

INTANGIBLE HERITAGE IN CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT PLANNING: THE CASE OF ROBBERN ISLAND¹

Harriet Deacon

International Journal of Heritage Studies, 2004

Note on the author

Harriet Deacon (PhD Cantab. 1994) has published in medical history (nineteenth-century Cape Colony doctors, nurses, midwives, institutions and medico-geographical and environmental discourses), using multimedia computer programs in history teaching, and on Robben Island's history as a place of exclusion (with particular reference to mapping). She has worked as a research fellow at The Queen's College, Oxford, and as a lecturer-developer at the University of Cape Town's Multimedia Education Group. Between 1999 and 2002 she worked at Robben Island Museum as Research Coordinator. She currently works as a consultant, mainly on heritage-related policy, and has recently written a paper on international legal and financial instruments for managing intangible heritage.

Email: harrietdeacon@iafrica.com

Keywords: intangible heritage, conservation management, Robben Island

Abstract

Robben Island Museum (RIM) officially commemorates 'the triumph of the human spirit over adversity', relating especially to the period of political imprisonment between 1961 and 1991, when Robben Island was most notorious as a political prison for the leaders of the anti-apartheid struggle. Robben Island became a world heritage site in December 1999 because of its universal symbolic significance - its intangible heritage. This paper explores the implications for conservation management planning of interpreting and managing the intangible heritage associated with such sites. Examples will be drawn from the conservation planning exercise undertaken by the Robben Island Museum between 2000 and 2002. The paper will look specifically at how Robben Island's symbolic significance has been defined and how competing interpretations should be included in the management plan. It then discusses the challenges around managing historic fabric whose significance is defined as primarily symbolic, and ways of safeguarding the intangible heritage associated with it.

Introduction

Conservation management planning is a relatively new field in South Africa, but the South African National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 requires that designated heritage places be managed according to a conservation management plan.² All management authorities for World Heritage Sites in South Africa are also required to develop and implement such a plan. Conservation management planning, a method born out of environmental management planning, systematises the management of heritage resources. This planning method focuses attention on the identification and protection of the heritage significance of the resource. Conservation planning methods pioneered by Australians like James Kerr have been elucidated and elaborated in the United Kingdom by Kate Clarke of English Heritage.³ Most of these conservation models focus on the management of historic fabric.

Robben Island, where Nelson Mandela was imprisoned for 18 years, became a world heritage site in December 1999 as a symbol of 'the triumph of the human spirit over adversity'. With

Mandela as the first president of the 'new' South Africa, the Island symbolised reconciliation and the democratic transition of 1994, and became a national museum and heritage site (then national monument) in December 1996.

Robben Island was opened to visitors in January 1997 and work soon commenced on various infrastructural upgrades. At this time, no conservation management plan (CMP) had yet been developed. RIM commissioned baseline studies of its heritage resources in 1998 and a formal conservation planning process commenced in early 2000, finally reaching completion of the first phase in 2003. A summary of the Management Plan has now been published.⁴ The relative lack of emphasis on conservation planning in the first few years of its existence is a symptom of RIM's institutional focus on tourism rather than conservation as noted by Myra Shackley and others.⁵ It is also a result of the relative lack of local experience with, and models for, management planning for sites of recent historical value and particularly those with a high degree of intangible heritage value.

'Intangible heritage' is a term used to describe aesthetic, spiritual, symbolic or other social values people may associate with a site, as well as rituals, music, language, know-how, oral traditions and the cultural spaces in which these 'living heritage' traditions are played out.⁶ In this paper I have used 'intangible values' to describe the former and 'living heritage' to describe the latter. Some countries, mainly in East Asia, have long recognised the importance of non-material heritage, but the West was slow to recognise as heritage-worthy both living heritage and intangible values associated with places or objects. Where intangible values of places, such as aesthetic value, were recognised as heritage-worthy these were seen as expert-defined values rather than community-defined values. Social value was seen as a confirmation of the heritage value of the place rather than an independent aspect of heritage value. In the Western tradition the main criteria for identifying heritage sites have been architectural style and historical significance.⁷

Gradual but tentative acceptance of the importance of intangible heritage internationally can be illustrated by three key moments of change: the acceptance of symbolic value as the prime reason for inscription of Auschwitz as a World Heritage Site in 1979; the acceptance of 'cultural landscapes' as heritage-worthy in the World Heritage Convention (WHC) Guidelines in 1992; and the rethinking of UNESCO's 1989 'Recommendation on the Safeguarding of Traditional Culture and Folklore' in the 1990s that resulted in the launching of a new Intangible Heritage Convention in 2003. The 1992 modifications to the WHC Guidelines allowed for the recognition that cultural meanings associated with natural phenomena, such as the spiritual Indigenous landscapes in Australia, are worthy of world heritage status.⁸ But because of fears about potential political conflict between UNESCO member states, inscription of world heritage sites on the basis of symbolic association alone has been limited. Also, UNESCO has adopted an add-on approach to the incorporation of non-material intangible heritage forms, proposing a separate Convention and a separate international heritage list.

In South Africa after 1994, intangible forms of heritage have become politically acceptable, even attractive, in the attempt to insert new interpretations onto the colonial landscape. Oral histories (especially those of the anti-apartheid struggle) were recognised even before 1994 as a key part of South Africa's anti-colonial heritage. The South African National Heritage Resources Act of 1999 emphasised the importance of the 'living heritage' associated with places and objects.⁹ Robben Island's intangible heritage was recognised as a central element of its heritage significance because the repressive physical features of the place (e.g. the prison) have been overlaid with a discourse of triumph and human rights. At the WHC meeting in 1999 where Robben Island was inscribed as a World Heritage Site it was even proposed that restrictions on inscribing symbolic sites on their own merits be dropped.

Yet the simple recognition of the importance of Robben Island's intangible heritage did not clarify the relationship between the supposedly 'universal' symbolism of the site, other forms of heritage significance, and conservation of historic fabric. The identification and management of Robben Island's heritage resources thus posed a number of difficult challenges for the conservation planning team. This paper will discuss some of the problems experienced in the planning process, especially with regard to the identification and management of intangible heritage.

Identifying Robben Island's intangible heritage

Intangible heritage is not a new or different kind of heritage – the concept is a political construct emerging out of the historical focus on grand buildings as heritage in the western tradition. Jean-Louis Luxen, Secretary General of ICOMOS, argues that 'the distinction between physical heritage and intangible heritage is ... artificial. Physical heritage only attains its true significance when it sheds light on its underlying values. Conversely, intangible heritage must be made incarnate in tangible manifestations, in visible signs, if it is to be conserved.'¹⁰ Tangible and intangible meanings associated with sites are in any case often inseparable.¹¹ All interpretations of place are human constructions, and no heritage value is therefore completely 'tangible'. Dawson Munjeri suggests that tangibility is secondary: 'the tangible can only be interpreted through the intangible'.¹²

In spite of the lack of analytical differentiation, the notion of intangible heritage remains attractive, both to those who wish to keep the status quo by implying that this *is* a new kind of heritage; and to those who wish to redress the historical imbalance in heritage identification and to emphasise the importance of alternative forms of heritage. National definitions of what constitutes intangible heritage thus vary according to what has been perceived as marginalised. In western countries, pre-modern, rural skills and vernacular architecture are promoted. In settler countries like Australia and Canada, and in other parts of the non-western world, marginalised indigenous ethnic heritage is prioritised.

In South Africa, the apartheid and colonial governments prioritised buildings and monuments defined as 'white' heritage. They also emphasised ethnic differences between indigenous groups. To turn this situation around, the 1999 heritage legislation explicitly recognised intangible heritage values and living heritage forms like ritual and orality. But there was also resistance to validating purely ethnically-defined heritage as the apartheid state had done. The post-apartheid government sought to establish itself as a modern, democratic form of political power, effectively marginalising indigenous leaders, both to control political power and because some traditional leaders had been part of colonial and apartheid systems. This has meant that ethnic, indigenous forms of intangible heritage have not been as heavily promoted as have oral histories of racism and slavery. Recognising the oral history of the anti-apartheid struggle in particular helps government to underline the commonality of all South Africans' experiences while recognising the suffering of the majority of black South Africans. It thus supports the government policy of reconciliation, redress and reconstruction.

The identification of Robben Island's intangible heritage took place within this specific historical and political context. Robben Island Museum established an extensive oral history project, mainly with former political prisoners and employed former prisoners as tour guides. The Museum thus validated ex-prisoners' moral 'right to represent' the site.¹³ This approach had a history within the anti-apartheid struggle, when censorship, 'Bantu' education and harassment denied many activists a public voice. Since the 1980s, prison memoirs and the films had begun to popularise the notion that the Island prison was both a 'hellhole' and an opportunity for personal and political growth.¹⁴ Mandela's story was specifically packaged for media benefit during the early 1980s to generate support for the anti-apartheid movement both internationally and locally. This focused public attention on Robben Island as a place of detention and a crucible for leadership. Most of the published accounts of Robben Island's

history continue to be memoirs by ex-prisoners, or academic pieces that rely heavily on the interpretations of prison life given in interviews.¹⁵

The central Robben Island narrative of political prisoners standing strong in the face of apartheid was given a broader gloss in the early 1990s. Activists waiting in the wings of parliament began to market South Africa internationally as an example of peaceful transition based on a human rights model. A number of former Robben Islanders were key negotiators and politicians working for the birth of a democratic nation in 1994 and became leaders in the new democracy.

The idea that Robben Island symbolises ‘the triumph of the human spirit over adversity’ was first widely publicised through an exhibition about the history of Robben Island that opened in 1993 at the South African Museum in Cape Town. In his opening address for the exhibition,¹⁶ Ahmed Kathrada, a former Robben Islander, suggested that Robben Island could symbolise a broader human rights culture: symbolising all kinds of triumphs over evil and adversity, large and small, anywhere in the world.

Robben Island Museum was conceived at a national level as both the gateway to tourism, and thus development, in the New South Africa, and as a model of hope and memory in the new democracy. Robben Island’s symbolic meaning was thus aligned not only to South Africa’s official government policy of reconciliation and redress,¹⁷ but also to its broader international role as human rights advocate. Nelson Mandela, who was feted for his lack of bitterness about apartheid, and is now an international peace broker, personifies Robben Island’s message. The hardships experienced by political prisoners like Mandela at Robben Island were used as a metaphor for the oppression experienced by all political prisoners countrywide and also by (mainly black) civilians under apartheid.

Within the prison network in the country, however, Robben Island was unusual in having relatively large numbers of long-stay political prisoners in custody, many of them leaders in their organisations. Most of the physical torture took place in police cells, before activists reached prisons like Robben Island. Work-parties and communal cells on the Island created opportunities for communication between them and the island situation reduced officials’ security concerns. Robben Island Prison has to thus symbolically represent oppression and triumph under apartheid without being historically representative of the country as a whole.

Both the establishment of the moral right to ‘know’ Robben Island’s meaning and the specific formulation of its ‘universal’ symbolic message are thus tied to the politics of the democratic transition in South Africa. Recognising this does not invalidate the symbolic meaning of the Island as expressed in the World Heritage Site application, but it does demonstrate the fragility of the interpretation, question its permanence and possibly also its universality. It also suggests areas of intangible heritage that have not been fully explored because of the focus on documenting the political careers of former prisoners and their experiences in prison.

Tensions in the symbolic brand

Understanding the politics behind the formulation of Robben Island’s official symbolism (its symbolic brand) helps us to understand why both former political prisoners and members of the general public have contested the official interpretation. It also helps us to develop ways of incorporating the process of contestation and debate into the statement of significance.

Proclaiming sites of ‘intangible’ heritage by defining their symbolic meaning is a kind of branding. To create a symbolic brand for a heritage site one has to come up with a simple statement that encapsulates as well as simplifies what is often a complex set of meanings associated with a site. This branding process then influences how we interpret the site and how we manage it.¹⁸ Branding is a feature of all heritage work, to some extent, because the

heritage industry is selling something for a particular purpose and from a particular perspective.¹⁹ Lowenthal suggests that heritage ‘seeks to design a past that will fix the identity and enhance the well-being of some chosen [group]’.²⁰ He argues that ‘heritage is not an inquiry into the past but a celebration of it, not an effort to know what actually happened but a profession of faith in a past tailored to present-day purposes’.²¹

Tunbridge and Ashworth have suggested that all heritage is thus one-sided, exclusionary or ‘dissonant’ to some degree.²² Particularly in complex post-colonial societies seeking to reconcile different viewpoints within a new political order, heritage ‘becomes a highly political and contentious arena in which decisions have to be made about its conservation, presentation and current usage against a background of various and possibly competing interpretations’. This leads to a focusing of meaning in an official brand and possible ‘dissonance’, or the exclusion of other interpretations.²³

Branding is a particularly interesting process with regard to a site like Robben Island because symbolic meaning is central to the definition of its value. Robben Island Museum faces the problem of how to make its symbolic brand inclusive enough to accommodate shades of opinion within its main stakeholder group, i.e. former political prisoners, as well as how to accommodate alternative interpretations by other interest groups. But at a broader level, the degree of contestation is itself part of the significance of the site.

Robben Island is symbolically over-determined, like the sacred indigenous Zimbabwean site at Matopo Hills where Cecil Rhodes chose to be buried. The fact that Robben Island performed a powerful symbolic role for the apartheid government, and colonial powers before it, as the place for outcast ‘terrorists’ was a great incentive for the post-1994 government to reclaim the space both physically and symbolically. ‘Owning’ an interpretation of a site so deeply inscribed with the soul of South Africa is a play for power. Not surprisingly, struggles over Robben Island’s meaning are thus echoes of broader political struggles. Since Robben Island Museum was created as one of the key symbols of political reconciliation, it is also a site where challenges to the government orthodoxy can be prominently aired.

The official message of triumph at Robben Island, read internationally as a moral and universalising one, is often read locally as a party-political one. Some former political prisoners question the extent and value of the political triumph over oppression demonstrated by the 1994 elections; others challenge the historical emphasis on Mandela and other key leaders. Indigenous Khoisan lobby groups use Robben Island as a symbol of the colonial oppression of the Khoisan since the 1650s, when a Khoi leader was imprisoned there. Sometimes both triumph and oppression narratives are displaced by other interpretations, as when former apartheid state employees visit the island to remind themselves of apartheid’s heyday, or when World War II veterans and former Island residents remember the positive aspects of life there.²⁴

Environmentalists usually see Robben Island in a wholly different light, as the site of an African Penguin colony that is the third-largest in the world, and breeding colonies of rare and endangered bird species.²⁵ Archaeologists have shown that it has one of the only surviving examples of early eighteenth-century Dutch East India Company garden walling.²⁶ The village church is an excellent example, one of the few in South Africa, of early Gothic church architecture.²⁷ There is considerable conflict, both within and outside the Museum, about the relative importance of the apartheid history versus the colonial history of the Island, of the story of political struggle versus other historical narratives, or of the natural versus the cultural heritage resources of the Island.

Changes in the political climate, challenges by political interest groups to the right and left of government and claims for the authenticity of other sites of memory about the history of apartheid can and will challenge the official interpretation of the Robben Island site. Such

challenges should not be ignored. They can and should become a very central and positive part of our understanding of ‘intangible’ heritage sites. Engaging more fully with debates over the significance of Robben Island could help the Museum develop an approach to symbolic branding that remains focused but not exclusive. This has partly been achieved by drafting a very broad statement of significance for the conservation management plan. This, however, still needs to be debated extensively with staff and the general public.

Robben Island Museum has an important role not only as an interpreter of Robben Island’s symbolic value but also as a forum for debating the meaning of the site. Ultimately, an openness to debate will strengthen the symbolic brand both because it will nuance the official brand and because recognising alternative interpretations helps to foster wider public ‘ownership’ of the site.

Developing conservation strategies

As we have seen, Robben Island’s symbolic brand is a politically-driven interpretation of the site, closely linked to the political transition of 1994. This interpretation is broadly accepted but remains contested in many quarters. The conservation planning process has to allow for a number of competing layers of significance – how, then does this affect conservation strategies? On the one hand, it is essential to protect all the different kinds of significance identified, and on the other hand, it is critical to manage both the significant fabric of the site and the meanings associated with the site, whether or not these meanings are expressed in the historic fabric. In performing these tasks the main problem is to achieve balance and assign priority. This cannot be easily achieved, but the current Management Plan assists in the process by providing a number of conservation principles to inform decision-making.²⁸

It is dangerous to focus only on the symbolic brand in identifying significance to be protected. Ashworth and Tunbridge have described what happens when a heritage brand drives conservation and interpretation strategies. They have focused on what they call the ‘touristic historic city’, in which an appropriate historic image is identified and marketed, and then preservation and conservation policies are applied in conformity with this image, including ‘the reconstruction of what is thought ought to exist’.²⁹ In his paper on Melaka as a touristic historic city in Malaysia, Worden describes how the city has been re-packaged to represent the ‘birth of the nation’ in the context of a political project to represent the pre-colonial feudal Melakan Sultanate as emblematic of the modern nation since the 1970s.³⁰ This influenced historical representation within the city’s museums and development strategies until very recently.

Branding is itself a very powerful exercise. Like Melaka, Robben Island’s symbolic brand focuses on its role as the crucible for the democratic nation. Tourism rather than conservation has also been the main focus of its work.³¹ The Robben Island brand affects all of the work of the Museum, including educational messages, research and tour guide narratives. Although guides come from different political and personal perspectives, a recent student study suggests that their personal stories as told to tourists have been deeply influenced by the triumph narrative.³² Given the powerful nature of the brand and the relative lack of attention to conservation, it is very important that conservation and interpretation strategies are carefully and openly formulated and reviewed. It is vital to distinguish between short-term and long-term goals, and between marketing, tour information and research priorities. Although the symbolic brand can be used for marketing and in setting short-term interpretive priorities, the full statement of significance should be used to develop longer-term conservation and interpretation strategies.

Robben Island is rather unusual compared to other sites inscribed on the World Heritage List with intangible heritage values. Most sites of intangible heritage outside the West, such as Uluru-Kata Tjuta National Park in Australia, draw on indigenous pre-colonial significance.

Robben Island is perhaps more comparable to sites like Auschwitz and Genbaku Dome (commemorating Hiroshima), but unlike them it portrays a positive symbolic gloss of triumph and reconciliation onto a largely negative history of imprisonment, enforced hospitalisation and banishment under colonialism and apartheid.³³ Does this mean that Robben Island's historic fabric, especially outside the political prison, is less critical to its symbolic meaning than might be the case in other heritage sites?

The relationship between symbolic meaning and historic fabric, and the preservation of layers of meaning, were critical issues in the development of the Robben Island CMP. Following the example of the Burra Charter,³⁴ the CMP developed a conservative response to changes in fabric. Because of the influence of the Burra Charter and work done by English Heritage, the CMP tended to focus on ways of protecting significance inherent in historic fabric.

Research, educational and exhibition programs already in progress in the Museum identified and protected the living heritage of the place. Places of significance to political prisoners have been identified through biographical interviews, individual site visits and larger reference groups on site conducted by the Heritage Department. Participants in these interviews – former political prisoners, warders and relatives of both - have spoken on record for the Robben Island Museum archives about the traditions, rituals, meanings, skills and practices associated with these sites. Sometimes rituals have been re-enacted for camera, such as the cooking of the periwinkles (*imbaza*) at the sea shore. The Exhibitions Unit at Robben Island Museum plans to use footage from these interviews in their interpretations of the sites, as well as recreations of prison artefacts created by former prisoners themselves. It has also been suggested that former prisoners could be employed to do some of the repairs on the prison buildings, re-inscribing onto the site the skills acquired in prison and employed in the original building work. The Education Department and Research Unit have also worked on projects to re-inscribe the tradition of educational seminars through their seminar programs, addressed both by former prisoners and by expert commentators.

In the development of a comprehensive CMP it is essential that these aspects of the work of the institution are seen as part of the conservation strategy, and as ways of protecting the intangible heritage of the site. As such, they should be developed and conducted within the framework of the CMP. So too, should the other work of the Museum, including marketing, finance and tours. The great tragedy of Robben Island Museum to date has been the failure to recognise the centrality of conservation planning to all the work of the institution, and to the conservation of the significance of the site.

Conclusion

Problems of conservation and interpretation face all heritage sites, in part because their meaning is always contested and politicised. This paper suggests that sites of intangible heritage rely very heavily on symbolic interpretations of meaning that create particularly intense forms of heritage dissonance. This is particularly true when symbolic interpretations are linked to very recent events and are part of a national political project within a country of great political and social diversity, which is the case at Robben Island. It is also particularly true where a heritage site draws its significance from an interpretation of human atrocity, which Robben Island does.³⁵

This paper has linked Robben Island's symbolic brand to the national project of reconciliation and shown how the significance of the site has been contested and expanded both by former prisoners as well as a variety of others, including environmentalists and architects. It has suggested that this contestation over meaning is in itself an important index of Robben Island's value as a heritage site. Suppression of alternative interpretations may damage its heritage value. While the formulation of a symbolic brand is an essential part of the

management of a site, it should be seen as the tip of the heritage iceberg: supplementary and alternative meanings also have to be researched and represented.

Conservation and interpretation policies should seek to protect the fabric of the site as far as possible, not only within the confines of what is significant in terms of the symbolic brand. The conservation of fabric is necessary but not sufficient for conservation of an intangible heritage site, however. Therefore, Robben Island Museum has to continue to develop ways in which the spirit of the place can be conserved through its employment practices, educational programs, research and interpretive strategies. Too often these are seen as operational issues and are addressed separately from conservation practice.

¹ The views expressed in this paper are personal and do not necessarily coincide with those of any organization. This paper is a development of a paper presented at the ‘Memory and History’ conference, University of Cape Town, August 2000. The author wishes to acknowledge contributions and comments made by Robben Island staff and Helen Moffett to the development of the paper. Most of the paper was written while I was working at Robben Island Museum, and I must thank them for their support in writing the paper.

² South African National Heritage Resources Act (NHRA) (1999), section 47(2)

³ For example, see K. Clarke, *Informed Conservation* (English Heritage, 2001).

⁴ *Robben Island Management Plan Summary* (Robben Island, 2004).

⁵ M. Shackley, ‘Potential Futures for Robben Island: shrine, museum or theme park?’, *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(4) (2001), 355-363.

⁶ Report from meeting to define Intangible Cultural Heritage, Piedmont (Italy), March 2001 (www.unesco.org/culture/heritage/intangible/masterp/html_eng/declar.shtml, accessed 12 Feb 2002).

⁷ M. Truscott, ‘Intangible values as heritage in Australia’, *ICOMOS Newsletter*, Mar-July 2000 (www.international.icomos.org/truscott_eng.htm, accessed 12 Feb 2002).

⁸ M. Truscott cited in H.J. Deacon with L. Dondolo, M. Mrubata, S. Prosalendis and workshop participants, ‘Legal and Financial Instruments for Safeguarding our Intangible Heritage’, a Human Sciences Research Council (HSRC) Social Cohesion and Integration Project paper for the South African Department of Arts and Culture, presented to the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP-RIPC) meeting in Croatia, October 2003.

⁹ NHRA 1999, section 3(2)(i)(ii); 13(2)(c) reiterates: “SAHRA must promote the systematic identification and recording of the national estate by—(vi) promoting the identification and recording of aspects of living heritage associated with heritage resources”.

¹⁰ Synthetic Report of the Meeting on ‘Authenticity and Integrity in an African context’, Great Zimbabwe National Monument, Zimbabwe, 26-29 May 2000, in ‘Report of the Bureau of the World Heritage Committee’, 24th session, 26 June – 1 July 2000, Paris.

¹¹ World Heritage Bureau Report, 25th Session, Paris (June 2001) cited in ‘Place-Memory-Meaning: preserving intangible values in monuments and sites’, Call for Papers for 13th ICOMOS conference (www.international.icomos.org/icomosan.pdf, accessed 12 Feb 2002).

¹² D. Munjeri, ‘Intangible heritage in Africa: could it be a case of ‘much ado about nothing’?’, *ICOMOS Newsletter*, March-July 2000 (www.international.icomos.org/munjeri_eng.htm, accessed 12 Feb 2002).

¹³ S. Bologna, ‘The construction of South African Heritage: a study of tourism to Robben Island and Cape Town townships’, unpublished paper for Anthropology Department, University of Cape Town, 2000, p.32.

¹⁴ For example, M. Dlamini, *Hell-hole Robben Island* (Nottingham, 1984); L. Wilson, ‘Robben Island – Our university’ (documentary film, Cape Town, 1990); Daniels, E. *There and Back: Robben Island, 1964-1979* (Cape Town, 1998).

¹⁵ For example, M. Maharaj (ed.) *Reflections in prison* (Cape Town: Robben Island Museum; Zebra, 2001); F.L. Buntman, *Robben Island and the Struggle against Apartheid*. (Cambridge

University Press, 2003); J.H. Jacobs, 'Narrating the Island: Robben Island in South African literature', *Current Writing*, 4 (1992), 73-84.

¹⁶ A.M. Kathrada et al. *The Robben Island Exhibition: Esiqithini* (South African Museum and Mayibuye Books, 1996).

¹⁷ V. Rioufol, 'The making of a new past for a new South Africa: the commemoration of Robben Island' (unpublished M.A. thesis, UCT, 1999).

¹⁸ Tunbridge and Ashworth cited in N. Worden, "'Where it all began": the representation of Malaysian heritage in Melaka', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(3) (2001), 199-218, p.200.

¹⁹ The use of marketing theory to help us understand the heritage industry is not new. See for example, J.E. Tunbridge and G.J. Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage: the management of the past as a resource in conflict* (Chichester: John Wiley, 1996), pp.7-14 and 21-23 especially.

²⁰ D. Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), p.xi.

²¹ Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade*, p.x.

²² Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage*, p.21.

²³ J. Henderson, 'Heritage, Identity and Tourism in Hong Kong', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7(3) (2001), 219-235, p.221.

²⁴ Robben Island Research Unit, Interviews with former residents of the Island, 1999-2002.

²⁵ N. Rossouw, et al *Robben Island state of environment: summary report* (Robben Island; Stellenbosch: Robben Island Museum; CSIR, 2000).

²⁶ T. Hart, 'Baseline archaeological report on Robben Island', unpublished report, 1998.

²⁷ Riley, P. 'Conservation survey of Robben Island' (unpublished report, National Monuments Council, 1992).

²⁸ *Robben Island Management Plan Summary* (Robben Island, 2004).

²⁹ Ashworth and Tunbridge cited in Worden, 'Where it all began', p.200.

³⁰ Worden, 'Where it all began', pp.199-200.

³¹ M. Shackley, 'Potential Futures for Robben Island'.

³² Bologna, 'The construction of South African Heritage', p.27.

³³ For an elaboration of this point see H.J. Deacon, 'Remembering Tragedy, Constructing Modernity: Robben Island as a national monument' in C. Coetzee and S. Nuttall (eds.)

Negotiating the Past: the Making of Memory in South Africa (Oxford University Press, 1998).

³⁴ Australia ICOMOS, *The Burra Charter* (1999).

³⁵ Tunbridge and Ashworth, *Dissonant Heritage*, pp.94-5.