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A Blurred Paradise: insider and outsider perspectives on Paternoster

Alyson Karen Smith

ABSTRACT

Paternoster is perpetually represented as being a tourist destination primarily through the use of imagery; yet this is often without interrogation of the primary narrative which when examined cracks in the visual façade surface. The overall objective of this research was to review the community conflicts through the use of an insider and outsider approach. This was achieved through using an insider qualitative, consensual, documentary style approach. Fieldwork, participant observation and interviews were used as inroads to the community and to enable the use of photography to explore existing narratives, why they exist and the possibility for alternative narratives. As an owner of property within this community (an insider), one is still categorised as an outsider, as someone not born in the community. This dual role allowed a different interrogation while providing its own challenges of not influencing the research. Further, this contested community with emotional undercurrents embedded in its complex matrix of relationships is further explored through research and interrogation of the perfect picture postcard view. This interrogation uncovers missed opportunities, mistrust, impacts of capitalism, categorisation of people along preconceived lines and a community in strife as it attempts to shift itself from its 19th century comfort zone to the 21st century filled with new economic and social realities. Simultaneously, the research explores the role that insider research presents, as well as the role of the potential biases of the photographer in her ability to create an objective view as possible. This is balanced with being on the outside, on the peripheries of this community and being part of a group that are seen as intruders. This provided a unique opportunity to research the community from a number of angles.
Introduction

Approximately 115km north west of Cape Town lays the picturesque village of Paternoster in its much-coveted glory. The idea of an idyllic peaceful tourist destination with beautiful beaches is its most depicted picture in the popular media and through photographic imagery. Paternoster’s ascent as a main tourist destination has been staunchly entrenched through its well acclaimed restaurants, beaches, quaint white-washed houses and the colourful ‘bakkies’, or boats, dotted along the coastline, and of course the local delicacy, the West Coast Rock Lobster more commonly known as ‘kreef’ or crayfish. Just beneath the surface however, Paternoster is a multifaceted, complex and fractured community.

As previously stated by the current author (Smith, 2012), “I first went to Paternoster as a tourist in 2002. At this time, I guess I left with an impression similar to that of most tourists, that of a small, picturesque village steeped in history, quaint houses that appeared to conform to a traditional architecture, an abundance of cheap fish provided by a community of fishermen, that one assumes are descendants of the original fishing families of the area”. The tourist gaze has been reiterated by the various photographic works and books that depict Paternoster in this romanticised way, one of which is the book "West Coast: Cederburg to Sea" by Vanessa Cowling and Karena du Plessis. However, there are few works, if any that show the multi-faceted character of the village. The tourist view creation and existence results from the use of beautiful imagery that encompasses a particular aspect of the seaside, coasts and beaches, coastal villages and perceived traditional dwellers. Imagery, or photographs, playing a significant role in these perceptions, for often “if we are unable to travel, a photograph then helps us to travel” (Becker, 2003, p.311), but photographs also provide a discourse of what travel and holidays entail for in essence the photograph intersects the gaze of the traveller. These photographs, often taken as pictured memories, beg an answer to question around what is it that really fascinates us with the seaside, when did a beach holiday become the aspirational holiday and what role does imagery play in these perceptions. Counter to this is how this reality differs for those whom are living there more permanently and are faced with the challenges of daily life in a hostile environment. Tourism has shifted from a simple family holiday to one that can provide options around ‘socially responsible tourism’. This in itself may further entrench the vast differences in communities and economic status.

Paternoster’s recorded history, both written and photographic, is at times sketchy, especially the last 100 years where historic facts have been filled by the collective memories, personal narratives and photographs passed down from generation to generation within the village. Often this has allowed for variations of memory, interpretation and the influence of emotional involvement in the narrative history. A key element of these told narratives is that there becomes the possibility of an alternative narrative, or narratives, supported by glimpses behind the façade into the multifaceted
elements of Paternoster. The process of creating a body of photographic work that accompanies this article, also entitled *a blurred paradise*, enabled engagement with the community and this in turn allowed conversations to take place with people that might have not been possible although at times some of the people approached did so reluctantly. With the use of photography and a very specific consensual approach, engagement took place in very different ways. As an ‘insider’ possibilities existed for the exploration of other narratives less often told, or at times hidden within families and the social fabric of this community.

Enwezor (2006) states “contemporary African photography…focuses not just on individuals through social representation, but also on social environments, on networks of shared relations and coevalness, on the events of self, on spatial practices” (p. 29). In essence, documenting the Paternoster narratives photographical needed to focus on all elements of the subject. It was not the aim to gain overall community consent or involvement either for the project itself, neither the photographs nor this paper, but rather consent was sought out from individuals to partake either in conversations or in being photographed. It is this approval to inclusivity, empowerment and choice that was used to investigate and portray the elements that make up this contested community.

Further according to Enwezor (2006) “photography is a probing tool…as much a medium of witnessing as it is an analytical one” (p.25). Paul Weinberg’s remarks, as quoted in Godby’s introduction to *Then and Now* (2008), that “recent work has indicated a shift into more in-depth community photography and more personal searches in the community of the photographer”. Michael Godby (2008), again in the introduction to *Then and Now* (2008), purports that photographers can neither propose nor identify culprits: they can simply document the experience of those affected. The opinion of Susan Sontag (1977) is that photographs are depicted as a representation of realism and that images have become one of the principal devices for experiencing something, for giving an appearance of participation; however, as history has proven, images are able to challenge, to create action, to bring about change, to influence. They are a way of providing a “new way of dealing with the present” in essence a way of documenting, reflecting upon and experiencing reality (Sontag, 1977). While photographic images are a “newer” way of representing the world, it can be argued that imagery itself, most often in its drawn or painted format, has depicted life much further back in time. This imagery has provided information and context to communities and their social conscience.

And so exists *a blurred paradise*. Firstly, as a fragile community on the brink of further erosion due to social and economic demands. Secondly, as a body of photographic work that attempts to capture some of this deeply embedded complexity of relationships, a history of land claims, historic misunderstood burial sites, a supportive community that relies heavily on fishing, ongoing dogmatic stereotypes, and racial, social class, cultural and economic tensions. Thirdly, as this written explicative that attempts to provide context and history as a way to understanding this contested community.
Narrative Consented Snapshots

The word narrative is defined as "an account of how and why a situation or event came to be. A narrative is intended to provide an account of how a complex historical event unfolded and why" (http://understandingsociety.blogspot.com/2008/11/narrative-history.html). Further, it "provides hermeneutic understanding of the outcomes and causal explanation", yet at its very core narrative history is formed on the basis of selectivity (http://understandingsociety.blogspot.com/2008/11/narrative-history.html) in that certain facts, or the way that these played out, are remembered. Stories, similarly, are defined as being "based on values passed down by older generations to share the foundations of the community with storytelling used as a bridge between knowledge and understanding, allowing the values of ‘self’ and ‘community’ to connect and be learned as a whole” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/storytelling).

The role of both narratives and stories within community understanding and development are key and as part of this remembrance there is often the central role of imagery and photographs. In essence an image provides a ‘snap’ at a certain point in time that informs, or provides key information, to substantiate a narrative or as a guide to remembering. Most often these come in the form of personal archives of photographs, which inform ‘insider’ stories and narratives within families and communities.

Increasingly in our communities images inform our memories rather than told stories. For instance if one thinks back to early childhood, and indeed if lucky enough a first childhood beach holiday, “memories may arise as faded snapshots, remarkably distinct from newer memories that can feel as real as the present moment. With time, memories not only lose their rich vividness, but they can also become distorted, as our true experiences tango with a fictional past” (Reas, E., October 15, 2013. Sourced from http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=important-new-theory-explains-where-old-memories-go). New research indicates that in fact memories are biologically or physiologically transformed each time we visit them or revisit them, indicating that when a memory is recalled often it will more rapidly become stored in the brain’s cortex, becoming less episodic. This in essence talks to the subjective nature of our memories in that some features are reinforced while others disappear, and why then even family members may dispute memories of the same experience as each individual holds true their own memory or version of the event. It can then also be argued that it is possible that one can also create memories through the use of tidbits from others, other stories and narratives, from photographs and images, and most certainly from the media. This is important because it becomes possible that there is an ability to transform our own, our family and other historical narratives indicates that most often narratives are intensely personal.

Without a doubt, photography and imagery play a role in community collective memory as well as in the perceptions of insider and outsider, the other, us and them. One intent of taking a picture is to foster and enhance remembering and through these pictures perpetuate a shaped memory that
stretches beyond personal experience of specific circumstances (Roberts, 2011, Retrieved from: http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1680/3203). Brathes (1977, p. 19) poses the question that “a photograph can be the site of conflicting memories, whose memory is to prevail in the family ‘archive’; which again talks to the ability to transform memory.

Reissman (2008) states that “[a] photograph stabilises a moment in time, preserving a fragment of narrative experience that otherwise would be lost. Transcripts of oral narratives similarly ‘fix’ a moment in the stream of conversation. But…the same oral narrative can be transcribed in different ways, each pointing interpretation in different directions and, if the conversational context changes, the speaker would likely shape the story for the new audience” (p.181). Certainly, for many people a photograph represents a truth, a fact, an aide memoire as it were, which is often declared ‘as the truth’, supporting the comment that “much meaning is conveyed by the visual” (Hills, C.N., 2011, pg. 5) and that “the visible captured, time arrested” (Morris, 2003, p.72). Berger, as quoted in Wells (2003, p.2), states that photography is like a memory…[which] is normally embedded in an ongoing experience of a person who is remembering…if the photograph isn’t ‘tricked’ in one way or another, it is authentic like a trace of an event, the problem is that an event, where it is isolated from all the other events that came before it and which go after it, is in another sense not very authentic because it has been seized from that ongoing experience which is the true authenticity. Photographs are authentic and not authentic, whether the authentic side of photographs can be used authentically or not depends upon how you use them”. With this positioning of photographs as an important component of narratives and stories, this cannot be achieved without consideration for the multiple factors that influence the ‘snap’. These include the photographer’s intent, the gaze and pose of the subject, the purpose, the location, the circumstance and so forth. In essence while it ‘freezes’ a specific moment in time, this moment and memory are influenced. There are always influencing factors to each one of these photographic recordings. It is this usage of images that was most often paramount in the minds of those people within Paternoster whom were approached to be included in the series and research. A keen interest existed in whether I, as the photographer, would benefit in any financial way through the taking of their portraits. A few others were more interested in if the image would be used to misrepresent them, ‘report’ on them or used in a photojournalistic account of events and community in either a favourable or unfavourable way. There was presented a deep mistrust that played out in numerous ways within the community.

Key to the ongoing portrayal of people and places in a documentary style is the use of the camera as a tool; as Sontag (in Wells, 2003, p.60) points out that the “creation of images that would not have existed if we did not have the camera”. Morris (in Wells, 2003) shares this view, that "with the camera’s inception an imitation of life never before achieved was now possible" (p.68). Certainly, it is the device that enables the photographer, or any other person, to capture the world around one. This development of documenting life of others through the lens has advanced significantly since in 1905, when the sociologist Lewis Hine started using cameras and photography to express social
concerns through the documentation of the life of working people and the changing nature of work itself. Early in the development of documentary photography, “there was an assumption that the world was productive of facts and that these facts could be communicated to others in a transparent way, free of the complex codes through which narratives are structured” (Price in Wells, 2009, p.93). Wells (2009) goes on to state that documentary is one which casts its subjects often within a ‘social problem’ framework, and which in the past has often attempted to argue for politics of reform and from the 1930’s there seems to have been a significant increase in the public’s appetite for images drawn from real life as it were. Within the South African context, a group of photographers named ‘struggle photographers’ in the 1980’s, predominantly worked within the framework of using photography to both question apartheid and influence social reform and general opinion. Ultimately, “photography cannot be divorced from the political or social issues that surround us daily. As photographers we are intrinsically caught up in these processes…[and] how we choose to make our statements…but should attempt to convey the reality of things, with all its attendant complexity” (Krantz, 2008, p.293).

A movement established in the United Kingdom in 1937 and named the Mass Observation movement, started as community of anthropologists and other social scientists interested in using photographs and other means as a way to capture the day-to-day life of their subjects with an apparent impartial eye. This was an attempt “to look at ordinary life through objective eyes” (Wells, 2009, p.93). Wells (2009) goes on to state that the Mass Observation movement did not have a prescribed approach to approaching subjects, with some seeking cooperation, while most seem to be concerned with being unobserved and to work without the knowledge of the photographed (p.94). The move of photographing ‘suffering people’ or those ordinary people that had fallen on hard times was reinforced by the work of the FSA, which documented certain social groups and invited the viewer to simply accept these as honest images. While initially the intent was to bring awareness to social issues, interestingly today there “are many of the well-off willing, even eager, at least to look at images of the have-nots, so long as they are elegantly presented on museum walls” (Goldberg, 2003, p.177). Sontag (1977) also argues that photographing the ‘suffering object’, even in their daily lives, is presented in a way that attempts to provide an aesthetic gloss to the experienced anguish; intimating that in fact photography is not as objective as one thinks. While as a photographer we consider the closeness of subjects to the camera, the stances of the people being photographed, the final editing, selection, exclusion and processing of images. These aspects are all influenced by the subjective and personal narrative of the photographer.

During the 1970’s there appears to have been a fundamental shift, where photographic work became increasingly critical and the notion of acts of simply looking and recording could not be neutral…or innocent and these were described as rather as containing or expressing relations of power and control (Price, 2009, p. 106). Other influencing factors on photographic recording of life and place also were positioned as needing consideration, including the photographer’s gender and social class for instance, or perhaps even ‘difference’ from the subject being photographed. For
instance, if photographing a person deemed to be of a lower social class or standing, there exists the possibility of this influencing the subject’s stance and gaze; unless of course otherwise the photographer provides formal direction. Becker (2003) states that race, gender and age determine the return gaze of the subject (p. 360). The influence of these factors and of both power and control supports the notion that photography has became much more than a simple recording but also a means to the way the photographer expresses themselves, articulating their peculiarity and indeed their own differences. Morris (in Wells, 2003) states that while the camera may take the picture, it is the photographer who is the collaborator who in many instances guides and constructs a reality, for instance that reality that is most represented of Paternoster.

The influence of myself as the photographer on the subject chosen and the ultimate series depicted in the images were key in determining my approach which included key decisions around my technical approach, examination of reasons for the project, positioning of the project verbally to interested or involved parties. At times this required adaptation of the chosen approaches in order to gain access to people, conversations and situations that enabled the research to progress. Thought this process I found myself examining the possible influence that I, or others, were having on the final photograph. This required at times a certain amount of taking images that would not be included in the final project but that were printed and provided to the individuals.

A challenge throughout this project and previous photographic projects undertaken within Paternoster, was the importance of gaining some acceptance and approvals to gain access to events and situations in order that I could take photographs. Personally there were times where I was threatened verbally and physically. Where acceptance and inclusion were allowed this was most often superficial and appeared at times to be based purely on economics, as in having previously purchased goods and/ or services from people, or that the participants were hopeful that this would lead to financial contributions. There felt at times that there was always a level of superficiality of being ‘allowed in’.

Language, social class and gender also played a role in gaining ‘access’. People within Paternoster categorise people based on preconceived notions of difference and otherness. Being a woman for instance did not guarantee access to female-based groups. Without a doubt a key factor was to ensure that I obtained consent. Without this most often aggression and mistrust were the responses obtained. The issue of obtaining consent and what this actually entails is often debated within the documentary genre. Henderson (2003, p.283) purports that there is a contradiction between taking pictures and informed consent, especially in public spaces; and that consent needs to consider exploitation of individuals, rights to privacy, consent without coercion, consent to take and consent for the photograph to be used in a certain way. The dilemma for the photographer becomes without the image you have no recording and certainly nothing to publish. Hence, why as far back as the Mass Observation movement and thereafter so many photographers work in an unobserved pattern to ensure that images were obtained. In this
instance, work was conducted in a way that objectives were honestly explained, the reasons for
the images detailed and clear requests for cooperation and consent. There were a large number of
people that would engage in conversations within which notes could be documented, but
photography was out of the question. In these instances, and to sustain ongoing accessibility to
people within the community, their wishes were respected, even if these had been voiced with
contempt and aggression, or physically avoidance was exhibited.

In essence, the documentation of Paternoster was completed as series of, rather than individual
photographs, which were completed in a documentary style. Underlying photographic essays, or
series, are always the story of the photographers relationship to the subject matter, a practice, a
manner or way of building relationships and connections with the subjects, social spaces and an
ethos (Soske, undated). Specifically relevant to this ‘documentation’ of Paternoster, was also being
part of the same community, which while it provided unique insights it also presented insider/
outsider research challenges. ‘Documentary’, or the documentation of something, in itself is a
controversial term and in itself refers to a style of photography rather than a document itself
(Rosenblum, 2008). Documentary style essays continue to struggle with the same criticisms and
challenges as they have over the last century; they are still conceived as a way “to draw the
attention of an audience to particular subjects…to achieve this goal documentary photographs
were rarely seen as single, independent images” (Price, 2009, p.102); hence a series of
photographs are represented with or without detailed written text, as an exploration into a specific
subject or area, to most attempt to influence or gain an emotional response to what is being
documented. Sontag (in Wells, 2003) purports that “there is also the sense in which photography
takes the whole world as its subject…and converts them into images” (p.60).

Without doubt, photographs, and therefore photographers, exploit the ‘other’ or ‘otherness’, for
without the ‘other’ what would there be to explore. While certainly the rise of the ‘selfie’ is
significant in the recording of daily lives through the use of the self-portraiture, even this is an
attempt to portray one’s uniqueness, difference or ‘otherness’. These differences provide a sense
of being inside or outside a specific group. At no point was the photographer included directly in
the images themselves. An additional dimension of contemporary documentary style is the
recording in some way the ‘I’ instead of the ‘other’, through bringing in elements of the
photographer’s life rather than what it is not and representing in some way that the photographer
has actually been present, either through being included or another representative way
(Grundberg, 1999). This can be achieved through representing the community as opposed to
being the ‘star of the show’. For many photographers this role as ‘star’ has surpassed the project
goals and as such the photographed end up playing “assigned roles in a drama where the
photographer is the real star” (Goldberg, 2005, p. 181). Of utmost importance in this research, was
the influence of initially being a tourist, then being a ‘new’ insider who was still most often
perceived as an outsider and finally as a researcher-photographer who was able to investigate with
consent and without exploitation. This shift from tourist to researcher was undertaken over a
number of years culminating in the photographing of the community. This included moving from visiting, to owning a home in the community and ultimately to spending extensive time over 6 months exploring, researching and photographing.

**On Being an Insider and Outsider**

It is clear that to be considered an actual insider in Paternoster means that one has been born in the village and these people are labeled as a *boorling*. Anyone who has arrived in the community is considered an *inkomer*. Some of the *inkomers* who I met have lived in Paternoster for as long as fifty years, are married to a *boorling* and have children born in the village, yet they are still considered an *inkomer*. Other people, particularly wealthier and most often white residents are considered intruders and tourists. The defining line of when one becomes considered an *inkomer* versus a tourist, or at times an intruder, are unclear. However, what is apparent across all spectrums of the community is that all people are labelled or placed in a category. This can most often is in one of the previously mentioned groups, or may often in conversations be the terminology of *us and them*. This provides for interesting dilemma’s in what is a essentially a very small community. This set of biases not only influences peoples’ perceptions within the community, but even with international tourists and other labeled outside groups. As a researcher, ‘being part of’ came with its own set of challenges and for me personally played out in the documented dichotomy of insider/ outsider research, which was further underpinned by normal research challenges of qualitative rather than quantitative research. “Insider research [most often] refers to when researchers conduct research with populations of which they are also members (Buckle and Dwyer, 2009, p.55). According to Rose (1985), when using insider research it is harder to maintain neutrality and at best “there is only a greater or less awareness of one’s biases” specifically in relation to specific sub-cultures. This is supported by Maykut and Morehouse (1994, p.123 in Buckle and Dwyer, 2009, p.55) in that “the qualitative researcher’s perspective is perhaps a paradoxical one; it is acutely tuned-in to the experiences and meaning of others – to indwell – and at the same time to be aware of how one’s own biases and preconceptions may be influencing what one is trying to understand”. In this instance photographing and researching one’s own biases was paramount in being able to a more objective exploration of the complexities, and these biases were challenged repeatedly. Despite these challenges of insider research it is counter argued that similarly outsider research is also not closed off to the influences of researcher perspective and experience. While arguments for both approaches can be supported, it is not a simple duality, but regardless of which approach is used, each needs to reference another person or group and that through this “there is no self-understanding without other-understanding” (Buckle and Dwyer, 2009, p.60).

In attempting to gain an understanding of Paternoster there were other difficulties in relation to power dynamics, perceptions around privilege or being privileged, cross-cultural and cross social class dynamics, language barriers which played out in the ability to both gain access to
information, narratives and people. The research which exposed and explored the implicit and explicit categorisations and divides within this community played out in the responses received to both the research and myself as the researcher. Tensions from both the researched and the researcher, or the subject and the photographer, were at times considerable. At a personal level I identified with Yakushko’s (2011, p. 283) whose experiences around encountering unanticipated responses were at times difficult, personally threatening, and yet at the other extreme were genuinely open, honest and welcoming. However, as the research progressed there was implicit confirmation and support for the hypothesis that there are divides within this community, cracks as it were in the façade that is most often presented to the outside world.

These cracks in the facade are most often attributed to the economic and social divides. For instance the rationale for owning land or visiting Paternoster is often the tacit sense of well being that comes from holidays, long weekends and places to detract from the ongoing rituals of routine that prevail within daily life. It is without argument that economic means enable this type of luxury; however, within this realm of wealth is possible an opposing envy of the simpler life by the ‘seaside’. At the opposing end is the envy from the poorer part of the population who see wealthier people ‘taking over their village’. De Botton (2005) reviews status anxiety suggesting that one’s value is important in the eyes of the world and that a higher status seems to be one of the most valued or finest earthly goals with the perceptions that this brings with it resources, freedom, space, comfort, time and a sense that one is cared for. It is the ongoing balance and possibly fluctuation in these two elements, together with the notions of perceived status of people and the historic notion that “the poor owe their poverty to their own stupidity” (de Botton, 2005, p. 67), that plays out in this community. The have wants what the have-nots have in terms of a simpler coastal lifestyle; while the have-nots want access to the perceived wealth of the new tourist or inkomers.

Although, this is only one element influencing the community, in terms of this research and what was being attempted to be portrayed, it was important as the researched not to fall into the trap of the tourist gaze as a protective armour against exploring the realities of this community.

**Historical Narratives**

To build a deeper understanding of Paternoster, it’s people and the complexities that exist a qualitative review of both the documented and undocumented history was undertaken to be able to understand what to document and portray. The West Coast of South Africa, including Paternoster, has some of the richest archaeological sites in Southern Africa. Whilst the sandy shores were rarely occupied, rocky shores in general have provided far more archaeological evidence through shell middens, which clearly indicate early stone age inhabitants whom would have most probably been attracted by ease of access to water and edible resources such as fat yielding marine mammals, as well as ready access to terrestrial resources (Jerardino, 2003: 53). Jerardino (2003: 53) goes on to state that most of what is understood about human settlement along the coastline is in fact based on rocky shore settlement investigations and conclusions, which are similar to those,
found within Paternoster, and therefore one can assume a similar history. Its primary difference is that Paternoster has both sandy and rocky shores, both of which show the existence of middens, some of which have been analysed and excavated. However within the community, there is little acknowledgement of these middens and their locales. In fact there are often misrepresentations of these sites, including a recent thesis paper entitled Women and the Management of Household Food Security in Paternoster (Swartz, 2013), which documents the existence of a ‘hill’ used by local ‘fishermen’ as a meeting point located just in front of the Paternoster Hotel. However, this ‘hill’ is actually one of the larger un-excavated middens as stated in Jerardino (2003). Closer to the current Paternoster Fisheries, in an area called Kliprug, both shell and cultural debris has been found dating back to the 1st millennium AD (Smith and Mutti, 2013: 71), which is indicative of a long period of seashore existence and habitation albeit at times nomadic and sporadic. This is supported by “successive studies [which] have indicated intensive shellfish collecting over the past 3000 years. A megamidden exists at the Eerstemosselbank (Figure 1 below refers), the first point north of the village…[where] several human skeletons have also been uncovered” (Smith and Mutti, 2013: 77).

![Figure 1: Map of Paternoster (Swartz, 2013, p.46)](image)

Often the burials of West Coast dwellers were found in these sandy, open locales and sometimes without grave or burial items (Pfeiffer, 2013:144). The discovery of skeletons continues and while this paper was being researched, a shallow grave was uncovered by children on what is a well-known site within the centre of the village. As previously stated, when findings like this are made there appears to be little acknowledgement within the community of the history or significance of these findings, or indeed of these ‘sandy hills’.

For instance, the midden where this skeleton was uncovered sits high above the high water mark, yet a family group within the community believed that this was the skeleton of a family relative
whom had gone missing less than two years prior and had washed up at this point, which would be near impossible given the distance from the high water mark. These aspects of memory gaps indicate that the social consciousness and subsequent narratives stretch back a limited time and have been ‘transformed’ through storytelling and personal recollection. Sadly, on returning to the site a few days later all that was left was disturbed sand, an empty crate and some rubble being walked over by dogs and their owners.

From the 1st millennium AD evidence indicates that there has been habitation along the West Coast. Evidence during the last 1000 years, it would appear that the KhoiKhoi predominantly occupied the land. There is little documentation or imagery of this period, with the history most often concluded from archaeological investigations or writings. This nomadic people are omitted from the historic discussions around Paternoster, with a preference for the far more romanticised stories of Portuguese explorers arriving in the 15th Century and staying on in the area. This is apparently also the story of how Paternoster’s name originated, which was from the same ‘fishermen’ saying the Our Father (Paternoster) as they landed or were swept to shore. Another lesser-known story around the name of Paternoster is that it could have potentially come from the names of the beads that the Khoi wore that were called Paternosters. This introduction to people from far of places must have certainly influenced the community that might have dwelt here at the time; however, the history and usage of the land has a far richer history.

From the 16th century, Western settlers started to move further up the West Coast, bringing with them new social, economic, agricultural and other cultural influences, but also epidemics such as small pox. These aspects significantly changed the lives of the KhoiKhoi, which appears to have included altering from being a self sufficient community or groups of people, to being hired for labour by Dutch settler farmers, or when not an option, being forced to move much further north to maintain their former life (Smith, 1993: 16). The primary imagery that exists of the life during the 1600’s to the 1700’s the KhoiKhoi, or their predecessors, is predominantly a Westernised interpretative view, most often delivered as sketches or written text that supported the dominant perceptions of the time and people.

The life of the KhoiKhoi continued to be impacted by rules and regulations such as the introduction of the “enclosure movement, which rapidly curtailed the scope for wandering in parts of the colony by creating enclosed places of whole farms” (Van Sittert, 2002:114); who goes on to state that the law stated that any claim to enclosing of land or ownership thereof required a level of social recognition and any claims to do this by African people was considered suspicious and required consent by the then Head of State. This advancing restriction of rights to move about or across land freely further, fundamentally changed access to land, land rights and to a continued lifestyle for the native people of the West Coast. The timing of this coincided with significant changes in Paternoster, as well as the ownership of lands both here and up the coastline, of business, fishing rights and of course access to wealth. This seems to coincide with when the history of Paternoster
starts to rely on the narratives of local residents, talking to the deep perceptions of land ownership and subsequent land claims that have taken place – a history that in the minds of most stretches back only about 100 to 150 years in time.

“By the 1880’s, the days of the individual merchant farmer capitalists were numbered as the Stephan brothers monopolized the west coast trade, buying up the main grain shipping points” (Jerardino, Malan and Braun, 2013: 132), which included people paying loans or goods with land when they fell on hard times. This meant that the Stephan Brothers accumulated lands across the area known commonly as the West Coast, enabling them to establishing key locations such as ‘Laaiplek’ (Loading Place) at the mouth of the Berg River, as well as providing them with capital to invest in fishing, transport and processing industries supported by the deployment of offshore fishing vessels, railways and canneries (Van Sittert 2001: 197). Ultimately these arrangements led to the formation of agreements with the State, which established the Exclusive Trek Seine Fishing Zones. This positioned the Stephan Brothers as a dominant force in the new manufacturing and other industries. Community divisions started to appear and progressively grew between resource owners, such as the Stephan Brothers, and local fisherman (Jerardino, Malan and Braun, 2013: 132). From the First World War onwards there was a crayfish-canning boom in the Cape that moved up the West Coast as demand grew. As far back as this period during the 1920’s, crayfish fishing was often over-exploited leaving factories of the time closing and leaving the fishermen vulnerable to the financial depression of the 1930’s (Griffiths et al., 2004 as quoted in Jerardino, Malan and Braun, 2013: 133). This challenges one of the current narratives that the fishing industry has only being affected significantly in, during and post-apartheid times. There is a misnomer that the quota system was only introduced during this period, implemented and revised, and further entrenched through the introduction of the Community Trusts concept (Hasler, undated). However, the quote system, which limits the number of crayfish able to be caught in day per bat or fisherman, was in fact introduced much earlier in the 20th Century. However, the economic environment during post apartheid times has certainly seen a steady decline in fishing and cannery factories on the West Coast resulting in increased unemployment in Paternoster which in turn has directly affected the community’s development and complex matrix of opportunities or missed opportunities.

Similarly, there are other questions around where the first settlers or the ancestors of the 20th century fishing community within Paternoster appeared. There is also a gap in knowledge of the Cape Town/ Saldahna fishing groups in the 18th century (slaves, freeblacks, free burghers) and the development of the crayfish factories on the West Coast (Jerardino, Malan and Braun, 2013: 136). Within this realm there are stories told by the local Paternoster community of people moving down the coast from what is known as Groot Paternoster (on the other side of the bay) to Klein Paternoster (the current Paternoster village) primarily for the purpose of moving their herds to different grazing grounds. Other stories tell of a variety of European nationalities staying in the village, while the ships were in the Saldahna Bay area, which has led to a distinct mixed ethnicity.
Interestingly one hears the same surnames repeatedly and one can assume that these people are predominantly ‘boorlinge’ (meaning having been born here). These surnames include names such as those of the Brutus, Coraizin and Pharo families. This seems to further indicate an insular community, which have stood together, often having a communal perception of wealthy capitalist factory, landowners, tourists and ‘inkomers’ (meaning a new comer). Essentially, Paternoster remains a small village with a population of around 2000 people. In fact the population has only grown by approximately 3,08% from the 2001 to the 2011 census, with actual numbers of people increasing from 1454 in 2001 to 1970 in 2011 (Retrieved from: http://www.citypopulation.de/php/southafrica-westerncape.php?cityid=163003001). The population remains pre-dominantly “coloured” (to use historic South African terms) at 84% of the population; “white” people account for 8% and “black” people 9% of the population respectively (Saldanha Bay Spatial Development Framework: 70).

Progressively ‘white’ people have moved into the area, initially owning crayfish plants as previously stated, often securing through political connections export quotas (Hesler, undated). These fisheries, or crayfish factories, used local fishermen to provide stock while often the fishermen’s wives working in the factories themselves. Overall there was a heavy reliance on these factories and businesses for livelihood and employment. During the 1930’s to 1950’s there were often tensions between owners and non-owners for control or access to marine resources. As the quota system reduced from 8 to 10 months in the 1960’s, to 3 to 4 months in the 1980’s (Hesler, undated), a period of time that still exists. This placed increasing pressure on these businesses to remain open and to provide consistent employment for the community a model that was not sustainable. In an attempt to curb unemployment and to bring about a level of redistribution of quota’s within these communities, “community trusts” were established during the 1990’s, which in themselves failed the same communities they were trying to assist. Certainly within insular Paternoster, these were viewed with suspicion with quota’s being reallocated to people and businesses that have never had a presence within the local community. Further, these initiatives were viewed as not having involved the local community and its members seemingly pushed top-down through the political parties of the day. There have been other developments and initiatives to the trusts, including the building of the Paternoster Fish Market positioned as being a place to build economic empowerment for the local fishermen and their families. This was viewed with similar suspicion, and apart from the locally owned On the Rocks fish and chips shop, hawkers from outside Paternoster only use it on weekends as a craft market.

The village’s economy “was historically driven by the pelagic fishing and crayfish industries…[where] fishing resources have largely collapsed with the processing factories operating at a fraction of their capacity. The dwindling growth and shrinkage in the fishing industries over the last 10 years has largely been offset by the increase in growth by tourism” (Saldanha Bay Spatial Development Framework: 259). While marine resources continue to be state owned, and the rights or quotas thereof managed officially by the state, the Paternoster
community at times illegally fishes crayfish exploiting this resource based on the argument that they own the rights due to ancestry. The typically hand gestures used to indicate ‘kreef’ for sale face the tourist along the main road from stop street to hotel. It seems that there is little respect for the legality of the community and an attitude of ‘we will do what we want to as we were here first’ interspersed with the social and economic realities of a shortened fishing period and a hand-to-mouth existence but it also points to an underlying social ill of not living within the law that is passed down across the generations. Similarly, the tensions that existed in the 1930’s to 1950’s around access and control of marine resources continue unabated and could be a contributing factor to the increasing complexities and covert tensions that exist today. The decline in the fishing industry, in particular with the closing of fishing or canning factories, coincided with growth in tourism to the West Coast and more specifically to Paternoster. This in turn has provided significant employment opportunities.

Also, “the fact that fishing industrialised relatively late, and in many cases not at all has made fishermen a visible and seemingly endured symbol of a bygone age when people interacted directly with nature free from the structures of capitalist work ethic in a perpetual struggle for survival. The fishermen...is envied this communion and supposed freedom accorded to him by his work, the rewards of which deemed all the richer for being hard won” von Sittert (1992, p. vii).

Gates (2001) goes on to state that local tourism and most often the coffee table book photographers are kept in business to a large extent by ongoing portrayals of the rugged fishermen and their colourful, yet often dilapidated, boats. The harsh realities of this lifestyle are often overlooked. It is highly unregulated in terms of safety devices being taken out on the boats, the seas are rough, the quota’s are slim as are the profits and alcohol and drug abuse is high, especially within the season when fishing does not take place. This is supported by the research of Swartz (2013) in which she found that with increases in unemployment… there has been an increase in alcohol abuse in Paternoster and the previously mentioned midden, or ‘hill’, is termed by the unaware locals as Die Wynduin (The Wine Dune). In the view’s presented to the tourist, the realities are hidden behind a façade where each person plays their predetermined role. Certainly, this romanticised departure from reality is underpinned by images of small boats (‘bakkies’) painted in bright colours, and together with the fishermen departing early in the morning and the boats lying empty on the beaches in the afternoons, tourists crowd the boats and fishermen either to purchase from the day’s catch, but predominantly to take photographs.

The village has three distinct main areas namely Vaalplaas, Kliprug and Hopland (The name Hopland is derived from the Afrikaans acronym for Herkonstruksie en Ontwikkelings Program (HOP) or Reconstruction and Development Programme in English), with other areas being renamed as part of private developments. “Kliprug is the place from which the weather and sea conditions are assessed, from which people watch for returning boats” (Paternoster Group Areas Hearing: A Technical Evaluation of the Issues), but is also the area that is historically, functionally and environmentally the centre of the community. In this same document, the community is
referenced as being over 100 years old, but that it is historically a coloured fishing village where the ‘white’ presence has always being limited. Interestingly the conclusions captured in this document were that groups not be segregated or relocated within the village, in a community that had traditionally lived harmoniously side-by-side regardless of colour classifications (p.9). The term ‘coloured’, or even ‘white for that matter, have to be questioned in terms as viable categories of identity and is purely an academic exercise from apartheid times (Gates, 2001, p. 85). Certainly the term ‘coloured’ raises more questions. Simply being categorised on the basis of racial groupings or of a shared history, which provides a shared sense of identification with a common past, runs deep within the Paternoster community. Under apartheid segregation was rarely formally implemented and there was a simplistic segregation primarily of political, economic and social resources. Of particular interest is that in Paternoster there was little formal segregation geographically within the community, most often with different races living side by side within areas of the village. While the official story is that there was a difference in ownership or access to resources, an alternate narrative is one where in the background of very little official segregation, there were opportunities available to all members of the community that were willing to take them.

Swartz (2013) documents that the “relationship was between the original settlers, Mr. Awie Coraizin and his family, and the registered owners of the land, possibly Mr. C. J. Walters. The formal ownership and other tenurial relationships that might have existed on the portion of land that came to be known as Vaalplaas when the Coraizins first settled on this land are not recorded. Vaalplaas is not referred to directly within the deeds register, but historically formed part of a much larger property that was named ‘Uitkomst’, portions of which were divided off and transferred to a number of different owners. The deeds for the portion of the farm Uitkomst which appear to correlate with the boundaries of Vaalplaas as it was known to the families who lived there indicate that the farm was granted to a Mr. C. J. Walters in 1878 under the Colonial Crown Land Disposal Act. He subsequently transferred the Vaalplaas land to a Mr. David Marthinus Pharo in 1928, from whom it passed to Mr. Gert Pharo in 1929…there is no evidence that Walters ever actually occupied, used or lived on the land or any part of it” (p.50). Contributing to the land claims issue around Vaalplaas was that a part of the Pharo family reclassified themselves under Apartheid, from ‘coloured’ to ‘white’ racial grouping. It was perceived in the community with negativity and it seems to this day that this plays to a large extent a key role in the divisions within the community. The “contradictions in our nation of what constitutes apartheid histories and these reflect the stark reality of a system of racial, class and gendered oppression along the West Coast of this country” (Vaalplaas Community Claim Document: p.5), continue to influence the complexities within communities to this day; including complex issues such as land claims that are based on narrative histories. As part of the land claim, thirty four households applied for restitution of their rights to portions of land in the Paternoster village – referred to as Vaalplaas – which they felt had been taken from them. Within the document they state that this mirrors the experiences of many indigenous coastal dwellers in SA who gradually alienated from their direct access to the sea and
land; and while it is not the purpose of this paper to provide a detailed analysis about this specific
land claim, it provides important insights into additional reasons for the underlying frictions that
exist.

Swartz (2013) also provides a clue to further fissions within the community, namely that the influx
of wealthier holidaymakers is making more ‘local’ residents feel marginalised. This provides a
possible alternate narrative that while certainly would create a different feeling to the village,
simultaneously it has also bought much needed work and economic growth into a community
that was reliant only a slowly declining fishing industry. This rise in tourism positively coincided
with a community that was otherwise in overall decline.

The Tourist Gaze

Wells (2003) states that “travel folders still insist on a photographic utopia of endless, deserted,
unpolluted, beaches…but the sea, rippled by the breeze, and the soft white sand are both obvious
and real, as is the protective shade of the palm trees that have sprung up at the proper distance so
that we can stretch our hammock and relax…if some inhabitant of paradise appears, he/she is
being photographed to show that the natives are obliging and of an innocent and exotic beauty”
(p.311). The concept of a seaside holiday and its attributes are invented Victorian traditions, when
initially ‘taking the waters’, as it were, was a medical recommendation for curing ‘ills’ and put a
scientific veneer on popular sea-bathing customs (Walton, 2011, p.2) and that the medical
profession started exploiting the benefits of the sun and therefore by implication sun-tanning
(Braggs & Harris, 2006). Further, it originates from a “rapidly-expanding working-class holiday
market” (Walton, 2011, p.1), which entrenched the concept of the holidays and certainly the
seaside holiday in England with this spreading to Europe in the 1920’s, specifically to the coastal
regions of the Mediterranean. Also according to Braggs and Harris (2006), in the Edwardian age
seaside holidays were a privilege of a few, but by the end of the 1930’s around 15 million people in
England were going away to the coast for a week or two. As a concept, this ‘luxury’ has spread
exponentially with barriers to accessibility diminished. However, within South Africa, holidays
continue to the luxury of few, despite the increasing options of journeying and access to cheaper
forms of travel.

Certainly summer days filled with sun and sea are often represented as the memories of holidays,
which locally have the connotation of being a luxury of the few. For people whom may not have
had the luxury of these experiences, these tangible elements that make up a summer holiday may
just be a picture created through stories told by others or by the media, often supported by
photographic evidence. Holidays and destinations are sold primarily through photographs and “the
photograph is not only perceived, received, it is read, connected more or less consciously by the
public that consumes it” (1977, Barthes, p.19) and imagines something else outside the frame. In
essence tourism creates its own culture for consumption enhanced by the tradition of the souvenir
and the postcard. For after all “photographs are evidence” (Kuhn, 2003, p. 395). It is precisely this picture postcard view that continues to provide evidence to a superficial Paternoster narrative. Certainly “the quaint localised West Coast communities associated with the tourist guide books are popular distortions in that they ignore the existence of political and economic scale” (Hasler, undated, p.12). Morris (in Wells, 2003) says, “in my role as a gullible tourist, I had been the true witness of a false event…but we continue to see what we will rather than what is there” (p.68).

Without doubt, photographs exploit the ‘other’ and the photographing of the ‘other’ and the social context of this ‘other’. “The dominant photographic language of the tourist brochure has affected how tourists construct their own photographs” (Ramamurthy in Wells, 2009, p.242), which as previously stated continues unabated in Paternoster with repeated images of fishermen, their boats, their catches and the beaches; all representing Paternoster in the same idyllic romanticised manner. Sontag (in Wells, 2003, p. 62) goes on to state that photography “allows you to bring back some of the world with you, enabling one to transform it and to miniaturise it” – in essence a aide memoire, with photographs providing information that is packaged and presented in such a superficial reality way that words can’t achieve. This is further reinforced by the snapshot trend and continues to create a constructed and commoditised experience of travel (Ramamurthy in Wells, 2009). Typically, what attempted is to photograph that which is different and perceived to be out of the ordinary, but most often tourists use a vocabulary that is embedded in power relations as has been represented to them via the media.

In an interview that appeared in an article on IOL News website, “Clinton Coraizin states that the fishing community was being threatened by developers of expensive properties aimed at recent, wealthy white migrants, who were changing the character of the village” (Mtyala, 2011). The interviewee clearly refers to race (white migrants) to explain the current challenges and as a reference to economic status (wealthy). The article further goes on to state that little progress seems to have been made in the way of progress with local people still being at the bottom of the ladder when it comes to development. Willem Jason is quoted in the article as saying that “the whites here want to disown us from our birth right – they’re trying to restrict our access to the beach” (Mtyala, 2011). Swartz (2013) goes on to state that the influx of wealthier holidaymakers is stated as making more ‘local’ residents feel marginalised; however, one can argue that tourism and land ownership has bought much needed work and economic growth to a community that was reliant on a declining fishing industry. At the same time this hints at some of the underlying tone and tensions between tourist, inkomer and boorling; as well as at the emotions and tensions resulting from within a divided community that centre around economic status, ownership, entitlement, displacement, trust, or rather mistrust, and unspoken conflict.

The exploitation perception that exists extends as far as people feeling displaced from their homes despite them having sold their homes for increased income and taking advantage of the wealthier influx. These homes are often replaced with free RDP houses in Hopland. This personal
empowerment and use of opportunity is often misconstrued as exploitation despite personal gain. Mistrust extends itself further into how people interact on a daily basis around respect for personal space and possessions. The continued perceived decline in the economic status of a few people provides a breeding ground for contempt, alcohol and drug abuse, a ‘we don’t live within the law’ attitude that has pervaded into child-crime typically targeting tourists and migrants. The parents of these children in this insular community deem it as not their responsibility to discipline their children and go to extremes to hide them. In the end this talks to the complex matrix of opportunities missed and gained, and to a community that seemingly becomes more marginalised, disorientated and fragmented that may influence the tourism industry.

The exploration through photography also challenged other narratives. One such narrative is that which exists around the current architectural trends of white washed fisherman houses – a key selling point in tourist documentation - this “unsubstantiated information about the heritage significance of regional and/ or vernacular architecture as a characteristic of a West Coast identity…was largely due to an absence of comprehensive regional studies” (Jerardino, Malan and Braun, 2013: 133). They go on to state that this misconception includes the narratives around the so-called “traditional” and often photographed whitewashed fisherman’s cottages that dot the shoreline. In the thesis entitled Women and the Management of Household Food Security in Paternoster (Swartz, 2013) states the false assumption that the typically white washed houses of Kliprug bought by wealthy holidaymakers are of a traditional architecture. The adaption to whitewashed houses is a fairly recent development. While this architecture has recently become the dominant architecture, prior to this there were most often impermanent structures, the round or oval matjeshuis and the rectangular A-frame style houses. Over time hamlets were created along the shoreline, one of these hamlets being Paternoster and the current, or stated traditional architecture, of stone, concrete and wood-iron built houses that were mostly associated with tenant fishing communities. In the 20th century, similar style houses were subsidised, or provided for, by the fishing companies for their employees. Some of these houses still stand in an area of Paternoster known as Kliprug and have been repeatedly used to guide the heritage building guidelines of the village by the current council. It is these ‘traditional’ houses that start to reflect the social history of the village but once again brings into question the concept that the history of the village only stretches back 100 to 150 years, is selective and has been transformed through personal embellishment.

**Conclusion**

While tourists continue to flock to Paternoster and drive the main roads that connect Vredenburg to the luxury beachfront houses yet most people never venture along the roads that are literally one road back – if they did the history, culture and community differs vastly and provides a contrasting picture to that most often experienced. This richness of culture and history, of narratives and stories, weaves a picture that contrasts to the one that most try to project and protect. What lies...
beneath the surface of this perfect tourist picture postcard façade is in fact a multifaceted complex historically developed community.

Berger (1985) argues that society provides the script for all those that live within it, so that our reality is socially constructed; and that in this script we all play our roles (p. 124). Further, “a role…may be defined as a typified response to a typified expectation” (Berger, 1985, p.112). So, while the ‘other’ exists – the tourist, the migrant, the inkomer and the boorling, these people are dependent on each other for mutual opportunities and benefit. Further, what becomes apparent is the symbiosis and interdependence that exists within the community. The benefits and opportunities from this symbiosis could be positive elements, yet they are often overlooked and not weaved into the central narratives. “Deconstructive inquiry aims to relocate meanings from the rigidity of the binary opposition and to search out surplus meanings that might give rise to new forms of living” (Winslock and Mark, 2008, p.1). In the same way, deconstruction through documentary style photography provides alternatives to the predominant narrative or narratives that exist, giving opportunity for opening new possibilities, an opening for previous marginalised stories to be entered into and provides a critical operation “in which taken-for-granted notions are questioned or disrupted” (Davies, 1993).

In Paternoster, people often play the roles that are expected of them, for instance during the tourist season, which in turn goes on to perpetuate the ‘quaint romantic’ view of Paternoster. Crayfish hawkers line the main road, children make shell decorations which they sell to passing tourists, art galleries selling pictures that continue to portray Paternoster in the traditional narrative, entrepreneurs opening businesses, fishermen negotiating sales at their boats as they come in from the sea, kayaking tours and restaurants. This conglomerate of people, activities and styles is precisely what makes Paternoster rich yet so complex. However, these are the exact elements that are also misinterpreted creating narratives that are less than adequate and which continue to exclude and include people on the basis of preconceived ideas.
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Annexure A: Interview List

People who consented to being photographed, although not all these images are included in the photographic body of work:

1. Ellen and Ria – Community employed Beach Cleaners
2. Darkie – Fisherman next to his boat in the water. Only caught 8 snoek that day (dd: 120613)
3. Heinrich and Vaughn – owners of a fish processing and drying plant
4. A policeman from Vredenburg – off duty
5. William – from the Karoo but has lived in Paternoster for 24 years – on the beach assisting fisherman, but unemployed
6. Hope – a little girl playing with friends
7. Ricardo – a teenage boy
8. Poppie and Monique – in front of general store. Poppie’s mom owns the shop. Poppie 42 years, her mom 62 years. Went to the junior school in Paternoster
9. Peter – artist from Paternoster but couldn’t work here so now is an artist. Lives in Veldrif with his wife
10. Tiana, Ronel and Chriszan - Sea shell sellers
11. Peter Samuels– Paternoster Rugby Club
12. Market Sellers
13. On the Rocks restaurant workers

Interview Notes:

1. Ruby Coraizin (nee Sampson) – Church (67 years)
   - Born in Paternoster
   - Originally lived in Blikkie but told to move by Fisheries
   - Then moved to another house on the cliff face and told to move again
   - Now live at the back of Kliprug
- Went to school at St Augustine’s in Paternoster – at that stage was part of the church. But school ended at Std 5 and if you wanted to go to high school the closest was Malmesbury

- 2 brothers (Paul and Gerald) and sister (Evelyn)

- Son – works at Paternoster Fisheries, Daughter Nurse (Tygerberg), Daughter Manager at Portnet and lives in Vredenburg, Son is a Swaeiver

- All children married, 7 grand daughters, 1 great grand son

- Ruby worked – at Paternoster Fisheries, Pharo Fisheries (which has closed) Post Office (23 years) as Asst Postal Helper

- Ruby husband – 40 years truck driver for Fisheries, used to drive the kids to school

- Beurwag - aande patrols

- Lot of women worked at Stompneus Cannery in St Helena bay but closed down – now work in the restaurants, guest house etc. for tourists. Seabreeze for instance provides work to other women in the community as well as themselves. Provides income for the families

2. **Tannie Sheila – Surname Bailey**

   Nothing really to tell, she was from outside (incomer). Most of the people that she knew in the community have died. She said that most women worked in St Helena, but now work in the restuarants, guesthouses, etc. in the community. She has lived here for 53 years.

3. **Oom Francisco (72 years) and Joyce Pharo**

   - Joyce is an inkomer (although she has lived in Paternoster for 50 years) originally from Laaiplek

   - Francisco from Paternoster – born here, went to school here – he is considered a Boorling

   - Worked in the Fisheries, before that the shop at the hotel

   - Pharo’s – coloured and white – but never saw the difference. The ‘white’ Pharo’s had money from building and were worried about losing it in the apartheid era so reclassified to white

   - All daughters work in Paternoster- On the Rocks take away, hotel, guest houses
- One never becomes a person from paternoster always an Inkomer
- Oom Fransco is sick with cancer and has had 2 operations
- Wife had cataracts removed
- House given to them by the Fisheries, he worked with them 25 yeras
- Wife worked in Fisheries also
- Original families from Paternoster – Dawie Walters, Pharo’s, Colonel Stephanus, Stephans Brothers
- Mnr Miller (?) owned the winkel – then Mnr Hartley
- Community Centre- Mr Tolleman/ Soloman
- Original white people – Walters, Millers

4. Oom Pat Pharo

- Problems with eyesight and hearing
- Sent me to Oom Francisco
- Was instrumental in getting houses from fisheries to be donated to employees

Daughter is Sharen Pharo (Sea Breeze) – married to a Bailey. Lived here all her life went to school in Paternoster and then Vredenburg. She knows about the other Pharo’s ‘buying out’ or into white classification. But it was the current children’s grandparents. So even for them it was not very real. The grandparents and parents used to play together, but current age group and great gran children live in different places so do not always play together or interact.

Vaalplaas the original area is where the Pharo’s (white) currently live.

Laundry started about 3 years ago. Starting a cleaning business. Approached various people from the rental companies but they were not interested. Eventually got in with Paternoster Rentals and have managed to build a business. Started when husband was out of work. Now have regular work – less in winter. 4 people work for Sherene in the Laundry and 3 people in the cleaning business.
Her dad (Oom Pat) had driven for them to keep Kliprug when they wanted to move them off the land down near Mosselbank. Fisheries wanted to use it for building tourist houses/holiday homes

5. **Naomi Cloete – Leader of Fisherman Association**

- Used to work at St Helena Bay Stompneus factory
- Everyone retrenched
- For 13 years has been the leader of the fisherman association
- 3 sons (Ryno) and 1 daughter
- Husband worked for Sea Harvest on the ships, originally from Namqualand
- Naomi born in Paternoster
- Meeting with Govt this afternoon (13 June)
- Weslander got article wrong a few weeks ago – check out article with Pieter van Dalen (DA Cape Town)
- Near shore fishing versus off shore fishing. Most of the research conducted has been for off shore and based on this conclusions made about the rest of the fishing near shore. Government say based on this that the fish are ‘uitgepit’
- Quota – 100kg per year, but govt. let 167 kg for past 2 years. For Snoek 60 fish per day

6. **Christa Tuilig (nee Kelders) – Voorsitter of Pato Neighbourhood watch**

- 7 vrouens/ 5 mans who are part of the neighbourhood watch. In June/July 2012 crime was really bad. IN 15 September 2012 the group was started.
- Work in shifts 9 – 1am and from 1am to 6am
- Office at hotel
- Mixed group of people from the community – Alvin, Naomi, Sanet, Tom, etc.
- Have managed to put 1 guy back into juvenile and another also
- Struggled to catch them
- They used the young kids to climb in – climbed through roofs, windows, used hooks etc.

- T & J Foot patrols make our life harder as they only work Friday and Saturday, sleep on the job scared of the kids etc.

- Lived in Paternoster whole life. Worked as a bediende at the Walters house

7. Francois Visser

- Moved her after spending 30 years overseas. Been here since 1999. Grew up in Leipoldtville – father was a teacher/ pastor – well respected in the community.

- Outa (male)/ lata (female), Sapper/ smutter (in time of Gen Smuts voted for other party

- Surnames Faro and Pharo – not sure when the split of the name happened, Faro means ‘light house’ in Portuguese

8. Andre Pharo

- Born in Paternoster – father and grandfather also born here

- Groot Paternoster and the rest started by Carol Stephens from Germany – owned the whaling rights and station in Langebaan. Built hotel and would bring Italians/ Germans/ Swedish from the ships to stay at hotel. Eventually owned most the west coast as would take land for payment when people couldn’t pay for things

- Vlaeplaas where they live, used to build crayfish boats (wood then fiberglass)

- Kraaifontein – Walters

- Kliprug – Fisheries

- Where the current market is there used to be a factory

- Group areas act – people had to choose areas – coloureds moved to Kliprug

- Landclaims was on Vaalplaas – but the house had never belonged to them

- Groot Paternoster across the bay – where crayfish are caught. Stephan’s owned most of Groot Paternoster. Father used to go there by donkey cart to take crayfish or boats. Sleep over.
- Used to take boats out of the water in winter and take over to St Helena bay. Might catch snoek out there

- Oep ve Koep was where Mid West Fishing started – owners Pharo’s, Walters, Piet Needling, Goetjie Bester and others. Now a large fishing company

- ‘Mooitjies’ – snoek cut in a certain way cured with salt and bay leaves. Put into cans/ soldered and then sent up country. Rinse in water and the salt off, which had turned meat pink

- Quota for crayfish has been around for a long time

- Originally no water in the village so would use brak water from village reservoir and collect rainwater. Every week people would go on trucks to Vaswaterbaai near Trekoskraal where the sea is filtered through the sand. There people would dig for water and wash their clothes there bringing them back to Paternoster to hang on the lines to dry.

- Fishermen were loyal. Vaughn’s (Heny) father (Jakob) worked as a foreman for the Pharo’s – Andre’s father and him worked closely together and had a bond. Vaughn is now an ‘outsider’ in the community as he has ‘made it’. Often the community does not like people to be successful or at least above others.

- Look up artists – Stephan and Iris Umperberg

- Ruins near Ruth and Andrew are where the people settled (Andre Coraizin) who laid the land claim

- Paternoster is a unique community. People have lived side by side all these years and in close proximity even during apartheid. We didn’t even think of colour until it was legislated. With the new additional RDP houses that are being built – what is the point and who are they for? Where will they work? There are some black people that live in Hopland but if more come they will unbalance and change the fragile nature of the community.

- The fisherman will not do other work – see it beneath them. They are fisherman through and through and it is a hand to mouth existence. They do not sell the crayfish they have people that do that for them either on consignment or otherwise. The women realised that this was not enough so they went to work in the factories and then in the guest houses/ restaurants/ etc.