

WORKSHOP REPORT SOUTH AFRICA HERITAGE

DAY - JUNE 5TH 2007 ZEIST, THE NETHERLANDS

Workshop Report

CIE Heritage Day South Africa; more than a meeting

The morning program of the day was used for a general meeting where attention was given to several heritage projects by way of lectures and poster presentations. Prof. Henry (Jatti) Bredekamp, President of ICOM South Africa, gave a presentation on the cooperation of Mutual Cultural Heritage after February 2008. The Secretary of State of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Frans Timmermans, had visited South Africa in February of this year to intensify this cooperation. The other lectures were on heritage themes in South Africa and those in cooperation with the Netherlands. Job Roos from the Technical University in Delft gave a lecture on the built heritage site Genadendal. The topic of digitizing museum collections in South Africa was explained by Trilce Navarrete of the University of Amsterdam. Ena Jansen, Professor of Afrikaans at the University of Amsterdam, discussed an important immaterial heritage subject, the language Afrikaans.

Robert Parthesius, director of the CIE, closed the morning program with a lecture of capacity building in maritime archaeology. CIE has broad expertise on maritime archaeology and at the end of 2008, a three-year program for capacity building was signed in Pretoria. CIE will offer expertise and coordination in this program.

During the afternoon, workshops were given to discuss some themes in the heritage field. Built heritage, museums and archives, books, photos were selected for workshops from the inventory. Apart from these practical workshops, one group discussed the mutuality in 'mutual' cultural heritage. A workshop for Afrikaans was also initiated, but there were not enough participants for a discussion. From each workshop discussion, recommendations were phrased which are presented here.

Workshop Built Heritage (chair: Jean-Paul Corten, RACM)

The participants in this workshop have very different professions. The chair of ICOMOS Shared Built Heritage was present, employees of the National Service for Archaeology, Cultural Landscape and Built Heritage, South Africa House, Urban Solutions, ArchiAfrika, Netherlands-South African Society and from South Africa, Irwin Langeveld of the Department Arts and Culture in Pretoria.

The topics that were discussed were focused on the relevance of the mutual heritage for today's society. What kind of changes is there for mutual built heritage and what kind of threats are there to this heritage? What are the trends in topical issues? Do the South Africans want to keep the mutual built heritage?

For the discussion, it was important to have some understanding about the Monument Legislation in South Africa. The National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 replaced the old National Monuments Act of 1969. There are three different grades to be distinguished in this

act: a national, regional and local level. The main protection there for monuments is the 'sixty years' mark. Historical buildings automatically receive protection after sixty years of their resurrection. This means that most of the 'Dutch' architecture in South Africa is already protected legally. All local governments are in the process of implementing renewal of urban legislation. Political commitment is important on every level. Initiatives that are developed in the urban renewal planning are for example: public-private cooperation, renewals and permits.

So monuments older than sixty years gain some legal protection, but not everything older than sixty years is also automatically heritage. The legislation is a starting point, an important tool to protect buildings. It can be used to start the process of validation, research and inventory to declare a site as a heritage site.

During the workshop, the question how Dutch (mutual) heritage policy is related to South African policy was discussed. In 1996, a bilateral agreement was signed between South Africa and the Netherlands to cooperate in the fields of education, science, arts and culture, health, welfare and sport. In 2002, an agreement on common heritage was signed: *Accommodate Cultural Diversity: The Challenge of Common Cultural Heritage*. The policy is now six years old and could have some adjustments. In addition, the projects that have been carried out during the last six years should be evaluated and prioritized for a good continuity of knowledge and development.

Common or 'mutual' heritage though is a difficult term. Cape architecture is a footprint that symbolizes mutual heritage. However, 'mutual heritage' is a Dutch perception. From the South African point of view it is their heritage - South African heritage. By defining Cape architecture mutual, it is distinguished from indigenous heritage. Nevertheless, the South African public considers 'mutual heritage' to be their heritage and to be remembered and preserved where possible. Colonial history and indigenous culture are both part of the South African history and therefore embraced. The government's point of view is to maintain and protect colonial heritage because it is a part of their identity and therefore chooses not to destroy it. It is part of a greater landscape of (black) heritage and balances the landscape out for the South African. Everything is thus included, but there are different levels of significance. This subdivision is made by the South African Heritage Resource Agency (SAHRA). The institute is funded by the government, but operates autonomously.

The discussion on how to appoint heritage is very topical. This is, however, not only the case in South Africa, but is a worldwide discussion. How can the value of buildings be determined? Social, economical and historical values certainly play an important role in appointing heritage. Important aspects for achieving sustainable monument protection and restoration of projects, is to achieve political commitment of the local authority. The second is public awareness, they should be able to acknowledge the value of their monuments, and the last one is economic feasibility.

Financing is always a threat to the monuments. The government does not have the funds to pay for every restoration. One of the main issues about South African built heritage is now the maintenance of the buildings after renovation. People and finances are needed in order to maintain the historical buildings. Attention should also be given to good inventories of the built heritage. *Docomomo* is mentioned as a way to learn from the Netherlands. It is an international working group for the Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and

neighborhoods of the modern movement. A valuation and inventory should also be made of modern heritage – the new architecture of the last sixty years is excluded from policy and legislation.

From the above discussion the following recommendations and conclusions for the built heritage workshop can be given:

There are certain threats for the built heritage:

1. Poor law enforcement.
2. Lack of maintenance of the buildings, which have been preserved and restored.
3. The limited options of the sixty-year mark. Modern heritage younger than sixty years is not protected.
4. Modern heritage is not drawn up in an inventory.
5. Lack of sufficient financing.
6. Lack of area protection.
7. Colonial heritage is made of sustainable material, but the indigenous buildings are in trouble of surviving the elements.
8. The exodus of the people out of historical city cores. For example: the districts in Pretoria.

Chances for the future:

1. The changes for mutual built heritage are the exchange of expertise on both sides.
2. Heritage can be seen as a potential for development.
3. Historical significance.
4. Potential material benefits for the South African population.
5. Through revitalization of the parts of the cities that have become slums and restoring buildings, there are tangible and economical benefits.

To offer to South Africa:

1. Knowledge exchange in maintenance & preservation techniques.
2. Knowledge and expertise on area protection & integrated conservation.
3. Advance techniques of documenting (docomomo).
4. How to organize and set-up priorities in built heritage and the recognition of it.

To learn from South Africa:

1. Fresh view on global issues by professionals.
2. Protection laws of archaeological sites. The 'air' above archaeological sites is protected.
3. Buildings with oral history are protected.
4. We can learn to be proud from the South Africans.

Workshop Archives, Books, and Photo's (chair: Frits van Dulm, CIE)

The participants in this workshop have various professions. There was expertise on digitising archives, for example the Atlas of Mutual Heritage (www.theatlasofmutualheritage.nl). The Dutch Institute for Southern Africa is responsible for the access of archives and collections of the Apartheid Movement in the Netherlands. The Institute for Dutch History has a project to collect and open up archives and documentation about organisations and persons that played

a role in mission work in South Africa between 1800–1960. From South Africa, there is an initiative to develop an institute for photo and film archives to be able to digitise these archives and develop research projects with this material. In short, the participants strive in their own archive expertise to digitise and to open up South African archives from different periods and materials.

The first topic discussed was the importance of the study of the history of all South African people through archival research. The archives contain important information about the roots of the South African society and give an insight in the role of South Africa as a cross point of the international ship traffic. The participants agree that the archives are an important source, with an emphasis on a source. Archives are not the only source for historical research. They are not an objective source of knowledge, most of the time they exist of documents written by the high-educated elite. In this case, the archives represent the 'powerful part' of society.

However, it is difficult to work with this; there is much more information about the reality of the officials than the reality of the indigenous people. The objectivity and value of archives does not only apply to written sources. Moreover, most of the photography and films were made by order of the white elite. There are few archives with critical and individual reports from the indigenous people from before the eighteenth century. In Utrecht, there is an archive with personal reports of the missionaries. The friars were encouraged to remain in contact with their relatives at home. The letters contain interesting aspects of daily life in South Africa. However, access to archives in South Africa is often difficult for historians, because governments regard the archives as a continuation of their own government.

Another discussion is the problem how to attract new and a younger audience towards the different kinds of archives. South African and Dutch youngsters are often unaware of South African history. The archives have to be presented in an active way to bring them under the attention of the new generation. In every period, the creation of a new basis has to be achieved for the maintenance of the archives. The participants, however, agree that it is impossible to save all the archives; selection is necessary. However, it remains difficult to make the right choices in what to save and what to destroy. Different archives can have different meanings in different periods.

There is still archive material in the Netherlands about for example the antiapartheid movement that is hardly available in South Africa. Certain literature was forbidden in South Africa and nowadays this knowledge is still only in the Netherlands. This has large consequences for the partition of knowledge. There are also big differences among the archive institutes in South Africa. Through non-cooperation and bad organisation, many institutes do not know about each other's collection.

Digitisation is therefore very important. For this digitising, it is important that South Africa and the Netherlands know what already has been digitized so this does not happen twice. What also should be digitized in the future are the archives of small villages. These local archives could have interesting material for example questions relating to the relation city-country. The older inhabitants often preserve these village archives, so it is very important to digitize these archives for research.

From the above discussion the following recommendations for the workshop archives, books and photo's can be given:

1. Archives are *an* important source, but certainly not the only one. It should be noted that most archives consist of selection criteria and written by a white elite.
2. Except for the archives of the VOC, attention should be given to:
 - Archives before 1652.
 - Missionary archives that can give a different view of the history of South Africa.
 - Archives of the antiapartheid movement; especially the photo and audiovisual material in the Netherlands are interesting for South Africa.
 - Archives of the Boer movement that give interesting insights of a later period of South African history.
 - Archives of scientific institutes like the Royal Tropical Institute, Meertens Institute and the Hortus Botanicus with some private archives of former scientists.
 - Local archives
4. It is important to invest in Dutch language education in South Africa. Only in this way can local scientists study the South African archives. Language is an important tool to open up sources.

Workshop museums (chair: Alex van Stipriaan, KIT)

In this workshop, a broad spectrum of people working in the museum field was represented. From South Africa, there was the representative of the Department of Arts and Culture present. Besides the commitment of South Africa in this discussion, there were representatives of the Tropenmuseum, Museum of Ethnology, Prince Claus Fund, Cultural Heritage Foundation, and Opera Design Amsterdam. The Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs was also represented, as was the cultural department of the Dutch Embassy in Pretoria.

The first topic that was discussed, was how South African heritage institutes can transform into institutes that reflect the ethnic composition of society, for example with regard to staff, collections and presentations. The chair stated that in 2004 a bilateral agreement was at the heart. Reflecting on yourself, what can you offer to this? When looking at your own staff and audience, how can the diversity of your society be reflected and how can you reach this goal? In South Africa, during the last 10 years, there has been a shift from complete white staff to a more diverse ones. But it is not the number that is the problem but rather the interpretations of the events and the people. Without strategy and skills, there is no sustainability. Practical know-how from the Netherlands is needed for preserving and promoting the past. However, since 1994, there is no increase in the budget so it is difficult to reach this goal and sustain it.

There are institutions and museums, which do not have diversity of people in the staff, but the audience can be divers. By planning and setting up exhibitions, more divers people can be incorporated. The visions of other societies can be reflected through exhibitions and advice from divers people can be used in designing exhibitions. By translating ideas into multi-media, you can also reach a divers audience. Problems are often with cooperation: guest curators are not incorporated fully. Differences of opinion between designers and curators occur.

The next topic discussed by the participants was how their collections are a representation of society. At first, you have to know what you have in your own collection; start digitization to make visible what there is. Also cross bordering can bring in information without actual objects; even without objects, the role of the museum and designer is how to tell the 'story' of the society it represents. General museum education is also needed: how to look at objects; the link to the public should be more intense. For example the catalogue of the exhibition on Afghanistan was bi-lingual. Historical places should be included in exhibitions; they are an important reflection of the changes in society. In museums, changes should also be made to reflect the changes in the society. Projects started by local communities should be supported more.

In South Africa, it is a slow process and a case-to-case question. More technical and financial support is needed otherwise it is not sustainable. There is still a transfer of skills; after fourteen years the vision of a united nation is still new. Following from this discussion the question was put forward how digitization projects can be of help to support the needed transformations. Digitizing should be seen as a tool to develop knowledge, preserve memories of tangible and intangible heritage. The concept is still new so misuse can be made. There is much use of material of intangible heritage without any copyright so there is a need for laws to protect this. Even inside museums, items have disappeared because the staff is underpaid. There is the issue of dissemination and education.

Digitization can be used to adapt to an exhibition for multi-media. It is a challenge to make museums interactive with their audiences and to democratize and disseminate knowledge and culture. However, more youth education is needed. Bring the museum to the street and the street into the museum.

The last discussion was how Dutch and South African institutes can work together in the museum sector. There is much knowledge on both sides; by joining forces through digitization further steps can be taken. Several partnerships can be implemented on a museum-to-museum base and a colleague-to-colleague base. An international platform would be useful to bridge the existing gaps. The repatriation of objects should be discussed. It can be a difficult point, but it is important for our cultural relationship.

To conclude the following recommendations are made by the participants:

1. Make new stories, new intangible collections, new perspectives, new concepts of aesthetics, and new interpretations by education policies, finding other target groups.
2. Share more information on projects, use young people and their 'culture' (mobiles!) and technology.
3. Staff should follow: Training at universities, staff should be enlarged.

Build up local know-how: work with local people.

Education of teachers: translate knowledge to the people.

4. Digitization is a modern tool and is still in a learning process; the technology can be

simplified: contents made visible to the people. Bring the museum into the street.

Workshop the Mutuality of Mutual Heritage (chair: Robert Parthesius, CIE)

The discussion was opened with the question to give a definition of mutual heritage. From South Africa the president of IZIKO (twelve museums in Cape Town) raised the issue of translating the Dutch term of '*gemeenschappelijk* erfgoed' into English, and the need to clarify between mutual, shared and common heritage. He suggests that in South Africa, the use of the term *common* might be seen as negative; *shared* suggests the most equal or integrated contribution to the heritage by both sides and is the most appropriate synonym; mutual suggests synonymous but autonomous consideration of the heritage best translated as *aswederzijdse*. He also suggested that in Afrikaans the word *erfenis* is preferable than the Dutch choice of the term *erfgoed*.

CIE drew attention to the fact that the Dutch policy of mutual heritage has created new heritage by influencing the development of mutual heritage projects, for example in Indonesia. Mutual heritage was perhaps significant for the development of Dutch policy and heritage, but for South Africa it is more important to focus on their own perspectives, stated the president of IZIKO. Heritage is a concept that is always being produced, public attention creates heritage and makes it visible in the national consciousness. Some suggested that not all Dutch heritage around the world is mutual heritage; there should be limits towards the mutuality. The question was put whether the concern for the heritage should not come from the land where it is located. There was no agreement on this point, but at least a mutual concern and collaboration are seen as very valuable.

The issue of mutuality was discussed through a specific case study of Cape Castle in Cape Town as the first Dutch settlement and a highly visible example of heritage. The participants were asked to choose whether this invoked a sense of pride or a sense of shame. There were two different opinions in the discussion. Those who felt pride called upon the Cape Castle as an example of Dutch glory days, of the celebration of export and trade, of awe and accomplishment, and of the durability of the structure as evidence of architectural achievement.

For others, the Cape Castle tells a story of colonialism and world heritage. For those feeling shame, the story that comes to the front is apartheid. This is interesting because it is a negative connotation being applied from a divorced time period. In examining this anachronism further, the group suggested that the sense of shame is also tied to the entire colonial relationship, and that the true arrogance of euro centric thought is often a source of shame that develops even if there is not a direct historical connection. After this, the participants were asked to give a creative vision for how the Cape Castle might ideally be developed. The geographical location of Cape Town can be used in the center of the global trade histories between Europe and Asia. For this, a museum can be established in the Cape Castle.

The Cape Castle is also still a highly functional place; it has continued to be used after the eighteenth century when the Dutch left. The choice of the South Africans to preserve the Cape Castle is itself evidence of its ongoing role as a product of heritage and contributor of identity. This should be realized by implementing effective and efficient management by the supervisor of the 'Council of the Cape Castle, the 1993 Castle Management Repair Act and the joint private and public partnership for management. A last proposal was also made for Cape Castle

to be developed as a center for the presentation of South African intangible heritage and so to combine these two elements of the cultural heritage.

Interesting is that the South African participant Sir Bredekamp, highlighted that Dutch history and mutual heritage is seen only as Cape issues whereas in contrast 'British' heritage is seen to be a South African issue.

The following recommendations can be given from this discussion:

1. For the (mutual) policy at Cape Castle: the celebration of diversity, curiosity and a willingness to learn from both 'sides'; the need to develop a potential platform for future research into the local public opinion in order to develop value-based policies; and an ideal sustainable model of Cape Castle as a tangible center for the celebration of both tangible and intangible heritage.
2. There is a need to clarify between mutual, shared and common heritage.
3. Mutual heritage is perhaps important for the development of Dutch international cultural policy and heritage, but for South Africa it is more important to focus on their own perspectives.
4. The Dutch policy also tends to create new heritage by influencing the development of mutual heritage projects.