both were world scale, long term, systematic, top-down impositions of injustice and oppression from one large group of perpetrators upon another equally large group of victims. Identification is thus so widespread in practice that it may be extended to include all humanity in one way or another. We are thus all involved whether as tourists or not.

The third such episode, which is studied here, builds upon these two precedents, the first of which has now a large academic literature (see Ashworth and Hartmann, forthcoming,) and the second which has recently been comprehensively introduced by Dann and Seaton (2003). It is the imposition in South Africa of the

ideology of racial separation, known as 'apartheid' from 1948-1994. As in the other episodes it was only the culmination of a much longer period of racial discrimination which was not confined to this period or to that country;. It is reflected in the memorialisation of many specific sites, events and personalities; it has a contemporary significance for social identities and nation building; it involves a wider world as legatee of victimisation or perpetration; and, finally and most relevant in this context, it is now beginning, somewhat hesitantly, to be used for tourism.

The noticeable differences are in timing as the ending of the apartheid system is much more recent than the abolition of slavery or the ending of the Jewish Holocaust. Secondly, and most significantly, is the continuing presence of both victims and perpetrators in the same country. The victims were neither eliminated nor physically expelled in a diaspora and the perpetrators are neither physically distant nor could be demonised into a mythical, conveniently now non-existent, caricature of 'slave trader'; or 'Nazi'. Furthermore this coexistence is not just a tolerated spatial coincidence, it has become a necessity to be maintained as economically and politically central to the creation of the new 'rainbow nation' of the explicitly multiracial South Africa. This adds a further dimension of complexity to an already inherently complex problem.

The motives

Motives of tourists

An explanation of why tourists are attracted to the heritage of atrocity is necessary for understanding how such heritage is actually used by tourists and how it should be managed. Tourists are people and thus the uncomfortable question arises, 'why are people attracted by atrocity?' This attraction may be condemned as a strange and aberrant social behaviour, betraying personal deviancy from the norms of the socially acceptable and from a balanced individual psychological disposition. If atrocity heritage tourists are antisocial 'weirdoes' and psychically disturbed 'ghouls' then such heritage must be at least carefully managed and probably actively discouraged. However the alternative to this deviance hypothesis is that an interest in atrocity is an aspect of quite normal behaviour or, at worst, only a more open or exaggerated form of normal intrinsic character traits of people. If that is so then we are all actual or potential atrocity tourists and the elements that favour the commodification of such sites, events and associations for tourism are easy to appreciate.

Four main arguments, each of which places atrocity within a much more familiar and generally unexceptional context, can be made.

The curiosity argument.
The unusual or the unique is interesting to people and thus to tourists. Therefore the reason why tourists are attracted to atrocity comes at least in part from the same curiosity that motivates people to notice and remember occurrences that are out of the ordinary. The unique and unusual evokes and satisfies human curiosity: the tourist is not strange in this respect, only perhaps less inhibited in this exercise by the constraints of daily life. Curiosity about the atypical motivates 'disaster tourism' where accidents and natural calamities attract spectators, souvenir hunters and popular media attention. On a more organised, and socially acceptable level, some spectator sports, and even traditional circus activities, owe their popularity to the entertainment value of the perceived

possibility of a personal disaster overtaking the performers. Atrocity being a unique, non-everyday event has a similar entertainment value.

The identity arguments

The explanation for an increasing interest in atrocity heritage may be the same as for heritage as a whole and heritage tourism is just an expression of this interest while on holiday. All heritage tourism is arguably a form of 'roots' tourism as the tourist seeks self-understanding and self-identity through heritage wherever it might be located. As much history has been unpleasant for many, it is not surprising that such a search almost inescapably reveals past atrocity with which the searcher can identify, most usually as victim. The motives for such a self-identifying visitor may be instruction in personal or family history, or have the spiritual and reflective characteristics of a pilgrimage to 'pay respects' to others with whom the visitor feels a personal link.

Equally the increasing differentiation and fragmentation of the tourism market has been matched by attempts to increase the specificity of the tourist destination. Heritage has long been a major instrument for the transmission of this distinctiveness, answering the question 'what happened here that makes this place different?' As with personal identities, atrocity heritage is an especially powerful instrument for differentiating places. It can transform an otherwise unprepossessing 'anywhere' into a very notable, recognisable and promotable 'somewhere'. Places may welcome such powerful indelible marking as 'putting them on the map' but equally if it is an undesirable map may attempt to escape from such ill repute. A place such as Sharpeville may find its notoriety a disadvantage and even townships such as Soweto, that figured prominently in world news bulletins over many decades, may find the persistent evocation of association with violence, lawlessness and conflict a major disadvantage in attracting not only visitors but economic activities, investment and residents.

The horror argument.

The idea that some people are attracted by horrific occurrences may appear a less acceptable argument than those advanced above. It may seem repugnant and just not morally acceptable for people to be entertained by the accounts of the suffering of others. However horror tourism is not new. From Roman gladiatorial spectacle to Madame Tussaud's 'chamber of horrors', suffering and death have been used as public entertainment. The link between portrayals of violence and amusement may be only an extreme form of a more general and socially acceptable attraction to the dramatic. The deliberate evocation of a mix of the emotions of fascination and fear through a voyeuristic contact with horror is a staple product of not just many tourism sites and trails but much of literature, folk stories, art and more recently film and television production. The relating to tourists of the heritage of atrocity is thus as entertaining as any of these media and for precisely the same reasons and with the same moral loading. Furthermore if the tourism experience is essentially an emotional occurrence which contrasts with the experience of daily reality and offers a temporary escape from it, then the tourist is posing the question, 'what extraordinary feelings can I experience at this site or facility?' Sites of atrocity would seem particularly apposite because there is just more and rawer emotions to experience.

The empathy argument.

This could be just a more acceptable way of expressing the fascination of horror as the distinction between an acceptable empathetic identification and an unacceptable voyeurism is vague and difficult to draw or to express through interpretation. Empathy

relies upon the capacity of heritage consumers to identify themselves with the atrocity narrative being related which is much easier to obtain with named and personified individuals, in this case overwhelmingly Mandela, than with large abstract groups. This identification is more usually assumed to be with the portrayed victims: it could equally however be with the perpetrators. If tourists engage in fantasy (Dann, 1981) then is a visitor to an atrocity becoming, in fantasy, a victim, a perpetrator or both?

None of these arguments are, of course, exclusive. Conscious political homage or atonement of largely sympathetic liberal markets in Europe and North America, meritorious self-education and a search for exemplars applicable elsewhere may combine with a curiosity about places made notorious by their repetition in news bulletins, with a frisson of excitement through exposure to previous violence and present perceived criminality, and obsessive interest in the exercise of human cruelty.

Motives of producers

The creators, custodians, interpreters and managers of atrocity heritage not only may have, but are very likely to have, quite different motives and objectives than the visitors. The explicit intentions of many of the managers and interpreters of sites and museums of atrocity heritage is frequently and openly expressed to be didactic. From the viewpoint of governments, the principal function of heritage is the legitimation of dominant ideologies and jurisdictions and thus a revolutionary change in the ideology of the state will be reflected in a radical change in public heritage which is adjusted to concur with new power relations, popular aspirations and values. A new past needs to be explicitly created to reflect and support the new present, whilst the old becomes at best irrelevant and at worst contradictory. However the simple argument for change is modified in South Africa by two constraints. First, realisation of a new heritage agenda costs time and money and there is a shortage of both. Secondly, a simple and definitive shift from the old to the new would threaten the stability of the transition. The new democratic government is publicly committed, to a multi-racial and multi-ethnic consensus. This raises the sensitive issues of establishing the trappings of the new state legitimacy while assuaging minorities, including those who were committed to the old. In simple terms if the new South Africa wishes to continue to involve its white, coloured and Asian minorities in its economic, social and political life, which is its clearly stated policy, then it cannot either demonise them or write them out of the script of the country's founding mythology. It needs at least their passive consent if not active embracing of the official heritage narrative. The 'rainbow nation' therefore may well have to accommodate separate heritages within the public domain, however uncomfortable or even contradictory these may be.

In addition, past atrocity is often used not only to stimulate empathy with past victims but to make any future repetition of such events in comparable circumstances less likely. Further, many interpretations attempt to draw lessons from the past that are considered to be relevant for the present and the future. Heritage managers have agendas which may be broadly and vaguely philanthropic, anti-racist, anti-militarist, and multi-ethnic. The significant point is just that the motives and messages of the heritage producers may not be the same as those of the consumers.

Motives of residents

Finally, although the motives of the visitors and of the official producers may well be

very mixed, so also may be the reactions of the local population. Residents and participants in the events commemorated may be gratified by outside interest or might be expected to resent the voyeuristic intrusion of 'poverty tourists' of another race and income. However local entrepreneurs, tour operators, guides, shebeen owners and those claiming to have been active in the resistance are prominent among the operators of such tours. This together with a lack of overtly expressed hostility to tourists suggests at the least that locals welcome the income more than they resent the intrusion.

The nature and location of the product

<u>The narratives</u>

The heritage of resistance to apartheid is communicated through two very commonly encountered heritage narratives. These can be labelled 'the progress thesis' and 'the freedom struggle'. The 'progress thesis' whereby the historical chronicle of events is reduced to an inevitable sequence of improvement from bad to better in a straight and unswerving line. This is the 'road to freedom' or equally could be the 'road' to prosperity, enlightenment, civilisation or any other such description of the completed present. It is the dominant narrative of museums and of 'national histories' world-wide. It is not only chronologically simple, it is easy to comprehend and avoids the complications of contradictory or competing ideas. It is also remarkably satisfying not only for the producer of such heritage narrative, as a self -justification but also for the consumer, who has the satisfaction of knowing that he is the epitome of progress, standing upon the pinnacle of achievement and is thus more fortunate than previous generations who have further to travel or have not yet embarked upon such a journey.

The 'freedom struggle', a term that encapsulates both goal and process, has similar attributes of simplicity and inevitability as the progress thesis, but within the context of struggle. The dichotomy between the conditions of freedom and oppression, and the actors as freedom fighter and oppressor, admits of only two homogeneous categories. This is unifying, both within the group and in relation to the external and necessarily demonised enemy outside. The nature of 'struggle' introduces the elements of drama and heroism and is strengthened by the ferocity and determination of fighting against odds. It thus produces heroes, as role models and foci of identification and critical events, 'turning points', around which the narrative can be constructed. Small wonder that almost every existing sovereign state has created for itself a founding mythology derived from the history of an ultimately successful freedom struggle.

<u>The locations</u>

The location of apartheid heritage has three characteristics. First, every 'homeland' and township is a monument to the apartheid system. Indeed the whole spatial relationships of areas and districts, of work, service and residential functions and of the transport systems than bound them together is a product of the attempt to establish racially separate development and thus a visible omnipresent heritage of that era and ideology. Secondly, the recentness of the attempt to create a heritage of apartheid and its insertion into an already existing panoply of British and Afrikaner heritages has almost inevitably resulted in a piecemeal scatter of sites and collections. Thirdly, much of the heritage does not easily lend itself to the architecturally impressive or the

historically dramatic. Much of the history of the anti-apartheid movement was acted out by poor people in the townships amongst the mundane and ordinary structures and environments of the poor. The homes of its heroes and the sites of its events are by their nature unimpressive and commonplace especially compared to the imposing public buildings and grandiloquent monumental statuary of the previous regime. Events, such as the Sharpeville shootings of 1960 or the Soweto school uprising of 1976, may have been dramatic and memorable but the settings in which they took place are not.

Buildings and sites
Although sacralised sites are often linked with buildings as structures become embued with the spirit of the historical events that occurred in and around them. There are, however, also sites which are just locations in space with no other distinguishing physical attributes.

The Regina Mundi Catholic church at Rockville, Soweto for example is the site in, and around, which political gatherings occurred in evasion of the Congregating Act. It was the so-called 'Soweto parliament' which attracted meetings of more than 6000 dissidents and the site of the funeral of the victims of the 1976 school uprising. It is also a physical monument as a building, accommodating diverse relics from the 'black Madonna' statue, to the bullet holes in the walls. The Morris Isaacson School in Mpathi Street, Soweto, is visually unremarkable but is sacralised as the place where the 1976 school protests against the introduction of Afrikaans as a medium of instruction are reputed to have begun. The nearby Vilakazi Street memorial mural commemorates the subsequent protest march and violent police reaction to it that focussed upon that street. Indeed Vilakazi Street composed of quite ordinary small houses in Orlando West has received the epithet, 'Home of the great' as former residence of two Nobel prize winners (Mandela and Tutu). The Hector Peterson Memorial in the Soweto cemetery is a commemorative sculpted object rather than a specific site marker, linking an individual with the other 300 similar victims of this episode. Typical of the otherwise characterless space is the recently named 'Freedom Square' in Kiptown, Soweto.   It is just an empty, as yet totally unmarked, space between residential districts used now, as previously, for access, some informal trading, socialising and meeting. Its heritage significance is the link with the so-called 'freedom charter' declared here by the ANC spokesman Walter Sisulu.

The museums
Cape Town's District Six Museum was opened as a housed collection in an already preserved Baptist chapel in 1994, although it can be argued that District Six itself had since the 1980s been a monument, in the sense of a sacralised empty space. The concept of 'salted earth', upon which developers were reluctant to build, represented in itself 'space on which meanings could be inscribed in the imagination' (McEachern, 2001: 127). The 'meanings' so inscribed are those of forced removal and survival, after the designation of the district as 'white' in 1966, a theme later transferred to the museum located on the edge of the district and significantly opposite the forbidding and infamous Caledon Road police station. As on Robben Island ex-residents of the area are used as interpreters with such 'autoethnography' being expressed both verbally through guides and also visually and in writing through the personal accounts that dominate the exhibits. The museum is basically a reconstruction of a remembered pasts with the historical map in process of continuous construction from the recollections of individuals, assuming a significance larger than the empty space

of the reality outside (Pratt, 1994:28). The political message is that of the 'rainbow nation' as past reality rather than only future aspiration. It is demonstrated to have existed prior to the deportations but was disrupted by its antithesis, the apartheid state. It may be that the district six community is a romanticised image of racial and social harmony that has taken on the significance of a myth. If so, or if such communities are largely created by the opposition evoked by threats to their existence, then apartheid effectively created district six as an idea. It now stands as representative of many such disrupted communities throughout South Africa, some commemorated in a similar way such as Pageview, Johannesburg (Kleuver 1999) and many that are not.

The Winnie Mandela House, Orlando West, Soweto, is the least architecturally impressive of the museums being a small otherwise unremarkable township house but its very small size and unpretentious ordinariness endow it with a quality of domestic cozyness. The content is similarly commonplace, composed of the utensils, accumulated souvenirs and cuttings of the Mandelas. The visitor has the feeling of a chance visit to a neighbour. This is, of course, both the content of its message of the struggle of ordinary people (like the visitor) against an oppressive and powerful state and its effective means of conveying it. It was for long privately owned by Mandela's ex-wife but is now in the hands of the Soweto Heritage Trust but remains without much information, visitor management, or facilities.

The Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg, opened in 2001, as a private museum contrasts sharply in every respect with the Winnie Mandela House. It is large, purpose-built, architecturally notable, and filled with carefully selected artefacts and exhibits. The visitor is from the entry professionally managed and guided and the exhibits are thoughtfully arranged and interpreted. The building design is deliberately stark with sharply contrasting shapes and materials, 'bringing to mind images of detention, oppression, division' (visitor brochure), reminiscent of Libeskind's Jewish life museum in Berlin. The interpretative theme is deliberately universal rather than particular to the South African experience and is clearly designed to appeal to all racial groups in South Africa as well as to foreign visitors. It didactically relates a narrative of injustice and resistance that avoids a stereotypical white versus black confrontation. It also does not ignore the existing heritage narratives familiar to whites, as for example the mythology of the trekboers, but includes and builds upon it as part of the wider story. It stresses the wide moral dichotomies of 'tragedy and heroism; tyranny and freedom; chaos and peace', which are intended to refer to all forms of racial inequality. It provides an experiential metaphor of the 'road to freedom' in the journey of the visitor from the racially segregated entry to the final triumph of the exit in 1994. Its location is also distinctive and not irrelevant to the intended message. If the message of the Winnie Mandela House is inseparable from its location in Soweto, the location of the Apartheid Museum on the outskirts of Johannesburg is also significant. It is sited next to the Gold Reef City historical theme and amusement park, inside a gated compound surrounded by an extensive car park. The promotional literature significantly points out that the museum is only 15 minutes from the international airport and 20 minutes from Sandton, (the largest and dominantly white residential and commercial edge city of the Johannesburg urban region): no information on access from Johannesburg or using public transport is given. Its intended market of tourists, educational groups and suburban residents accessible by car and coach is not dissimilar to that of its Gold Reef neighbour although its heritage message is much more serious, eschewing the more casual and entertainment oriented history of its neighbour.

Although neither so extensive nor so well known as the above cases, many

other local museums attempt to narrate aspects of the apartheid experience (Berning & Dominy, 1992). Both the Natal Museum, Pietermaritzburg and the KwaMuhle Museum, Durban relate the daily life of the township and thus contain an implicit message of continuous grinding inconvenience, if not hardship, stemming from the local consequences of the imposition of apartheid (Goudie et al, 1999). The Bo-Kaap museum, Cape Town, similarly houses largely domestic artefacts and records relating to the long standing dominantly Malay community of Bo-Kaap.   Its political message is muted and its relationship to the anti-apartheid struggle indirect (Murphy 1997). Like the District Six Museum it concentrates on evoking the image of a lively and harmonious past community which is in process of disappearing: it is thus in this sense typical of many such museums in South Africa and beyond. The very existence of such racially defined communities is itself a memorial to segregation. However, unlike District Six, far from being disrupted by the Group Areas Act of the apartheid regime, the ethnicity of this otherwise centrally located and attractive residential location was preserved from a gentrification which would at least in part have been white. The disappearance of the traditional community can thus be attributed to the removal of such residential restrictions.

The prisons
Prisons, penal colonies and detention centres are frequently used as powerful symbols of a heritage narrative based upon struggle not least because they convey particularly evocative heritage experiences with which the visitor can empathise (see Tunbridge's, forthcoming comparative study of the heritage of penal colonies). The Robben Island prison complex is in many respects the centrepiece of the whole resistance to apartheid heritage system and is the main and sometimes only such experience of visitors to South Africa, and as such it has generated a substantial literature since 1994 (see Smith, 1997). It owes its success (indicated by the over 300,000 annual visitors) in part to its ease of association with a single individual, Nelson Mandela, imprisoned here for 18 years, and in part to its fortuitous location in Table Bay, 11 km from Cape Town. The island is only accessible by official inclusive boat tours from the Victoria and Alfred waterfront (via the purpose built quayside Nelson Mandela Reception Centre) which allows a strongly directed visitor tour management. Graham et al (2001: 244-8) recognise three perspectives on Robben Island that have an uneasy relationship with each other, namely the 'political', the 'tourist-commercial' and the 'environmental'.

The political use as the centrepiece of the resistance to apartheid narrative and flagship site of the new national identity is the most obvious. It was declared a National Monument and Museum in 1997 and applied to UNESCO for World Heritage inscription in 1998. The interpretation contains a simple explicit ideology of injustice. The interpretation is strongly personalised by both the ex-detainee interpreters and by the focus upon the experience of a single familiar individual. The oppression is related as largely devoid of perpetrators: the oppressor is the 'system' as instrument of an abstract idea. The Afrikaner guards are seen to an extent as ignorant innocents in process of education by the inmates and as co-residents and thus co-victims.

The 'tourist-commercial' dimension is enhanced by the island's location near Cape Town and by its effective incorporation into the Victoria and Alfred waterfront development which is a major centre for recreational shopping and entertainment for residents and tourists alike. The use of a heritage site by tourists creates potential tension if only through the existence of multiple markets at the same time and place.

This becomes problematic if the behaviour, expectations of different groups conflict. One aspect of this is that from a standpoint of the tourism industry, heritage products are consumed very rapidly and rarely lead to repeat visits. There is thus the need to both constantly diversify and extend the product itself as well as to lengthen the tourist stay by the provision of other attractions and facilities and preferably overnight accommodation. Widening the heritage product range to include heritages other than that of the anti-apartheid struggle is certainly possible. The island has a long history of use as detention centre for political dissidents long before those of the anti-apartheid struggle and has also a heritage related to its use as a quarantine station, leper colony and war time base. These additional strands could widen and complement the core message or dilute it and distract from it. Even more distracting would be the use of the 'environmental' perspective whereby non-heritage tourism products, such as the nature/ wild life components (notably penguins), or even picnic and outdoor recreation would be added to the visitor package. More controversially still would be proposals for hotel, and even casino, development which would be anathema to many who would regard this as a devaluing of the political and ideological message (Worden, 1996; 1997). This potential conflict between the political didactic intentions, that are currently dominant and the tourism entertainment and natural environmental themes is likely to become more significant if commercial success is to be maintained and the immediacy and novelty of the anti-apartheid victory heritage and its living participants as both visitors, presenters and principal exhibit, recedes into the past.

The success of Robben Island has prompted the development of other similar prison museums but none are comparable in features or visitor numbers. The Drakenstein open prison where Mandela spent the 14 months from December 1988, immediately prior to his release, lacks the drama of the sparseness of the site and the setting of Robben Island.

The nomenclature

The renaming of places and streets is an obvious, visible, cheap and easily executed form of reinterpreting public heritage. Some of the most high profile architects of the apartheid state, such as Malan or Verwoerd have largely disappeared from at least officially used place names. Notably however the historic figures associated with the founding of the Afrikaner state, the white politicians of the succeeding Union and the capitalist adventurers have generally not been so treated. The names as well as the public statuary of Kruger, Smuts, Rhodes and the like, have not been replaced by figures from the resistance struggle. Indeed some such as Oppenheimer of the Anglo-American Corporation are commemorated as local benefactors in places like Soweto.

Although few existing place names have been changed, the opportunity to add a new nomenclature has been taken when needed. The cities of Pretoria (after a leading 'voortrekker') and Port Elizabeth (after a British governor's wife) remain but the new urban regions of which they are to be a constituent part are Tswane and Mandela Urban Regions respectively. Most notably the country itself remains South Africa and not, as some would prefer as a clear statement of new beginning, Azania.

Non-place specific heritage

Much heritage, including that of resistance to apartheid, is not place specific, but could be located almost anywhere. This is the case with the many buildings, streets, and organisations named after individuals associated with the 'freedom struggle' and most usually to Mandela. This personification of the struggle around a single named

individual is epitomised by the planned 65m high statue of Mandela in Port Elizabeth, an attention that, it is reported (Campbell & Beresford, 2002), concerns and embarrasses the subject of this personality cult adulation. However the point is that this, and other such, is not intended to commemorate any specific link with the site or the city.

Apartheid tourism

The heritage of the resistance to apartheid has been developed rapidly as a tourism product especially on foreign markets since 1994. Attractions such as Robben Island or District Six Museum are now firmly on the tourism circuit of Cape Town, and the many memorials in Soweto in particular form a part of the burgeoning 'township tours' of Gauteng and elsewhere. The steady growth of 'township tourism' has widened the market with an increasingly professional packaging of 'authentic' 'meet the people' walkabouts, sanitised 'shebeen visits' and private caterers offering authentic lunches 'at home'. This has removed some of the attraction of pioneering adventure into a potentially dangerous area. It is reminiscent of other former 'hot-spot tourism' in Northern Ireland, Lebanon, former Yugoslavia and elsewhere and 'township tours' are similar to the 'ghetto tourism' that is commercially successful in for example Harlem, New York or Watts, Los Angeles.

However although apartheid heritage is developing into a significant tourism product line, two caveats need mentioning.

First, apartheid heritage is dominantly an add-on to other tourism products in South Africa and the two main categories of products on offer to tourists to South Africa have changed little since the demise of the apartheid government. The 'South African experience' as marketed externally is still composed principally of a combination of wildlife (especially the 'big six' animals but including more broadly African natural landscapes, reservations and parks) and secondly, what could be termed 'vernacular tribalism', that is the 'traditional' performances, customs, craftwork and cultures of the indigenous black African tribes. The sites most visited by western tourists (Robben Island, District Six Museum, the Apartheid Museum Johannesburg) are those that fit most easily into networks of the more traditional tourism sites (in the cases mentioned above the Victoria & Alfred Waterfront, Downtown Cape Town and 'Gold Reef City').

Secondly, even in the specifically heritage tourism market, apartheid heritage is a relatively minor addition to a more established set of heritage products. The two most notable of these are the interlinked narratives of the founding of the Afrikaner state and society and the British imperial saga. These dominate in museums, monuments, markers and place names. The battlefields of the South African and Zulu wars, the Voortrekker monument outside Pretoria and the public buildings and statuary of the VOC and the Union are still the most visited heritage sites.

This marginal nature of apartheid heritage is not dissimilar to most Holocaust tourism in Europe in which the Kazimierz ghetto is linked to baroque Krakow or Buchenwald to Dresden. One major difference however is that apartheid tourism has not attracted a substantial specialised and personally involved pilgrimage tourism in the same way as holocaust tours. This may be in part because there is just not enough apartheid heritage, at least as yet, to in itself justify the long travel distances involved from the main European and North American tourism generating markets while the neighbouring African markets which might associate with the experience are simply too poor to generate much such tourism. However the main explanation of this

difference is again in the critical distinction about the location of victims. In South Africa the direct victims and those who associate most strongly with them are still in the same country and indeed often in the same sites. They are therefore excursionists (school parties are prominent in many of the museums mentioned) or at most domestic tourists. Diasporic tourism so important in the Israeli, and US markets for Jewish heritage in particular, and even the beginnings of such tourism from the US to slavery sites in West Africa, (Dann & Seaton, 2003) has no real parallel in apartheid tourism.

A glance at the major guidebooks [*Insight, Footprint, Lonely Planet*] directed at foreign visitors demonstrates the ambivalent situation. All mention the major museums and sites referred to above but usually with smaller entries than those for Gold Reef City, Sun City, Cape Castle, or the Voortrekker Monument. Townships are described in historical sections but only Soweto is recommended as a place to visit as part of an organised tour. Indeed all the guidebooks contain stern warnings discouraging individual visits to townships on grounds of personal safety.

The management issues

The management of sites of atrocity for tourism is rendered more difficult but more necessary by some inherent characteristics and contexts of such sites.

First, as with almost all heritage there is an almost inevitable multiple use in which tourism is only one, and frequently not the most important function. Atrocity heritage has important functions for political legitimation, social cohesion and individual 'settlement of memory'. The recentness and central importance of the apartheid experience enhances its importance in South African nation building. It is managed by authorities in furtherance of these goals, which may not concur with the objectives of tourism development. A further complication is that the strength of the individual and collective emotions evoked and conveyed by such sites imposes constraints and responsibilities on their management for tourism. Such management may operate thorough initial market segmentation, selection and targeting, on-site interpretation and marking, to physical or social constraints on visitor access, circulation or behaviour. However the motives of visitors remains varied and turnstiles cannot operate policies that discriminate between acceptable and unacceptable visitors on the grounds of their motivation.

Secondly, the new heritage is being created within the context of the old. There are three main policy options. The heritage of resistance to apartheid as a new national narrative can replace, accommodate or coexist with the previously dominant heritage narratives. First, replacement of the old heritage of 'Boer, Briton and Bantu' by the now dominant heritage of the 'freedom struggle' disinherits the white minority whose continued commitment to the state is essential. It would also discard the main existing heritage tourism assets. Secondly, accommodation would not eradicate the past as narrated nor ignore its sites and relics but modify it and incorporate it into the new dominant interpretation. Some Anglo-Boer war memorials have been modified to include the roles and sacrifices of non-white participants (Tunbridge, 1999). New place names have appeared on the map for new provinces and metropolitan regions rather than as a renaming of existing places. The 16th December 'Day of the Vow' sacred to Afrikaner Trek mythology has been retained but renamed as the 'Day of the Nation'. The two potentially highly divisive centenaries in 2002 (the 350th anniversary of the landing of Van Riebeeck at the Cape and the 400th anniversary of the incorporation of his employer, the Dutch East Indies Company (VOC) were

mutedly commemorated as largely unspecified historical occurrences. Thirdly, in this spectrum of approaches, the new can be added to a largely un-reconstituted old in either what could be termed the 'core plus model' or in 'the parallel heritages model'. The former uses the new heritage as the integrating national core with which all groups identify as a common base which is then enhanced by various optional add-ons, which could be existing regional, social or ethnic heritages. The latter merely adds the new heritage to an existing, tolerated pool of different heritages with which different groups identify. Both raise questions about whether the heritage of resistance to apartheid would be equally acceptable as such a national core and whether other heritages would comfortably co-exist or contradict and conflict with such a core. It should be noted here that much of the 'old' heritage is now in private (Voortekker Monument, Pretoria; Taal Monument, Paarl) or corporate (Victoria and Alfred Waterfront; Kimberley Mining Museum and Kimberley Club) hands which removes it, probably intentionally, from direct state influence and which renders much of the discussion about national policy largely irrelevant.

Thirdly, the issue is more complex than a simple confrontation between a black heritage of victimisation and a white heritage of repression. The minority non-white heritage (Coloured, Malay, Indian) suffers a degree of ambiguity in its relation to resistance heritage concerning their ambivalent role as either co-victims of apartheid or collaborators in its imposition. Also the previous white minority regime did not 'disregard' (Timothy & Boyd, 2003: 261: Gawe & Meli, 1990), or 'exclude' (Stone & Mackenzie 1990) black African heritage, it reduced it to a 'tribal vernacular' which was and still is prominently narrated and promoted to tourists. Colourful, tribally distinctive, crafts, customs and performances, reinforce group identities, and also remain a highly sellable tourism product on overseas markets. The heritage of resistance to apartheid is, however, non-tribal in its affiliations, political aspirations and goals of national identity.

Finally, the above discussion raises more general issue of the wider impacts of heritage atrocity tourism upon the societies of both hosts and guests. The objectives of most atrocity heritage producers are unambiguously altruistic and humanitarian. However, whether visitors accept their pedagogic moralising messages, and even whether they are actually received at all, and whether the later behaviour of visitors is thereby altered to the benefit of their home societies, remains unknown. The experience of atrocity tourism may have impacts upon the individual tourist and the tourist's home society. Atrocity tourism may anaesthetise rather than sensitise visitors, making horror and suffering more normal or acceptable, rather than shocking and unacceptable. It may be psychologically undesirable and even destabilising for susceptible individuals and the publication of especially horrific events may lead to their repetition. There is also an argument that promoting the visiting of atrocity sites may legitimate the atrocity or those who committed it and thus encourage more in the future. Finally, tourists may be repelled rather than attracted by atrocity if they feel that they themselves could become victims of continuing terror, inconvenienced by the results of atrocity or merely because they find its recent memory distasteful rather than attractive.

The heritage of apartheid, its systematic imposition of suffering and of the ultimately successful resistance to it, is central to the founding narrative of the new state, the reconciliation of its 'rainbow' constituents, and the way that state projects itself to nationals and visitors alike. It will be enhanced and expanded as the state develops and will play an increasingly significant role in extending the heritage

tourism products on offer. However its very importance in all these fields adds to the complexity of its management. The future, not only of a nascent tourism industry earning much needed foreign exchange but of South Africa itself, and especially of its unique multi-racial and multi-ethnic experiment in nation building, may depend upon the successful management of this past.

Acknowledgment

References

Berning, G. and Dominy, G. (1992) The presentation of the industrial heritage in South African museums: a critique *South African Museums Bulletin* 19 1-14

Campbell, D. and Beresford, D. (2002) Mandela: a giant among men. *Guardian Weekly*. December 26 p2

Dann, G.M.S. (1981) 'Tourist motivation: an appraisal' *Annals of Tourism Research* 8 187-219

Dann G.M.S (forthcoming) *Children of the dark* in Ashworth, G.J. and Hartmann,R. *Horror and human tragedy revisited: the management of sites of atrocity for tourism* Cognizant, New York.

Dann G.M.S and Seaton, A.V. (eds) (2003) *Slavery, contested heritage and thanatourism* Haworth New York /London

Gawe,S. and Meli, F. (1990) *The missing past in South Africa*, In Stone, P. and Mackenzie, R. (eds) *The excluded past: archaeology in education* Unwin Hyman, London 98-108

Goudie, S.C., Khan, F. and Kilian, D. (1999) Transforming tourism: black empowerment, heritage and identity beyond apartheid', *South African Geographical Journal* 81(1) 22-31.

Graham, B.J., Ashworth, G.J. and Tunbridge, J.E. (2001) *A Geography of heritage: power, culture, economy.* Arnold, London 244-8

Kleuver, J. de (1999) De dood van Pageview *Geografie* 4/8

Lennon, J.J. and Foley, M. (2000) *Dark tourism: in the footsteps of death and disaster* Cassell, London

McEachern, C. (2001) *Mapping the memories: politics, place and identity in the district six museum.* In Zegeye, A. (ed) *Social identities in the new South Africa* Kwela books Cape Town. 223-47

Murphy, D. (1997) *South from the Limpopo* Murray, London

Pratt, M.L.(1994) Women, literature and national brotherhood *Nineteenth century contexts: an Interdisciplinary Journal* 18 29-45

Smith, C. (1997) *Robben Island* Struik, Cape Town

Stone, P. and Mackenzie, R.(1990) (eds) *The excluded past: archaeology in education* Unwin Hyman, London

Timothy, D.J. and Boyd, S.W. (2003) *Heritage tourism*, Prentice Hall, Harlow.

Tunbridge, J.E (1999) Pietermaritzburg, South Africa: trials and traumas of conservation *Built Environment* 25   (3) 222-35

Tunbridge, J.E (forthcoming) *Penal colonies as tourism sites* in Ashworth, G.J. and Hartmann, R. (eds) *Horror and human tragedy revisited: the management of sites of atrocity for tourism* Cognizant, New York.

Tunbridge, J.E. and Ashworth, G.J. (1996*) Dissonant heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict*, Wiley, London

Uzzell, D. (1989) *Heritage Interpretation* Belhaven, London

Worden, N. (1996) Contesting heritage at the Cape Town Waterfront *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 2 59-75

Worden, N. (1997) *Contesting heritage in a South African city: Cape Town* in Shaw, B.J. and Jones, R. (eds) *Contested urban heritage: voices from the periphery.* Ashgate, Aldershot 31-61