A Completion of Memory? Commemorating a decade of freedom in South Africa: 1994-2004.

Michelle Burns
(Curtin University)

Abstract: *South Africa celebrated its tenth anniversary as a democratic nation in 2004, marking a decade of freedom since the final dismantling of apartheid rule. Commonly referred to as the 'new' South Africa, this decade has seen the country engage in a radical process of transformation, a contested search for a new national identity and new models of identification for a culturally diverse society. The 1994 inauguration of Nelson Mandela as State President heralded the official beginning of this new order, and marked the beginning of a search for new commemorative projects to represent the new national ideals of freedom, unity in diversity, and reconciliation. This search inevitably looked back to South Africa's turbulent past as a source from which to derive meaning and base the new nation's identity. Memory has been selectively invoked through new commemorations and memorial projects to create a revisionist history and reinforce a sense of a shared national identity. This article focuses on a number of South Africa's official monuments and memorials that have appeared during the last decade, as concerted attempts to redress the bias of the past regime's monuments and memorials. I will explore the ways in which these memorials are being used to reconstruct South Africa, both successfully and problematically. In particular, these memorials reveal that the relatively recent struggle for the liberation from apartheid has become the foundation myth for the new South Africa.*

South Africa celebrated its tenth anniversary as a democratic nation in 2004, marking a decade of freedom since the final dismantling of apartheid rule. Commonly referred to as the 'new' South Africa, this decade has seen the country engage in a radical process of transformation, a contested search for a new national identity and new models of identification for a culturally-diverse population, all of whom call South Africa home. Within this process, the nation has sought to redefine its culture and heritage principles, amidst debates over what should be included and excluded, pointing to the central role of memory in the nation-building project. The subjective, creative, and constructed nature of cultural memory has allowed South Africa to use its problematic and contested past to reconstruct its identity symbolically, and in the process attempt to manage social conflict and create unity. In particular, there has been strong top-down

support for the construction of new monuments and memorials, aimed at promoting the new national ideals of unity in diversity and reconciliation, representing those that were previously silenced and marginalised under the old regime, and offering spaces for healing within a society that has and is dealing with legacies of trauma and guilt.

This article focuses on a number of South Africa's official monuments and memorials that have appeared during the last decade, as concerted attempts to redress 'the biased landscape of memory'.[1] I will explore the ways in which these memorials are being used to re-construct South Africa, both successfully and problematically. As Annie Coombes notes, the complex layering of histories of colonialism, totalitarianism, and organised resistance movements has left a legacy of multiple identities all linked to different memories of the past and all vying for a stake in the reconstruction of the new South Africa.[2] Often, the government's constructed ideal of a Rainbow Nation that includes all, is not entirely evident within the memorial process. Furthermore, Sabine Marschall argues that the most significant aspect of a new nation's process of creating a new group identity is the forging of a compelling foundation myth which involves the selective remembering and invention of usable pasts in order to define the beginning of the new order.[3] Although the term 'myth' suggests the distant past, in practice foundation myths can be chosen from very recent historical events and often focus on struggle or liberation narratives. As this article will demonstrate the relatively recent struggle for the liberation from apartheid has become the foundation myth for the new South Africa.

A New Beginning

Paul Connerton argues that when a social group or society makes a concerted effort to begin with a whole new start, they choose to base their beginning on arbitrary recollections of the past. He cites the example of the historic rupture of the French Revolution which has provided us with the myth of a historic

beginning, but has also positioned recollection at the centre of all apparent new beginnings.[4] For Connerton, selected images and recollected knowledge of the past are conveyed and sustained by ritual performance in order to signal a break from the old order. Such commemorative rituals confirm the ideals and values of the new order through a process that rejects the old ideals while recalling them at the same time: 'To construct a barrier between the new beginning and the old tyranny is to recollect the old tyranny'.[5] The 1994 inauguration of Nelson Mandela as State President heralded the official beginning of South Africa's new order, and marked the beginning of a search for new commemorative projects to represent the new national ideals of freedom, unity in diversity, and reconciliation. This search inevitably looked back to South Africa's turbulent past as a source from which to derive meaning and base the new nation's identity.

South Africa's commemorations do not simply remind citizens but re-present them with knowledge of the past that aids in the healing process, seeks to create a sense of unity in a once-divided society, and allows South Africans to re-imagine themselves as a nation.[6] This happens through annual national festivals such as the National Arts Festival in Grahamstown, celebrations to mark repeatedly new national days such as Freedom Day, inauguration ceremonies, and through the creation of commemorative projects such as Freedom Park, and various monuments and memorials.[7] In particular, the monuments and memorials of this new post-apartheid South Africa act as permanent and physical commemorations that mark the progress of the nation in time and space.[8] Certainly, the monuments and memorials of the new South Africa transport the past into the present and can become the foci for cultural memory and importantly, sites for remembrance and healing.[9]

Cultural Memory and National Healing

The cultural historian Pierre Nora suggests that the examples of the recovery of memory that occurred in Eastern Europe after the collapse of Communism, and

in post-Apartheid South Africa with the work of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, illustrate that a renewed concern with remembering has been manifesting itself. He terms this the 'age of commemoration' and argues that 'stockpiling memory' is a reaction to our growing uncertainty about the unpredictable future.[10] Arguably the Great War and its aftermath marked the beginning of this age of commemoration in which humans in the present seek meaning in their past and particularly in their tragedies. Jay Winter argues that Europe's recent chequered history of integration makes it necessary to recall the 'bloody history of European disintegration'.[11] He sees the Great War as the starting point of both Europe's division and unification in the twentieth century and therefore it becomes a central point from which to derive meaning in the present. Remembrance through specific sites, commemorations and the many memorials that appeared in the wake of the Great War testify to the human need to understand in order to transcend trauma and pain.[12]

Furthermore, over time memorials can acquire more layers of meaning as their aesthetic or political value transforms them into symbols of national pride that become a part of the landscape. Indeed following what was then the bloodiest war in history, bereavement and remembrance did become part of the European landscape. Both remembering and forgetting were part of a process of healing for traumatised populations. Up until today these war memorials, as sites of memory and mourning, act as 'foci of the rituals, rhetoric, and ceremonies of bereavement' that are mostly carried out collectively.[13] The iconography of these memorials and the rituals associated with them may differ in each country, however the meaning, whether implicit or explicit, always surrounds the universality of loss and the implication of 'Never Again'.

Similarly in South Africa, trauma, loss, and bereavement exist as legacies of the apartheid system. The memorials that have appeared since 1994 are South Africa's attempt to deal with the divisions and pain of the past and to find some meaning in the abuses of apartheid. Furthermore, unlike examples from Eastern

Europe where the monuments from former regimes have been torn down, the South African government has, after much public debate, kept most of the monuments previously erected to commemorate the Afrikaner people. With the exception of a number of statues of Hendrick Verwoerd who was considered by many to be the architect of apartheid, no monuments from the former regime have been torn down or destroyed.[14] Arguably this is a gesture to the government's commitment to cultural inclusivity, while another reading would be that the monuments of the old regime have acquired new layers of meaning in the new South Africa as their iconography and messages are re-read into the national narrative.

In *History after Apartheid*, Annie Coombes outlines an example of this with Tokyo Sexwale's visit to the Voortrekker Monument in 1996. Sexwale was a former Robben Island prisoner and premier of Gauteng Province at the time, and his visit to what was once the 'great temple of apartheid' made headlines in a photographic spread in the *Sunday Times*.[15] As Coombes points out the significance of this visit by a prominent black public figure, two years into the life of the new democracy, was that Sexwale chose not to point out the distortions or negative symbols of the monument; instead he inverted and 'Africanized' the symbolism by reading new and different meaning into the elements to declare the monument effectively safe for all to visit.[16] This was a significant step in demythologising a physical structure that had sat atop a hill, dominating Pretoria's skyline since its completion in 1949. The monument commemorates the Great Trek and the Trekkers' 1838 defeat of thousands of Zulus, at what is now known as the Battle of Blood River. Significantly, this event acted as a foundation myth for the Afrikaner nation. Therefore, the monument as a 'white' shrine, cemented and justified the Afrikaner belief in their divine right to rule.[17]

As a cultural and aesthetic form, the Voortrekker monument follows the design trend of nineteenth century monuments, which tended to be heroic, self-aggrandising icons celebrating national ideals and triumphs. Certainly, the

imagery, symbolism and meaning of the Voortrekker Monument positions it within German historian Martin Broszat's view, which suggests that monuments can coarsen historical understandings while creating them. By burying the actual event of the Battle of Blood River under 'layers of national myths and explanations' the monument engages what Nietzsche calls 'monumental history', that oppresses the living with a stultified version of the past.[18] In addition, monuments often seek to provide 'a naturalizing locus for memory' by legitimising a nation's ideals and founding myths, and creating an illusion of truth and fixed meaning.[19] However, as James E. Young states, both a monument and its significance 'are constructed in particular times and places, contingent on the political, historical and aesthetic realities of the moment'.[20] Just as the meaning of art can change over time, so can the meaning and significance of a monument.

Ravi Nessman's 'Breaking out of the stone laager' outlines the series of changes that the Voortrekker Monument has undergone in the new South Africa in an effort to demythologise the structure and reduce its significance by transforming it into a museum of Afrikaner culture and history. Other than Tokyo Sexwale's visit, the monument's chief executive officer Gert Opperman has taken a number of steps to achieve this since his appointment in 1999. These have included inviting Nelson Mandela to visit, hiring black guides to give African language tours, opening the monument's museum to children from predominantly black schools, and holding jazz concerts in the monument's once sacred spaces.[21] These changes have evidently been accepted by the new government, as in 2003 the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) doubled its previous year's subsidy for the running and upkeep of the monument and museum.[22] It seems ironic that the government should do this for a highly public monument that symbolises everything that the new government is trying to eradicate and that still has the ability to induce fear in some South Africans. Perhaps it remains because, as one history professor at the University of Stellenbosch puts it, the Voortrekker Monument only has the symbolic power

of a bygone era, but the new government possesses the real power and can therefore safely leave the monument where it stands.[23]

This certainly is one view of how an icon of the former regime can be accommodated in the new democracy, and indeed after coming to power, the African National Congress (ANC) government was adamant that most of the apartheid and colonial monuments and statues should remain as reminders of the past. This represents a past that can be learnt from and built upon, and certainly one that cannot be denied by any South African for its effect on current identities. A strong argument for the monuments and statues to remain was that they acted as powerful reminders of what the struggle had overcome. In this way the monuments of the past regime act as reference points for identity in the new South Africa. Alternatively, the old apartheid monuments and statues can act as objects of forgetting in the new South Africa in line with the theory that the larger the monument, the more likely it is to be ignored. An example of this is the large bust of former Prime Minister J. G. Strijdom, which sits unnoticed by passers by as it becomes a naturalised part of the background in Pretoria's Strijdom Square.[24] It is often only through performances and rituals that forgotten monuments become reanimated, and therefore cultural policy designers in the new South Africa can determine levels of significance to existing and new monuments and statues.

New Monuments for a New Nation

It does seem in practice though that it is not enough just to leave the Voortrekker Monument where it is. Intense debates occurred during the transition to democracy over a proposed counter-monument that would sit equally as imposingly on the hill opposite to the Voortrekker's hill overlooking Pretoria. The memorial that was chosen in the end, while more subtle, has still been designed to counter the Voortrekker Monument. It is called Freedom Park and it aims to cover the country's history from the early life of southern Africa, through the

colonial and apartheid eras, until the present era. The first phase unveiled in 2004, focused on representing anti-apartheid freedom fighters. The main criticism against this memorial is directed at its unapologetic Africanist viewpoint, and unsurprisingly the main opponents are Afrikaners, many of whom now feel alienated from their history and marginalised in the new dispensation.[25] Certainly, despite the official rhetoric of the Rainbow Nation, there is a definite and arguably inevitable shift from a Eurocentric to an Afrocentric perspective in all areas of representation and the arts in South Africa. I cannot help feeling though, that the physical and symbolic juxtaposition of an Africanist Freedom Park against the Voortrekker Monument, is reverting to, and perpetuating, the distorted and reductive idea of apartheid as being a black/white dichotomy.

The choice to commemorate anti-apartheid activists in the first phase of Freedom Park is also extremely revealing about what is deemed to be representative of the new South Africa. As Sabine Marschall argues, the self-aggrandising foundation myth of the Afrikaner nation has simply been replaced by the 'struggle for liberation' as the foundation myth of the new South Africa.[26] Indeed, apartheid and the struggle have been a central theme of many of the new memorials, including the first official memorial project of the new South Africa, the Robben Island prison museum.[27] Opening in 1997, the former prison, which housed most of the anti-apartheid activists, is most well known for its association with Nelson Mandela, and is seen to be the birthplace of the new democracy. The memory of the prison is deemed so important to the nation that it has become a symbol of the victory of human rights, not only in South Africa but all over the world. Arguably the expectations of an international tourist market have shaped the selective remembering associated with the island, and what has resulted in the island's iconic status has tended to homogenise the liberation struggle, and in effect silences the many differing narratives of struggle by presenting a largely black, male, ANC perspective.[28]

Apartheid and its legacy is further evident in the appearance of a number of bronze statues that depict heroic people engaged in the liberation struggle, such as Black Consciousness leader Steve Biko, Mahatma Gandhi, and particularly Nelson Mandela. The struggle is again evident in 'massacre memorials' which depict tragic events such as the Bisho Massacre, Sharpeville, and Hector Pieterson Memorials. These memorials recall landmark events on the road to freedom, and some have played a role in marking South Africa's new annual cycle of national days, linked to the anniversary of the events they commemorate. For example, the Sharpeville Monument was unveiled to mark the anniversary of the Sharpeville massacre on what has now become Human Rights Day, and the Hector Pieterson Memorial was unveiled on the anniversary of the Soweto uprising which has now become South Africa's Youth Day. In addition, these events resonate with a larger international audience which has experienced persecution, tragedy, and injustice, linking the South African nation to the liberal values of freedom from oppression, democracy, and human rights. However, the high international status of these events and their recent association with national days has again shaped the remembrance processes involved, and raises the question about who controls the use of memories, symbols, and myths involved in these processes, and for what purpose.

For example, the Hector Pieterson memorial in Orlando West, Soweto, reveals the selective and exclusive nature of South Africa's memorial process. Sabine Marschall argues that this memorial is one of the most significant new heritage sites in that it uses a key event of the liberation struggle – the 1976 Soweto uprising and the death of the young boy Hector Pieterson – to visualise the struggle against apartheid as a foundation myth.[29] The Soweto uprising was the outcome of rising tensions that came to a head with the apartheid government's decision to make Afrikaans the official language in all South African schools. On 16 June 1976 police intercepted a group of predominantly black students from three different schools who were planning to march to Orlando stadium for a protest meeting. Over twenty students were killed and many more wounded in

the shooting that broke out, and this senseless killing instigated even more deaths in the violent reaction that ensued over the following months. Hector was not the first to die during the uprising however, as an innocent victim, he immediately became an international symbol of the oppression and senseless violence of apartheid.[30] Photographer Sam Nzima immortalised the dying child in a famous photograph of Mbuyisa Makhubo carrying Hector's body, while his crying sister Antoinette Sithole runs alongside. A large screen-printed reproduction of this image was installed at the memorial unveiled in 2001, next to a pre-existing memorial stone.

The use of this photo is designed to remind visitors of the pain involved in the struggle, but at a deeper level it reveals a politically-strategic choice that shapes public remembering within a narrow representation of the liberation narrative. International recognition of this photo has ensured the memorial's high status within South Africa's heritage sector and its exploitation for cultural tourism purposes by the Department of Environmental Affairs and Tourism (DEAT).[31] The extent of government intervention in this particular memorial has garnered suspicion from those involved in the Soweto uprising who believe the memories of that day have been appropriated and manipulated for current political agendas. Certainly, the ANC government's enthusiasm to incorporate the uprising within its own struggle metanarrative for the nation is revealing, considering that most of the participants in the uprising were not politically aware and those who were, were more closely allied with the Black Consciousness movement.[32] Selective and constructive processes can again be seen in the Sharpeville Monument which was erected to commemorate the massacre of peaceful protesters in 1960, but which excludes other significant events associated with the same location. Sharpeville in Vereeniging was where Nelson Mandela signed South Africa's new Constitution in 1996 and it was also where the British and Boer armies concluded their pact to end hostilities after the South African War. This event in 1902 created 'a new South Africa' and the beginning of black disenfranchisement. These two significant events in the same location

seem to be ignored by the Sharpeville Monument.[33] Furthermore, the acknowledgement of the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC) as the organisers of the Sharpeville protest seems to have been completely overridden by an ANC-driven commemoration of the day.

Regardless of the debates surrounding the validity and biases involved in using these events to refashion the nation's collective identity, domestically, these statues and memorials continue to act as sites for collective remembering and healing. The monument artist Horst Hoheisel suggests that the life of memory is guaranteed only with an unfinished memorial process.[34] Conversely, erecting monuments can signify the final stage of memory or the end of the mourning process. For example the Steve Biko, Sharpeville and Hector Pieterson memorials were all initiated at least twenty years after the events they commemorate, suggesting that they could signify the end of a collective mourning process, a completion of memory, and a willingness to let go and forget aspects of a painful past. In a similar vein, Andreas Huyssen argues that monuments in this age of mass memory production and consumption bring an end to memory, but this time by burying it and ossifying the past.[35] By building more monuments to memory we are in some degree divesting ourselves of the duty to remember. Indeed, it could be argued that some memorial projects in South Africa have tended to stall, or even halt, the processing of memory.

A case in point is the Monument to the Women of South Africa in Pretoria. The nation's search for appropriate heritage subjects was renewed at the beginning of the new millennium and the women's integral role in the liberation struggle was finally chosen for commemoration in 2000. The power of women's strategic organisation against the apartheid regime is often overshadowed by a narrow and totalising narrative of the liberation struggle that favours stories from a black African male perspective, and so this long overdue monument was necessary for the construction of a meaningful national history. However, there are worrying issues regarding the exclusive and limited access to this supposedly 'public'

monument that seem to exclude the women's story of the struggle from the public eye.[36] The focus of the monument, which includes a multimedia component, is a small *imbokodo* (grinding stone) situated on the floor of the amphitheatre in the Union Buildings in Pretoria. This location recalls the memory of the women's march of 9 August 1956, when twenty thousand women gathered in front of the Union Buildings to present Prime Minister J. G. Strijdom with a protest letter demanding the repeal of the pass laws.[37] While this location has historical significance, the security measures associated with the building have prevented the general public from accessing the monument, without gaining permission prior to visiting. In response to criticism about access, the DACST issued a statement in the national press in 2000 stating that the monument would have 'structured access' similar to the White House, where requests would have to be made for tours during set times.[38] Arguably, the monument instead provides what Pierre Nora calls the 'exterior scaffolding and outward signs' of a society that has not fully integrated this story into its collective memory.[39] It could be argued that this monument has, in effect, ended the memory of the women's struggle and divested South Africa's obligation to remember a vital part of its history.

Other than access issues, the Monument to the Women of South Africa has also sustained criticism in regard to its scale and abstract nature. A counter-argument to this criticism is that the scale of the Women's Monument actually imbues it with more significance and meaning, as what James E. Young calls a counter-monument.[40] These memorial structures or spaces challenge the very premise of the monument by rejecting the traditional forms and reasons for public memorial art such as consoling viewers, or offering redemption after a tragic event. In the same vein as Maya Lin's Vietnam Veteran's Memorial in Washington, counter-monuments instead symbolise open questions, creating awareness and provoking the viewer to engage in their own memory work. It could be argued that the simplicity of the Monument to the Women of South Africa evokes awareness and invites contemplation about the women's struggle (depending of

course on open access). Its small scale also separates it from the negative association of monuments as totalitarian art from communist or fascist regimes. Perhaps 'the demagogical rigidity and certainty of history' that are exuded by the large monumental forms of apartheid, is being counteracted by the generally smaller monuments and statues of the new South Africa.[41]

Conclusion

South Africa's monuments and memorials were designed to represent a sense of South Africa to its citizens by including recognition of some of the significant events and people from the past. In this way, the past is recalled selectively in the present to create a more inclusive national identity and to aid in healing the divisions of the past. It is evident that the liberation struggle has become a foundational myth for the new nation and an important memory from which to derive meaning and identity in the present. The Afrikaners' foundation myth that was also based on a search for freedom during the Great Trek has been replaced by the similar black South African struggle for liberation from apartheid. This and the Africanisation of commemorative projects all form part of the larger quest to redress the imbalance of cultural and heritage projects from the old regime. The partly contradictory themes of unity in diversity and a reassertion of African culture suggest that inclusion in the Rainbow Nation exists more in official rhetoric than in practice.

It is surprising, considering South Africa's commitment to cultural diversity, that new monuments and statues are not representative of all groups within its population. As Sabine Marschall discovered while studying community mural art during South Africa's transition, Indian art and culture is still marginalised in the new South Africa as it had been in the old.[42] Gandhi's statue is perhaps a gesture aimed at recognising South Africa's Indian population; however it is still associated with the totalising narrative of the freedom struggle. Arguably this focus on recalling the struggle and eventual triumph of freedom has occurred

while South Africa was consolidating its identity as it approached and reached a significant ten-year milestone in its new history. The memorial process does invariably pull together some sense of a shared identity based on the conviction that in remembering the past, it will never happen again. Perhaps the future will bring a more inclusive and diverse range of memorial projects, free from excessive government intervention, once South Africa has moved far away enough from its painful past.

---

[1] Sabine Marschall, '"Lest we forget": the "struggle for liberation" as foundation myth', *Oracle*, 2004, at: http://www2.univ-reunion.fr/~ageof/text/74c21e88-621.html, Accessed 22 September, 2005.
[2] Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid: Visual Culture and Public Memory in a Democratic South Africa*, Duke University Press, Durham and London, 2003, p. 7.
[3] Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto', *Visual Anthropology*, Vol.19, 2006, p. 146.
[4] He asserts that this is because the absolutely new is inconceivable and we all base our particular experiences on a prior context in order to make sense out of those experiences. See Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989, p. 6
[5] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, p. 9.
[6] Paul Connerton, *How Societies Remember*, pp. 9, 40-43.
[7] See *National Arts Festival, Grahamstown*, at: http://www.nafest.co.za, Accessed 2 October, 2004; *Freedom Park*,at: http://www.freedompark.co.za/index.html, accessed 1 September, 2004, and "Freedom Park to Tell SA's Story", *SouthAfrica.info*, 28 Apr, 2004, at: http://www.southafrica.info, Accessed 1 September, 2004.
[8] Tony Bennett, D. Carter, P. Buckridge and C. Mercer (eds), *Celebrating the Nation: A Critical Study of Australia¹s Bicentenary*, Allen and Unwin, St Leonards, 1992, p. 8.
[9] Cornelius Holtorf, 'Sites of Memory', *University of Toronto*, at: https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/citd/holtorf/2.6.html, Accessed 16 October, 2004.
[10] Pierre Nora, 'The Reasons for the Current Upsurge in Memory', *Eurozine*, at: http://www.eurozine.com/article/2002-04-19-nora-en.html, Accessed 21 June, 2004.
[11] Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995, p. 2.
[12] Antoine Prost, 'Monuments to the Dead', in Pierre Nora, *Realms of Memory: The Construction of the French Past*, Vol.2, 'Traditions', Columbia University Press, New York, 1997, p. 308.
[13] Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning*, p. 78.
[14] Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid*, p. 20.
[15] Ravi Nessman, 'Breaking out of the stone laager', *The Star* [Online], 8 May, 2003, at: http://www.thestar.co.za/general/print_article.php?fArticleId=142351&fSectionId=225&fSetId=50, Accessed 13 September, 2004.
[16] In one example, Sexwale pointed out the gateway in the granite laager that encircles the monument, and declared that he finally understood the laager mentality, but it was lucky there

was a gateway so that the Afrikaner people did not remain trapped. In another significant example, he translated the symbolism of the actual wrought-iron gates themselves, which take the form of assegais, or spears, and that were intended to represent the power of Zulu leader Dingane that blocked the path of white civilisation. Sexwale reversed this by stating that it was the spear, or *Umkhonto we Sizwe* (*Spear of the Nation*) that did finally open the way for civilisation to enter South Africa. In a symbolic gesture, he was photographed standing between the opened gates. See Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid,* pp. 35-37.

[17] Michael Leslie, 'Bitter monuments: Afrikaners and the new South Africa', *The Black Scholar*, Vol.24, No.3, 1994, p. 33, at: ProQuest/1560580, Accessed 13 September, 2004.

[18] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture: Memory, Counter-memory, and the End of the Monument (I)', *Lunds University*, at: http://www.arthist.lu.se/discontinuities/texts/young1.htm, Accessed 20 July, 2004.

[19] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[20] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[21] Ravi Nessman, 'Breaking out of the stone laager'.

[22] The Voortrekker Monument is not fully funded under the ANC government, but does receive an annual subsidy of R825,000 in 2003, and receives revenue from visitors and tourists. See Ravi Nessman, 'Breaking out of the stone laager'.

[23] Albert Grundlingh in Ravi Nessman, 'Breaking out of the stone laager'.

[24] Andreas Huyssen in James E. Young (ed.), *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, Prestel-Verlag, Munich and New York, 1994, p. 9 and Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid*, pp. 12-13, 112.

[25] K. Walker, 'The History of South Africa: A Twice-told Tale', *Carnegie Reporter*, at: http://www.carnegie.org/reporter/08/southafrica/index2.html, Accessed 8 October, 2004.

[26] Sabine Marschall, '"Lest we forget": the "struggle for liberation" as foundation myth'.

[27] H. Hughes, 'What is remembered and what forgotten: a decade of redefining culture and heritage for tourism in South Africa', *The University of Nottingham*, at: http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/ttri/pdf/conference/Heather_Hughes.pdf, Accessed 8 October, 2004.

[28] Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid*, p. 105.

[29] Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto', p. 145.

[30] Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto', p. 154.

[31] Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto', p. 151.

[32] Sabine Marschall, 'Visualizing Memories: The Hector Pieterson Memorial in Soweto', p. 161.

[33] Leslie Witz, 'Beyond van Riebeeck', in Sarah Nuttall and Cheryl-Ann Michael (eds), *Senses of Culture: South African Culture Studies*, Oxford University Press, Cape Town, 2000, p. 330.

[34] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[35] Andreas Huyssen in James E. Young (ed.), *The Art of Memory: Holocaust Memorials in History*, p. 9.

[36] Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid*, p. 112.

[37] Annie E. Coombes, *History after Apartheid*, pp. 106-107.

[38] Sabine Marschall, 'Serving Male Agendas: Two National Women's Monuments in South Africa', in *Women's Studies*, Vol.33, 2004, pp. 1009-1033; Annie E. Coombs, *History after Apartheid*, p. 112.

[39] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[40] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[41] James E. Young, 'The Holocaust and Historical Trauma in Contemporary Visual Culture'.

[42] Sabine Marschall, 'Affirming Africa: recovering cultural heritage and representing ordinary people's lives in South African community mural art', *MotsPluriels*, 2000, at: http://www.arts.uwa.edu.au/MotsPluriels?MP1600sm.html, Accessed 29 September, 2004.