

LOOK, SEE, PEEP...? ABOUT A PHENOMENON OF *TOWNSHIP TOURS* IN SOUTH AFRICA AND THE MOTIVATIONS OF ITS PARTICIPANTS

This article was based on my reflections from a trip to South Africa. From 3rd to 26th September 2013 I was traveling along the route of south-west coast of SA, from Cape Town to Port Elisabeth and back, with many stops in smaller towns. Most of the route lies in *Western Cape* Province, and only a minor part of it, including Port Elisabeth, in the second biggest *Eastern Cape* Province. Frequently during the trip I engaged in discussions with tourists and travelers from different parts of the world, Europe predominantly, on the *township tours* matter. Exchanged insights and interviews were ultimately confirmed by personal observations and participation in such a “tour”.

This article attempts to answer the question why citizens of the so-called well developed countries participate in organized, paid tours around *townships*? What makes trips to the poorest and most dangerous “cities inside the cities”, where no-one would like to live, as important part of trips to South Africa as national parks, beaches, museums, restaurants? Finally, does the participation in *township tours* change anything in the perception of the world, in the approach towards others, in ourselves. In a word — is it an enriching and thought-provoking experience? Therefore, my subject of interest is neither the description of “attractions” offered during this kind of trips, nor is it the attitude of *townships*’ citizens towards the tours and their participants.

*

In 1994, after the fall of *apartheid*, the new government elected in the first democratic and at the same time general election divided country into nine provinces. The fourth largest one is *Western Cape* with Cape Town as its capital city. About two third of the provinces’ residents lives in its metropolitan area. For years south-west coasts of *Western Cape* have opposed fierce attacks of Atlantic and Indian Oceans, which join their forces and mingle their waters in this place. From the east, *Western Cape* borders *Eastern Cape* with its capital city in Bhisho, however, one of the two largest cities of the province next to East London is Port Elisabeth (in short PE, also called “Friendly” or “Windy” city). *Western* and *Eastern Cape* provinces are the most commonly visited places by tourists in the country. According to the official data from 2011, there are more than fifty one million people living in SA, out of which eighty percent are Africans, nine percent are white people and the so-called “Coloureds” and about two and a half percent are Asians

(<http://www.gov.za/aboutsa/people.htm>). Racial and cultural diversity in the country is well exemplified by the popular term *the Rainbow Nation*, initially used by Archbishop Emeritus Desmond Tutu.

*

Townships, splinters of sinister legacy, grow quickly around every bigger city in SA. They are undeveloped and underfunded areas which were reserved for the so-called “non-white” population until the end of *apartheid* era. Generally, *townships* were appearing in the suburbs of the cities. Their inception was caused by racial segregation and discriminatory laws, forbidding (excluding) “coloured” people from living in the city centres. A specific cohesion was created between *townships* and urban centres. On the one hand, cities absorb new and cheap reserves of unqualified manpower which is “spit out” by the poverty districts in practically unlimited amounts. On the other hand, residents of the outskirts, even if they do not believe in the possibility to ameliorate their own fate, want to at least survive. And among the whirl of urban labyrinths this seems to be easier than the dependency on capricious barren land and the plagues of nature. Currently, biggest *townships* around Cape Town are: Mitchell’s Plain, Khayelitsha, Guguletu, and biggest ones around Port Elisabeth are: Ibhayi and Motherwell. *Townships* permanently bulge and proliferate in an uncontrolled way, annexing more scraps of greenfield; still, because on the one hand, the population of the country is growing fast, and on the other, SA is considered “a gate to paradise” and a promise of a better life by many immigrants from poorer African countries located on the south of the equator (just like Europe for African immigrants from the countries in the north of the continent) (Brinkbäumer, 2009). Thus, the migration stream flows incessantly towards the Cape Country. Often, after catching up with the brutal reality, newcomers instead of fulfilling their dreams, supply the ranks of poverty districts diverse in terms of origins and material status of their population.

Townships in SA climaxed in the 1950s and 1960s. Their creation had been initiated by the racist legislation (the foundations of the system of racial segregation had been created in the report of the South African Commission for the Natives in 1905), and afterwards by the governments of the National Party established in 1914, which won the general elections of the “whites” in 1948 and began implementing *apartheid* (Preez, 2004, 241; Rooyen, 2011, 8-13). The oldest, formally planned by the authorities *township* in SA that endured until now is Langa, located in the metropolitan area of Cape Town. Langa was founded in 1927, and was the first *township* created on the ground of *the Native (Urban Areas) Act* from 1923 (the act establishing racial segregation, limiting the access of black people to the cities and controlling their settlement in Cape Town, which was supposed to remain the so-called “*apartheid* city”). Langa, where in 1960s, with cata-

strophic consequences, “black” people had protested against racist politics — *Anti-Pass Laws Campaign*, was intended as an exemplary “village for the natives”, and more specifically, a rough, residential area for Africans, forced to leave Ndabenia. “White” people claimed that in Ndabenia created at the turn of the century district of Cape Town, Africans were the cause of spreading diseases (Nieves, 2009, 203). Since the 1940s, the National Party kept introducing more and more strict and discriminatory laws in relation to “coloured” people. Political changes in SA were at the time connected to economy. In 1940s in southern Africa, flourishing industry generated a demand for new employees. At the same time in rural regions resources of land available for cultivation was running low. There was poverty and unemployment, both reaching about 70 percent. As a result, between 1942 and 1943, laws forbidding Africans from migrating from rural areas to cities were suspended. However, white owners were against this legislation, especially owners of mines and farms, who wanted to keep intact the lucrative system of seasonal work. Due to the moods prevailing among “white” people, National Party came into power and started to introduce a stringent legislation, restricting migration of Africans to cities. It was decided that Africans would be able to leave rural areas only for a short period of time, unless they were hired by Europeans. However, the unfavorable seasonal work system did not return. In the late 1950s and the beginning of 1960s, African cities were growing dynamically enough to create around fifty percent of all work places (Curtin et al., 2003, 689-691). Already in the early fifties, under the pretext of the liquidation of slums, the government started to resettle citizens of the so-called “non-European” societies. Those “black spots” filled areas designated exclusively to “white people”. Meanwhile in many districts, despite the low standard, social life was highly developed. New localizations were chosen for the resettled ones. Zachariah Keodirelang Matthews ironically called them “a heaven for blacks”. African National Congress (ANC) proved to be completely ineffective in blocking discriminatory legislations, *Group Areas Act* among them (Preez, 2004, 241-245; Pietersen, 1992, 22-24). While some of the so-called “coloured” was eagerly leaving their existing homes, others were forced to leave Sophiatown, near Johannesburg or *District 6* — lively, “coloured” district of Cape Town. It is worth emphasizing that there was racial segregation even within *townships*, which were organized for “non-white people”. “Black” people, “coloured” people and Indians were located separately. The real architect of *apartheid* was Hendrik Verwoerd, who took over power after the death of Hans Strydom in 1958. Between 1950 and 1958, being a Minister for Native Affairs he implemented solutions that were meant to “solve” the problem of natives, but at the same time, he was consolidating supremacy of white Afrikaners. During the reign of Verwoerd, which lasted a total of 16 years, racial segregation concerned not only areas of residence and education but almost all other spheres of life. *The Promotion of Bantu Self-*

Government Act was implemented in 1959. It was an attempt to stop the global critique of “white people’s” government in southern Africa, the critique strictly associated with human rights violation in the era of decolonisation and the struggle against racism. There were created quasi-independent and ‘ethnic national Bantustans’. In theory, they were supposed to be units ruled by “black people”, but in practice they were small parcels, which “white people” considered useless. ‘Bantustans’ served more as ‘bedrooms’ or ‘old people’s homes’, because healthy men were needed for work in cities. Meanwhile, the legislation stipulated that cities were supposed to stay entirely “white” (Welsh, 2000, 444-453). That is why, in a safe distance from them, “coloured” suburbia were growing dynamically by organizing crude conditions that only allowed people to survive. On these small parcels, people would most often put up something resembling homes of bags and metal sheets. They were the only building materials “black” people could afford. Although since 1991, discriminatory acts were invalidated one by one and all SA citizens were granted the ownership of the land, there are still many illegal houses built in *townships*. The lack of governmental permissions results many people’s lack of access to basic services (such as water, electricity or sewerage).

Additional problems appeared with the dynamic growth of population density and frequent fires. However, among many shaky constructions, one could see brick houses, because democratic government invested significant amounts of money in building basic house infrastructure for the poorest (<http://www.dhs.gov.za>). Only between 1994 and 2002, there were 1,4 million of new brick houses built from governmental subsidies (cost about 2000 dollars each) (Guest 2004, 221). On the other hand, more and more people living in *townships* and working and earning in city centres have organized themselves to improve conditions of their existence. However, one should take into consideration the fact that despite many reforms implemented by ANC since the beginning of the 1990s and promoted as part of *the Reconstruction Development Program* (RDP), there are still huge social and economical inequalities in SA. Those differences deepen because there is a high level of unemployment in the country, especially among black citizens. And that, among others, leads to high crime rates.

*

Since the fall of *apartheid*, tourist industry became a huge chance for both, the central government and local leaders. Its dynamic development related, among others, to the cash inflow (but not only), allowed the realisation of many concepts contained in *the Reconstruction Development Program*. For comparison, in 1990, SA was 56th on the world list of tourist destination countries. Ten years later it was 25th (Grundlingh, 2009, 171). There is a constantly growing interest in tourist attractions such as *township tours*. In many aspects, they remind the extremely successful *ghetto*

tours in New York or Los Angeles. Currently, interest in “tours” to the so-called poverty districts grows practically in all developing countries (for instance Brazil, Indonesia, Philippines, India). First “tours” of the members of the middle class to slums started to be organized in the second half of the 19th century in London and New York (Saint-Upéry, 2010). In SA, organized tours to *townships* around Johannesburg started in the late 1960s. Their participants at the time were white South Africans, who were desperately curious, wanted to “peep” into the living conditions of “primitive” and “exotic” of *townships*’ citizens. Those escapades ended in the late 1970s, both because of increasing awareness among Africans as well as growing disturbances and anti-governmental protests, voiced mostly within “black” poverty districts. At the end of 1980s such tours were organized to *townships* around Cape Town. They were addressed to white citizens of cities who wanted to see what life was like “on the other side”, in the areas dominated by “black” people. Many of these early tours were initiated by white local activists, who practically did not know anything about poverty because of *apartheid* politics (Nieves, 2009, 201-203). The tours were organized also by Africans, who wanted to show to politicians the conditions most SA citizens had to live in. In the end of 1980s, *township tours* were incorporated by increasingly popular and commercialized SA touristic industry. *Township tours* were fully reborn after 1994. They are still one of the main tourist attractions in SA, but now their participants are mostly foreign tourists.

*

Robert Guest noticed that one of the most trivial clichés used in the travelogues is one that describes the country as “the land of contrasts,” but adding after a moment, that in the case of South Africa it is basically impossible to avoid it. South Africa “(...) is like a European archipelago dropped into an African ocean. The Third World lives in a shed at the bottom of the First World’s garden, which he weeds on Wednesdays” (Guest, 2004, 220). Striking socio-economic contrasts “snap” on European tourists almost immediately after landing in Cape Town. This let people get through the initial although the necessary shock therapy. It is because one needs to get from the international airport into the city centre, which is located tens of minutes away. Modern road infrastructure winds among tangled sea of *townships*, whose waters open up even without Moses’ call, and form a narrow passage for the chosen people and separated from the poverty world with metal bodies of motor vehicles. Meantime, the reality on the other side of the glass strains for next kilometers and sometimes even overlooks the street. Drivers hit the brakes in the nick of time, giving another chance to black and colored residents of poor districts who run up under the wheels, for returning to their world, from which they wish to break out. Their vast world seems awfully small, and thus much more distant from the “heaven” than the

one closed in glass office towers and hotels in the center of the city. More and more small brick houses emerges among wooden barracks, twisted metal sheets, shaky houses knocked together with literally anything, which probably maintain balance only by some supernatural power and among the disorganized mass of waste keep on existing squeezed and nestled into each other at every available patch of land. Cape Town city center is a completely different world, in many ways adapted to the standards and needs of Europeans, even the ones with full pockets. Extremes, divisions and differences, however, do not give a respite to the more observant ones. For instance, they strongly marked the urban space. SA is one of the most vivid examples of separating space and cultivating the so-called *gated communities* (more in: Jałowicki, Łukowski, 2007; Czarnecka, 2012, 69-83). Fences and high walls behind which beautiful worlds are bred for the citizens of South Africa are no longer the sufficient protection. Therefore, they are normally crowned with barbed wire bracelets, and then the whole is connected to the current. According to the accepted standards, this type of protection is considered necessary not only by the owners of detached houses, but owners of all residential buildings, including blocks of flats, and even tourist resorts. Places I have stayed in were not the exception.

In the hostels there are stacks of flyers with descriptions of attractions for every day of the week waiting for temporary visitors from a distant world. Apart from national parks, the Cape of Good Hope, wineries and whale watching, there are also *township tours*, sold separately or included in joint offers. Colorful leaflets hanged on refrigerators and hostels' cork boards invite you to a meeting with a much less colorful, but apparently completely "authentic" world (Urry, 2007, 27; Wiczkorkiewicz 2008, 31-93). Owners of tourist shelters often encourage participation in expeditions, which allow, in their opinion, to better understand the true face of South Africa.

Not every newcomer decides to spend a relatively small amount of money enabling him or her to watch disorder, dirt, and something called the daily life of "black" population of the country. Many tourists claim that this kind of behavior is at least morally ambiguous. Here come the rich Europeans who "have fun" at the expense of the poor, and do not have the slightest idea about their problems. It is impossible not to notice that in addition to the pure human empathy (how would we feel in their position?), newcomers' decisions are shadowed by the legacy of colonialism. Some educated citizens who come from democratic Europe, a place where people defend libertarian slogans, struggle with guilt for the actions of white ancestry against the formerly enslaved natives. In the era of fashionable slogans of humanity, freedom and self-determination, cultural tracings come back from the underworld like ghosts. They show the superiority of men watching "the Other" — an indolent native, who "(...) in its natural profligacy and depravity needs the European domination" (Said, 2009, 180).

Europeans were organizing their “human zoo” in the sixteenth century in many European cities, through the centuries, living with the conviction that “the Other, even if it is not the enemy, is considered as someone who is watched, not as someone who (like us) also watches” (Sontag, 2010, 89) and that “to see is to know” (the motto used, among others, during an exhibition in 1893). Ethnological exhibitions were not closed at the beginning of the twentieth century but in the second half, therefore, the time distance is still relatively small. In Brussels, the last colonial exhibition was organized in 1958 (for more information: Corbey, 1993, 338-369). The famous fossil skeleton and body casting of Saartjie Baartman of South Africa has been viewed in Paris until the mid-seventies of the twentieth century (for more information: Wieczorkiewicz 2013). When she lived (in 1810, she was brought to London from Africa by a doctor), she had to publicly undress and show her protruding buttocks during ticketed shows. It was only in 2000, when under pressure from Nelson Mandela France gave the skeleton of the “Black Venus” back to South Africa (Tochman, 2013, 120-121). Many think that fashionable in our times, organized trips to the slums are on the one hand, a kind of continuation of the previous European deviation, but on the other hand, they are the evidence for the “old” part of the world to be privileged. The history of colonialism raises guilt in some people, therefore resignation from the participation in *township tours* becomes not only an inner moral requirement, preceded by personal reflections or acquisition of specific knowledge, but also a manifesto against the shameful legacy of the past and ambiguous, increasingly commercialized present.

Controversies surrounding *township tours* are still very much alive (Weiner, 2008). The most common objections are, on the one hand, depriving residents of poor districts of human dignity, their objectification, “selling” and therefore causing suffering and humiliation, and on the other, the exploitation of the poor by the wealthy, mainly by companies organizing “tours” whose profits do not translate into improvement of living conditions in *townships*. Companies frequently provide the following counter-arguments: 1. carriers try to teach visitors something about poverty, 2. they help to overturn negative stereotypes accrued around the slums and their inhabitants, 3. part of the generated income is spent on helping slums’ residents (Ma, 2009-2010).

It is worth noting that participation in *township tours* in South Africa is not always associated with thoughtful decisions and free choices of people taking part in them. Of course, in most cases, people decide to participate in the “trips” themselves. Nevertheless, the situation becomes more complicated in the case of joint offers. Their main point of the program is to go to a different location, for example, to national parks located far away from the city, where you spend most of the day. At the beginning or at the end of the tour a guide tells you about an additional attraction of your choice and submits two proposals. One of them is often a *township*

tour. The selection is done by voting, and the decision depends on the will of the majority. The minority must therefore yield. If the unit insists against joining the willing group, the only option is to spend two to three hours in a car parked in the maze created with narrow streets and corners of the *township*, which usually convinces the resistant. More or less, that was how the decision was made to enter Ibhayi, a *township* near Port Elizabeth, by the group I was traveled with to the Addo Elephant National Park, the third largest national park in South Africa.

Our driver and guide in one person, a white South African with a military manner a real war veteran should have, and before the entrance to the national park he carried out the vote at the group of seven that he “took over” into his care. Since most of the tour participants welcomed this additional and inexpensive offer at the end of an eventful day in the form of an entry into the *township* with a great joy, he made a few phone calls and collected an additional sum from each of us. The plan was, inter alia, to visit the “typical” household of one of the residents of Ibhayi, which ultimately did not happen. It was then that we decided unanimously to move to the second point of the program — dinner at the *shebeen*. These local bars and pubs were built during the *apartheid* era, especially in the *townships*, as an alternative to the Africans who were forbidden to access licensed bars and pubs reserved for “whites”. Currently, *shebeens* operate legally and play an important role in the integration of local communities. The owner of the pub, and a friend of our guide, greeted us personally and invited to the table for the popular in this region Chakalaka (he got paid for it). *Township* residents sat in a rough-and-ready furnished room with a dim light; we encountered only black men and boys. Talking to the sound of subsequent beer glass bottles’ strikes, they divided their glances between us and the transmission of the match projected directly on the wall. Interest in “whites” was noticeable, but in no way mixed with hostility. After the talks, a delicious dinner and a few beers, we said goodbye and went our way by car. There was a sense of security in the *shebeen*, but it disappeared forever, as soon as we got into the car. Images that appeared in front of our eyes in the darkness of the night, no longer allowed us to perpetuate this blissful peace.

There is no doubt that the demand for *township tours* grows and nothing predicts this trend to change in the near future. It is generally administered that the “trips” to the shantytowns are divided into two categories. The first represent those that are focused on culture and education, and the other represents those whose main purpose is entertainment. However, in practice, in most cases it is difficult to draw a sharp line between them.

In the scientific literature, there are different divisions of motivations that lead people to travel. These divisions are the proposals and do not form closed catalogs. For example, Charles R. Goeldner and JR Brent Ritchie distinguish four categories of motivation: physical, cultural,

interpersonal and prestigious, while Philip Pearce and Uk-I. Lee mention: escape, relaxation, networking, interpersonal relationships, self-improvement (Ma, 2009-2010). Valene L. Smith distinguishes the following types of modern tourism: ethnic, cultural, historical, focused on the environment, recreational. Erik Cohen listed four types of tourists (conventional institutionalized, conventional individual, tourist explorer, floating hiker), taking into account their willingness to go beyond the boundaries of their own world (Wieczorkiewicz, 2008, 80). In practice, different motivations exist in a symbiosis of some kind, overlapping each other and mutually complementing. In this text I treat these divisions as a useful tool, but I do not limit myself to any of them solely, considering them only as a theoretical framework.

An important component of the organized *township tours* is the opportunity to acquire specific knowledge, not only about the living conditions of people living in slums, but on the cultural heritage of ‘non-white’ inhabitants of South Africa, unnoticed by the Europeans until recently. Until 1994 the dominant sphere of the so-called cultural tourism in South Africa was focused exclusively on the places associated with European heritage, including but not limited to the Boer wars. Only after the fall of *apartheid* and the development of *township tours*, the interest in the heritage of the previously discriminated “black” population revived. In the *townships*, which were historic strongholds in the struggle against *apartheid*, museums and memorials were created. Unfortunately, the simple architecture of the *townships* that does not attract the attention of visitors works against them. Heritage preservation and exposition in such cases must be, according to experts, linked to other strategies (Nieves, 2009, 201-203). According to John Urry, attracting tourists with nostalgic memories of heritage and changing more places into the centers of performances and presentation, has a typically postmodern overtone (Urry, 2007, 140-153). Indeed, despite the fact that many professionals who work to protect heritage show *township tours* as an opportunity to get to know the “real people”, “true story”, “real country” as an alternative to the stylized performances and “cultural villages”, it seems right to assert that the people of the *townships* also “play”, but in their own way (Nieves, 2009, 202).

Much more often the participation in *township tours* is motivated by two reasons: interest in a foreign culture and life of the Other and the desire to get a new, previously unavailable experience than by the desire to gain knowledge about the cultural heritage and to visit historical sites related to the fight against segregation and racial discrimination. Curiosity of contemporary people is related to the desire to observe the daily life of the natives, taking place in the context unusual for visitors. “What seems to be (and probably is, if you think about it — but what a tourist would wonder about?) a daily routine for the natives, for the tourist is a collection of exotic oddities and an opportunity to experience some nice thrills” (Bauman, 2008, 272). The

inhabitants of the *townships* are viewed by visitors and they know it, but at the same time, and modern travelers realize that, they are being watched by these “Others”. It is worth noting that “white” South Africans hardly ever visit shantytowns as racial separation, in practice, is still marked very strongly. Among the tourists, voyeurism as a motivation appears rarely. No participant of the “tour” has any delusions that he will be able to go unnoticed, blend into the crowd and peep unpunished into the “real” life of the Others with pleasure.

The experience associated with being in this particular place is much more important than a viewing (not just looking), understood as a desire to establish a deeper knowledge and relationships with the inhabitants of the *townships*, thus meeting with the Others. That experience manifested in the possibility to tell someone about being somewhere, consists in the commitment of all the human senses. Extraordinary experience unavailable every day and beyond the reach of many of those with whom we have a personal or professional relationships means that its value increases, as does the level of satisfaction gained this way. And this desire decides on joining a “tour” more than the so-called search for authenticity or meeting with a stranger. Dean MacCannell’s thesis does not seem entirely accurate in this context. It states: “(...) all the tourists embody the search for authenticity and it is a modern variant of the universal human need for the sacred. Tourist is a modern pilgrim seeking authenticity in “times” and “places” possibly distant from their own everyday life. Tourists are especially fascinated by “real life” of others, which appears to them as more real than their own experience” (quoted in Urry, 2007, 25). Although tourists often say they want to see “real life”, many are aware that during short trips they will not be able to get to know the people, their problems, joys, or even get an idea of the space they visited. They know they will not get “behind the scenes”. In this context, Zygmunt Bauman’s observation on contemporary tourists seems accurate: “(...) they do not belong to any of the places they visit; they are only guests everywhere, everywhere on the run. Wherever they are, they are „on the outside”. (...) The tourist is as if inside the bubble — transparent but with a strictly selective incisiveness. (...) Wrapped in the membrane the tourist can feel safe. The bubble effectively protects against the powerful suction and the viscosity of the ambience” (Bauman, 2000, 144). Deeper interactions between residents of *townships* and tourists do not exist, they are, at most, limited to the exchange of a few non-important, and hence non-binding words. “One can only have casual contacts with the natives and strangulate only superficial relations. (...) The natives are not the owners of taverns and inns, in which a pilgrim would stop many more times. For those natives, a tourist meet on his way, he «encounters» accidentally; (...) The meeting started out of yesterday’s urge and will end up with tomorrow’s one” (Bauman, 2000, 145). And further: “Traveler — a participant is an observer — a sham. (...) That „friendship” that requires

a distance is a type of contact that can instantly transform into the story of adventures in travel, compose into the family album, and convert into memory. This way, experiencing, self-centered, touristic „I” is safe. The „remote friendship” (which is the result of adjusting to a sense of alienation) does not require the involvement, does not make us uncomfortable, but adds color to our biography, and makes ourselves seem more interesting” (Wieczorkiewicz, 2008, 207). Therefore, an individual experience of a visitor and his own satisfaction is essential. In this case, Urry’s concept gain importance. He questions the idea of searching for the authenticity of the experience and focuses rather on finding the difference in relation to everyday life: “It is possible that the search for authenticity is an important aspect of this phenomenon, but only to the extent that the authenticity contrasts with everyday experience” (Urry, 2007, 30). That is why the difference, the uncommonness, and everything that cannot be experienced in the place where one lives are the most important for contemporary “experience collectors”.

Gaining new experiences such as *township tours* also helps in building something that could be called “prestige”, although this is certainly not the leading motivation. Returns abound in meetings with friends, during which the returning ones will be able to focus for a moment the attention of the environment, to show the photos as the material evidence and share insights. It will be difficult to deny it to all those who “have not experienced it personally.” The discourse of this kind is always included in the virtual costs, which the story teller suffered to “experience” something unusual. Tragicomical and paradoxical is the fact that in the 21st century, tourists from developed countries build their “prestige” among other things, through the acquisition of unusual experiences in the districts affected by the epidemic of poverty.

For some tourists, the participation in the “trips” to the *townships* is an unusual experience and a new sensation on the one hand, and fun on the other (indispensable determinant of successful holidays). There is not much interest in the knowledge, acquisition of knowledge, seeing much more, but there is more in spending time pleasantly with friends — the other participants of the expedition. These tourists easily give in to something, that Urry called “pretending to be a child” (Urry, 2007, 151). This kind of approach of the newcomers enters into ambiguous from a moral point of view, uncontrollable consumption of goods and services. In an extreme form, *township tours* focus exclusively on providing entertainment for the tourists, converging into the “human safari”.

Finally, it is worth considering whether the participation in the organized “trips” to areas of poverty has any deeper meaning or changes anything? From the economic point of view, part of the inhabitants of the *townships* notes some profits from the influx of foreign tourists, although they are in the minority. Some companies destine some of the money for the development of

local initiatives, but there is no doubt that in most cases they are the main beneficiaries of organized activities. The tourism industry enters *township tours* into a thick catalog of unusual attractions, hoping primarily for the global profits from visits of foreign tourist to South Africa. Individual experiences and reflections of the participants of such trips vary and depend, inter alia, on the level of sensitivity, education, origin, and material status. Some people quickly forget what they saw, because they are more absorbed with new travel plans, others remember, but regard the “trip” to the *townships* only as an expansion of their own conviction about their own uniqueness, cosmopolitanism and favoring.

Bibliography:

- Bauman, Zygmunt; 2000, *Ponowoczesność jako źródło cierpień*, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sic!
- Bauman, Zygmunt; in: Mateusz Halawa, Paulina Wróbel (ed.); 2008, *Bauman o popkulturze*. Wypisy, Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Akademickie i Profesjonalne
- Brinkbäumer, Klaus; 2009, *Afrykańska odyseja*, trans. by Joanna Czudec, Wołowiec: Wydawnictwo Czarne
- Corbey, Raymond; 1993, *Ethnographic Showcases, 1870-1930*; in: *Cultural Anthropology*, vol. 8, No 3, p. 338-369
- Curtin, Philip et al.; 2003, *Historia Afryki*, trans. by Marek Jannasz, Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo MARABUT
- Czarnecka, Dominika; 2012, *Przeciw gettoizacji przestrzeni miejskiej — czyli dlaczego niektórzy ludzie nie chcą mieszkać za ogrodzeniem*; in: Cezary Kardasz, Julia Możdżeń, Magdalena Spychaj (ed.), *Miasto jako fenomen społeczny i kulturowy*, Toruń: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, p. 69-83
- Grundlingh, Albert; 2009, *A Cultural Conundrum? Old Monuments and New Regimes: The Voortrekker Monument as Symbol of Afrikaner Power in a Postapartheid South Africa*; in: Daniel J. Walkowitz, Lisa Maya Knauer (ed.), *Contested Histories in Public Space. Memory, Race, and Nation*, Durham — London: Duke University Press, p. 157-177
- Guest, Robert; 2004, *The Shackled Continent. Africa's Past, Present and Future*, London: Pan Books
- Jałowicki, Bohdan, Łukowski, Wojciech (ed.); 2007, *Gettoizacja polskiej przestrzeni miejskiej*, Warszawa: Scholar
- Ma Bob; 2009-2010, *A Trip into the Controversy. A Study of Slum Tourism Travel Motivations*, http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1011&context=uhf_2010, entered on 25.02.2014
- Nieves, Angel, David; 2009, *Places of pain as tools for social justice in the 'new' South Africa. Black heritage preservation in the 'rainbow' nation's townships*; in: William Logan, Keir Reeves (ed.), *Places of Pain and Shame. Dealing with Difficult Heritage*, New York: Routledge, p. 198-214
- Pietersen, Minette (ed.); 1992, *This is South Africa*, Pretoria: South African Communication Service
- Preez, Max; 2004, *Of warriors, lovers and prophets. Unusual stories from South Africa's past*, Cape Town: Zebra Press
- Rooyen, Kobus; 2011, *A South African Censor's Tale*, Pretoria: Protea Book House
- Said, Edward, W.; 2009, *Kultura i imperializm*, trans. by Monika Wyrwas-Wiśniewska, Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego
- Saint-Upéry, Marc; 2010, *Left at the Crossroads: Ogling the poor*; w: RIA Novosti, <http://en.ria.ru/columnists/20101021/161035393.html>, entered on 19.02.2014

- Sontag, Susan; 2010, Widok cudzego cierpienia, trans. by Sławomir Magala, Kraków: Karakter
- Tochman, Wojciech; 2013, Eli, Eli, Wołowiec: Wydawnictwo Czarne
- Urry, John; 2007, Spojrzenie turysty, trans. by Alina Szulżycka, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN
- Weiner, Eric; 2008, Slum Visits: Tourism or Voyeurism?; in: The New York Times, 9.03.2008,
http://www.nytimes.com/2008/03/09/travel/09heads.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0, entered on 24.02.2014
- Welsh, Frank; 2000, A history of South Africa, London: HarperCollins Publishers
- Wieczorkiewicz, Anna; 2008, Apetyt turysty. O doświadczaniu świata podróży, Kraków: Universitas
- Wieczorkiewicz, Anna; 2013, Czarna kobieta na białym tle. Dyptyk biograficzny, Kraków: Universitas

Websites:

- <http://www.gov.za/aboutsa/people.htm>, entered on 17.02.2014 — official SA Internet website
- http://www.dhs.gov.za/uploads/documents/1_Simplified_Guide_Policy_Context/2%20Vol%201%20Part%202%20The%20Policy%20Context.pdf , entered on 19.02.2014 — SA Internet website containing documentation on *the National Housing Policy*