Chapter 4

Troubling statues:
A symptom of a complex heritage complex

Sipokazi Madida

It has become common to ascribe the troubling¹ of South Africa's monumental landscape to the failures of post-apartheid administrations, the government's structural and operational defects, slow transformation and the broader socio-economic issues that continue to scourge the country.² While this approach is valid in many ways, it often neglects or superficially acknowledges the complicated networks of messy operations that produce heritage. The approach focuses much on external factors as enemies of heritage, and fails to see beyond the façade of authority and the impression of a structured, orderly practice that government officials and heritage practitioners often create. Although some policy reviews delve deeper to underscore gaps, contradictions, overlapping mandates and restraining bureaucracies, their recommendations tend to create or normalise simple dichotomies and categories. They tend to pinpoint dominance and authorised discourses,³ which they juxtapose with

1 Troubling is here used to mean disturbed, stirred up or fraught with disorder, as used in the *Holy Bible*, John, chapter 5 verse 7, and a state of dilemma as used by Joseph Diesco in his novel *Troubled Waters*, 1993, which highlights the 'troubles' of black and white individuals as they helplessly strive to alter the apartheid system in which they find themselves.

2 See for example, Van Vuuren, Chisto J. "The intricacy of intangible cultural heritage: some perspectives on Ndebele earthen architecture". *South African Journal of Art History* 23, 2, 2008; King, Tony. & Flynn, M.K. "Heritage and the post-apartheid city: Constitution Hill, Johannesburg." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18, 1, 2012; Nyamnjoh, Francis B. "Black Pain Matters: Down with Rhodes". *CODESRIA Bulletin*, 3-4, 2015: 74-93; Mbembe, Achille. "Decolonizing knowledge and the question of the archive". Presented at Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research (WISER), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2015, Accessed 2 August 2016, <http://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf>

3 The notion of authorised heritage discourse was coined by Laurajane Smith to refer to a discourse of 'experts' and an instrument of political and cultural power, which produces

‘voices from below’, counter-memories and counter-narratives. Since these are generally imagined as distinct and determined, they easily settle with the simplest meanings of, for example, redress, unbundling, delineation, decolonisation and Africanisation. It is important to consider the complexity of the society under study, and the dynamics of its heritage economy. The best start is to acknowledge that taking socio-political struggles to sites of monumentalisation is not a new phenomenon in South Africa, and that the contexts of such occurrences have always been tricky. During apartheid monuments were from time to time rallying points for groups mobilised around particular social or political agendas. In many cases, as it is at present, the subjects of contention were neither directly connected, nor obviously related to the sites ‘under siege’.

To demonstrate the complexity of monumentalisation, and how statues have come to contribute to the complexity of the post-apartheid heritage practice, this chapter begins by historicising the troubling of South Africa’s statues. The aim is to illuminate trends related to contestations of sites of public representation, and perhaps inform the heritage policy reviews currently underway. The chapter invites the reader to pay attention to heritage as an intricate assemblage of institutions, agencies, things and ideas, and to the ambiguities and contradictions in the various contributions and operations of these components within the heritage practice.

Here I examine this complex network through three distinct but interlinking discussions. The first relates to complex transactions through which memories and narratives intersect to produce multifaceted and awkward heritage products (which attract contestations more for their awkwardness than for being one-sided). The second relates to an assemblage of legislations, institutions, and agencies which purport to represent different scopes and frameworks, and to produce different knowledges, experiences, memories,

packages that undermine or constrain alternative views. See, Smith, Laurajane. *Uses of Heritage*. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.

disciplines, practices, and approaches, although these overlap and intersect in complex ways. The third relates to the ambiguities and contradictions of a heritage practice that makes as it unmakes, and opens as it closes. The three discussions interlace with each other through the central argument of this chapter, which is that issues surrounding South Africa's public statues are a symptom of a heritage practice made intricate – not necessarily by bureaucracies, hegemony, dominant ideologies, suppressed voices, counter-narratives and counter-representations, but by disordered intersections of knowledges, meanings, memories and identities.

These troubles are not new

The weeks-long anti-apartheid marches that plagued the city of Pretoria in September 1989 could have come and gone without much drama, if the demonstrators had not climbed up the statue of Paul Kruger in Church Square. The act particularly irked members of the Afrikaner Weerstandsbeweging (AWB), such that on Sunday 23 September 1989 they came out in retaliation and gathered around the statue for a rally addressed by their leader Eugene Terreblanche. Their cause was to protect the statue “against what the blacks did ... because [it was] a sacred monument, not something for the apes to climb atop of”.⁴ On that day, the immortalised Paul Kruger stood tall as ‘blacks’ and ‘whites’ exchanged blows at his feet for about an hour before the security police ‘intervened’.

The bone of contention was not the statue or figure of Kruger, but what it represented. The statue and others in its category embodied racial exclusivity and white supremacy that fed into the very threads of the system of apartheid.⁵ Such symbols constituted a monumental

4 Wren, Christopher S. “Pretoria Stops Anti-Apartheid March”. *Special to The New York Times*, September 24, 1989. Accessed 10 May 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/09/24/world/pretoria-stops-anti-apartheid-march.html>

5 Buchli, Victor & Gavin Lucas. *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge, 2001: 90.

complex⁶ mobilised around the concept of *erfenis*,⁷ and produced monumental representations that fostered European identities and celebrated imperialist achievements. By 1989, about 97% of the monuments declared by the Historical Monuments Commission (HMC) and later National Monuments Council (NMC) represented people of European origin and their conquests.⁸ Only 3% represented the art, architecture and artefacts of Africans, who were about 84% of the country's population.⁹ It was indeed a racialised monumental practice. Hence, climbing versus defending statues was for that 23 September 1989 moment the defining factor between 'blacks and whites'.

But the politics of public representation transcended mere racial categories. Monuments had by the late 1980s become rallying sites of venting political rage across and among other groupings. *Afrikanerdom*, for instance, had by 1989 disintegrated into factions, which Annie Coombes summarised as a prosperous bourgeois sector versus right wing activism.¹⁰ The latter was conspicuous for taking its frustrations with the other faction to monuments. Sites like the Voortrekker Monument and Fort Schanskop were from time to time taken hold of by Afrikaner groups protesting certain views or actions. For example, in May 1990, the Conservative Party 'took hold' of the Voortrekker Monument to demonstrate their stance against political changes such as the beginning of the negotiations between the South African

6 Derived from Tony Bennett's concept of exhibitionary complex, which he uses to illustrate the bringing together different knowledges, disciplines, approaches, and practices into the museum institution resulting in a nexus of forms of knowledge and discursive structures within which power constitutes and manifests itself not in negative coercive force, but in various negotiable, adaptable and substitutable forms of agency. See, Bennett, Tony. "The Exhibitionary Complex." *New Formations*, 4, 1988.

7 A Dutch or Afrikaans word for inheritance.

8 The National Monuments Council established in 1969, replaced the Historical Monuments Commission which was established in 1923, but could only begin its monumentalising work in 1934, due to its limiting earlier framework.

9 Frescura, Franco. "National of Nationalist? A Critique of the National Monuments Council, 1936-1989." In *Proceedings of the National Urban Conservation Symposium*, University of Witwatersrand, 12-14 July 1991, edited by Derek Japha & Vivienne Japha. Cape Town: Oakville Press, 1991.

10 Coombes, Annie E. "Translating the past: apartheid monuments in post-apartheid South Africa." In *Hybridity and its discontents: Politics, Science and Culture*, edited by Avtar Brah & Annie E. Coombes. London: Routledge, 2000.

government and the African National Congress (ANC).¹¹ This must have been sparked by a meeting between some government leaders and ANC leaders on 4 May 1990 at the Groote Schuur presidential residence. In December 1993, the Pretoria East Boere Commando mobilised around a similar stance invaded the Fort Schanskop. The statue of Paul Kruger was at some point a subject of heated debates regarding its value and suitable location. Although commissioned in 1896, the statue changed locations twice before it finally rested at Church Square in 1954.¹²

The troubling of statues associated with frustrations did not perish with apartheid, but gained even greater momentum with the roll-out of post-apartheid monumental projects. Sabine Marschall highlighted this momentum and what appears to be dominant ideologies and official heritage discourses versus vernacular discourses.¹³ In the current era dubbed post-apartheid, society still gets stratified by the climbing versus the defence of statues, although the associations and voices are ambiguous and at times contradictory. Between 1997 and 2015, more than 20 colonial and post-apartheid monuments were contested and defaced. To cite a few examples, the statue of Steve Biko erected in the city of East London in October 1997, was spray-painted with 'AWB' initials less than 24 hours after its unveiling. On 16 December 1998, attendees of the unveiling of the Ncome and Blood River Monument were cautioned not to go near the makeshift bridge 'of reconciliation' that linked the new monument with the old Blood River Memorial on the west side of the Ncome River. There were rumours that 'the Afrikaners' holding their own celebrations on the west side of the river had threatened to blow the bridge up.

In 2003 the City of Johannesburg proudly unveiled the statue of Mahatma Gandhi, and renamed the square of its location Gandhi Square, but the statue was vandalised with paint in April 2015. In September 2005, six

11 Coombes, Annie E. "Translating the past: apartheid monuments in post-apartheid South Africa." In *Hybridity and its discontents: Politics, Science and Culture*, edited by Avtar Brah & Annie E. Coombes. London: Routledge, 2000.

12 The statue was first erected at Prince's Park, and then moved to Pretoria Station.

13 Marschall, Sabine. "Targeting Statues: Monument Vandalism as an Expression of Sociopolitical Protest in South Africa." *African Studies Review*, 60, 3, 2017: 203-219.

days after the unveiling of the statue of King Makhado in Makhado (formerly Louis Trichardt), the statue was defaced with paint in the colours of the former South African flag.¹⁴ Similarly, a monument erected in remembrance of the Duncan Village Massacre, which President Mbeki unveiled in the city of East London in March 2008, was contested and vandalised soon after its erection. A spear was removed from the hand of the African warrior-like sculpture. When the Buffalo City Municipality reacted and fenced the memorial, it was pelted with stones.¹⁵ In 2008, the South African Heritage Resources Agency (SAHRA) constructed a memorial at the grave site of Sara Baartman in Hankey, and then declared it a National Heritage Site.¹⁶ But the grave plaque was vandalised with white paint in April 2015. Before this, the grave in which Sara Baartman's remains were buried on 9 August 2002 had been vandalised several times. Battling to explain the cause Crais and Scully speculated that "the powerful symbolic site offered ritual specialists powerful *muti* (medicine) to cause harm, to ensure benefits or to ward off witchcraft".¹⁷ It was unclear in their speculation why the 'harvesting' of *muti* would involve vandalism. But the splashing of the plaque with paint some thirteen years later, resonated more with the 2015 wave of the troubling of statues.

Again, these violent contestations were not just about balancing lopsided representations or replacing sets of memories and narratives. Deeper investigations into each case could potentially unmask more than just prominence of dominant or 'official' discourses over 'vernacular', local or popular expressions.¹⁸ Minkley and Mnyaka performed this unmasking in their critical analysis of the case of the Duncan Village

-
- 14 Thotse, Mahunele. "Contesting Names and Statues: Battles over the Louis Trichardt and Makhado City-text in Limpopo Province, South Africa." *Kronos* 36, 2010.
 - 15 Minkley, Gary & Mnyaka, Phindezwa. "Seeing Beyond the Official and the Vernacular: The Duncan Village Massacre Memorial and the Politics of Heritage in South Africa". In: Peterson, Derek R., Gavua, Kodzo & Rassool, Ciraj (eds.). *The Politics of Heritage in Africa: Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
 - 16 *Government Gazette* No. 30987, 2008.
 - 17 Crais, Clifton & Pamela Scully. *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus: A Ghost Story and a Biography*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
 - 18 Marschall, Sabine. "Commemorating the Trojan Horse Massacre in Cape Town: the Tensions between Vernacular and Official Expressions of Memory". *Visual Studies*, 25, 2010.

Massacre Memorial. Their reading of memories, imagery and meanings of the massacre transcended simple categories and dichotomies of good and bad, or hegemonic and counter-hegemonic heritage. The essence of their reading was that the contested warrior-like sculpture was “simultaneously national and particular, exclusive and ‘tribal’, and not simply universal or ‘African’ national.”¹⁹ It is such simultaneity and intricate overlapping of interests of various contributors and role players that continues to render the heritage practice complex. In many cases involving constructions of monuments, consultations (and even lack of) can be considered as producing complex transactions, whereby local and popular memories rely on, borrow from, feed into, and sometimes translate into official, nationalising and universalising ideas, and vice versa. Thus, contestations do not necessarily confirm dominance or subjugation of one discrete and discernible discourse by another. Instead, they respond to medleys of meanings that make up convoluted and often ambiguous and contradictory heritage products.

To explicate the complexity of the post-apartheid heritage practice further, it is necessary to scrutinise role players and their contributions, and to critically study the production processes and products at various stages, including the unintended consequences. However, for the scope of this chapter focus is limited to the complexity created by the overlapping structures and frameworks of heritage institutions and agencies and their intersecting mandates. It is to highlight the inevitable frustrations with a disorderly heritage practice and to demonstrate that there is indeed a correlation between the current climbing and defence of statues and their contexts. Unlike in the late 1980s, the current issues regarding statues are not limited to racial exclusivity and political inclinations. In fact, post-apartheid monumentalisation simultaneously produces exclusivity and inclusivity, and contestations do not always arise along strict political lines. While the post-apartheid monumentalisation purports

19 Minkley, Gary & Mnyaka, Phindezwa. “Seeing Beyond the Official and the Vernacular: The Duncan Village Massacre Memorial and the Politics of Heritage in South Africa”, 2015: 60.

to construct and represent collective memories of a rainbow nation, its anti-colonial orientation juxtaposes blackness with whiteness.

Furthermore, while monuments erected after 1994 can be seen as marking new memorial beginnings, they also symbolise convergences and conclusions of negotiated historical and heritage knowledges and meanings. Each monument immortalises particular streamlined memories and narratives, the custodians of which are heritage practitioners and government officials in charge of 'the nations' arts and culture. Certainly, this seems to render post-apartheid monuments merely official, rigid and subsequently unfulfilling to the 'general public'. Yet, heritage practitioners and government officials often present the same monuments as open invitations to 'the nation' to utilise the spaces for ongoing creative engagements and production of new memories. And through such 'opportunities' interest groups invent themselves as heritage communities and advisers, beneficiaries and custodians of certain heritage processes and products. That too does not guarantee fulfilment. Besides, with heritage interests and groupings mutating every now and then, there is never certainty about who the climbers or attackers and defenders of monuments can be at any given moment.

Complex negotiations and the blurring of official versus counter-narratives, or those involved versus the side-lined, becomes even more prominent during events such as commemoration days, when these generally lifeless monuments get resuscitated to speak to and for 'the nation'. On such occasions, speakers (representing government or communities) often seek relevance by carefully straddling between particularising the monuments to races, ethnicities and groupings, and generalising them to 'the nation' and the universe. Notably, the #RhodesMustFall movement launched another occasion whereby the statue climbers and defenders constructed and disseminated explicit meanings of race, ethnicity and gender, and amplified Rhodes into whiteness, Europeanness, and masculinity, at the same time as they sought to exterminate such generalisations. It is such endings and beginnings, closures and openings, and medleys of voices and

meanings that have come to characterise the post-apartheid heritage. And, it is for such complexity and disorder that the practice has landed itself in a web of socio-political struggles related to slow or lack of transformation and poor service delivery. The troubling of monuments therefore should be viewed through the lens of the kind of critical heritage studies that probes beyond simple binaries.

Theorising the post-apartheid heritage practice

For the scope of this work I consider three approaches to critical heritage studies that continue to write or talk past each other with regard to the troubles unsettling South African monuments. One approach is the dominant ideology thesis, which is concerned with issues of power and dominance in heritage productions and representations.²⁰ It illuminates processes and outcomes that reflect top-down practices (usually by the government), subjugation and counter strategies. Another approach employs the notion of an authorised heritage discourse (AHD), and uses discourse in terms derived from linguistics.²¹ It explicates complex power dynamics in rhetoric, legislation, structures and operations, social and political contexts, the control of people's worlds, and the organising of people into nations, classes and identities. It then approaches this control and ordering as an authorised discourse working against competing discourses. But there is another approach concerned with knowledge production and power relations in heritage. It is closer to the Foucauldian notion of discourse, and draws largely from Tony Bennett's notion of exhibitionary complex.²² It approaches heritage as

20 For example, Van Vuuren, Chisto J. "The intricacy of intangible cultural heritage: some perspectives on Ndebele earthen architecture". *South African Journal of Art History* 23, 2, 2008; Jethro, Duane. "An African story of creation: heritage formation at Freedom Park, South Africa." *Material Religion* 9, 3, 2013; Marschall, Sabine. 2010a. *Landscape of Memory: Commemorating Monuments, Memorials and Public Statuary in Post-apartheid South Africa*, Leiden: Brill; Marschall, Sabine. "Targeting Statues: Monument Vandalism as an Expression of Sociopolitical Protest in South Africa". *African Studies Review*, 60, 3, 2017, 203-219.

21 Smith, Laura Jane. *Uses of Heritage*. Oxon: Routledge, 2006; King, Tony. & Flynn, M.K. "Heritage and the post-apartheid city: Constitution Hill, Johannesburg." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18, 1, 2012.

22 Discourse according to Michel Foucault, and in simpler terms than he explains it, is not a

a nexus of negotiated meanings and knowledges.²³ Discussions and argument in this chapter are aligned with this last approach.

It is important to note though that for all these approaches, the political transition of the 1990s was one opportunity for rethinking public representations through monuments and statues. The opportunity enabled an extensive body of literature devoted to comparing the 'before and after'. For example, Franco Frescura explored apartheid and post-apartheid monumentalisation through a persuasive critique of the work of the HMC and NHC, and of monumentalisation as a conservation strategy in general.²⁴ Another critique of the HMC as an institution 'charged with making a register of monuments which ought to be preserved' versus the NMC as an institution charged with erecting monuments was offered by Hall and Lillie.²⁵ These contributions were quite successful in highlighting the racial, ethnic and regional disproportions of conservation approaches over years, although Frescura's contribution was mainly from an architectural point of view.

Subsequently, a number of contributions on the subject emerged, which appraised the post-apartheid memorial ambitions as they painstakingly documented the declarations and erection of monuments and statues

manifestation of thoughts, knowledge and speeches of a particular subject, but a system, a way of organising or structuring, or a formation in which knowledge and meanings are produced or organised by means of power and its effects. In such system knowledge and meanings are produced to form what manifests as meaningful social relations, logics, collective understandings and a set of social facts. See, Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Pantheon Books: New York, 1972: 55 and 117. See also, Bennett, Tony. "The Exhibitionary Complex." *New Formations*, 4, 1988.

- 23 See, Minkley, Gary. "A fragile inheritor: The post-apartheid memorial complex, A.C. Jordan and the re-imagining of cultural heritage in the Eastern Cape." *Kronos* 34, 2008; Witz, Leslie & Rassool, Ciraj. "Making Histories". *Kronos* 34, 2008; Minkley, Gary & Mnyaka, Phindezwa. "Seeing Beyond the Official and the Vernacular: The Duncan Village Massacre Memorial and the Politics of Heritage in South Africa", 2015.
- 24 Frescura, Franco. "National of Nationalist? A Critique of the National Monuments Council, 1936-1989." In *Proceedings of the National Urban Conservation Symposium*, University of Witwatersrand, 12-14 July 1991, edited by Derek Japha & Vivienne Japha. Cape Town: Oakville Press, 1991; Frescura, Franco. "Who Needs Monuments?" *Juta's SA Journal of Property* 5, 2, 1989.
- 25 Hall, Andrew & Ashley Lillie. "The National Monuments Council and a policy for providing protection for the cultural and environmental heritage". Paper presented at Myths, Monuments, Museums: New Premises Conference. University of the Witwatersrand, history workshop, 16-18 July, 1992.

around the country.²⁶ Marschall and Grudlingh offered compelling critiques of the ‘new monumental premises’ and highlighted some myths and ambiguities embedded in the nationalising ideas and ideals of unity in diversity, reconciliation and social cohesion. Coombes offered a broader and more critical analysis, placing monuments and statues at the centre of intricate public history and memory-making projects fraught with ambiguities, contestations.

Indeed, a few sources highlighted the numerous shortcomings characterising post-apartheid monumentalisation. Buchli and Lucas found monumentalising a heritage of recent political past generally a challenge, since it related to contemporary political issues that remained unresolved.²⁷ Marschall evaluated the whole practice through a dominant ideology thesis. She perceived public monumentalisation in post-apartheid South Africa as manifesting dominant ideologies, and as produced through an official, hegemonic narrative, and as constituted within a discourse authorised, made official and endorsed by ‘agents of state’. Marschall criticised new monumental projects as embodiments of a triumphalist ‘meta-narrative’ of the struggle, and as representing a ‘dominant, authorised version of the past in visualised forms’.²⁸ Similarly, scholars like Duane Jethro singled out ‘legacy projects’ like the Freedom Park to diagnose anatomic issues from conception to the launch.²⁹ Their overall focus was on highlighting successes and failures

26 Marschall, Sabine. “Gestures of compensation: post-apartheid monuments and memorials”. *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, 55, 2004; Marschall, Sabine. “Reordering the Past: Monuments and Architectural Heritage in Post-Apartheid South Africa”. *Repenser les limites: l’architecture à travers l’espace, le temps et les disciplines*, INHA Paris, 2005; Marschall, Sabine. ‘Struggle Heroes: Constructing a Genealogy for the New South Africa’. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 2006; Grudlingh, Albert M. “A cultural conundrum? Old monuments and new regimes: The Voortrekker monument as symbol of Afrikaner power in a postapartheid South Africa”. *Radical History Review* 81, 2001; Coombes, Annie E. “Translating the past: apartheid monuments in post-apartheid South Africa.” In *Hybridity and its discontents: Politics, Science and Culture*, edited by Avtar Brah & Annie E. Coombes. London: Routledge, 2000; Coombes, Annie E. *History after apartheid: visual culture and public memory in a democratic South Africa*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

27 Buchli, Victor & Gavin Lucas. *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge, 2001.

28 Marschall, Sabine. *Landscape of Memory: Commemorating Monuments, Memorials and Public Statuary in Post-apartheid South Africa*, Leiden: Brill, 2010.

29 Jethro, Duane. “An African story of creation: heritage formation at Freedom Park, South Africa.” *Material Religion* 9, 3, 2013.

of the post-apartheid state. Jethro also revealed the contradictory nature of gigantic monuments like Freedom Park that have failed to attract visitors although conceived with the grandest ambitions to be the opposite. Some of the arguments made in this chapter about grand plans, chaotic operations, and unfulfilling and banal monumental products are grounded on Jethro's observations. However, beyond centres and directions of power that Jethro has looked at, are some interesting disorderly spaces and processes between what appears as neatly constituted and organised institutions and lines of authority.

In the light of the #RhodesMustFall movement, numerous contributions focused on issues of transformation and related socio-economic conditions.³⁰ Cynthia Kros offered a more detailed analysis exploring the rationale behind the recent call for removal of colonial and apartheid statues and monuments.³¹ However, none of these contributions probed the forms of knowledge informing the ideas and ideals driving the post-apartheid monumentalisation, and the structures within which heritage was produced.

But this chapter is aligned with the deeper probing of these issues, which is prominent in the writings of Witz, Minkley, Rassool and Mnyaka. These scholars have for the past decade consistently analysed the post-apartheid heritage practice through critiques of disciplines and knowledge forms informing public representations. Most persuasive is Minkley and Mnyaka's critical analysis of the memorial complex through a case study of a statue erected in Duncan Village, which highlights not just contestations but the intricacy of power/knowledge relations in post-apartheid heritage.³² Another most

30 Nyamnjoh, Francis B. "Black Pain Matters: Down with Rhodes", *CODESRIA Bulletin*, 3-4, 2015, 74-93; Mbembe, Achille. "Decolonizing knowledge and the question of the archive". Presented at Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research (WISER), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, 2015, Accessed 2 August 2016, <http://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf>; Habib, Adam. "Race, Racism and Memorials", Accessed on 2 August 2016, <https://www.wits.ac.za/news/latest-news/general-news/2015/2015-04/race-racism-and-memorials.html>

31 Kros, Cynthia. "Rhodes Must Fall: archives and counter-archives". *Journal of Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*, 29, 2015.

32 Minkley, Gary & Mnyaka, Phindezwa. "Seeing Beyond the Official and the Vernacular: The

recent contribution to this ‘advanced’ critical heritage scholarship is a collection of essays focused on understanding post-apartheid heritage as a complex.³³ The essays on South Africa successfully steer away from settling with simple notions of heritage as authorised by the state and/or experts, but challenges one to think beyond coercive power. Yet so far, each of the studies of post-apartheid statues and monuments has been insulated and unrelated to the rest under an overarching yet close and critical reading. What remains absent in these studies is an overarching theorisation of the fundamental issues troubling the monumental landscape.

My interpretation primarily draws from the critical heritage scholarship that approaches post-apartheid heritage practice as a complex in order to offer an account of the troubled monumental landscape as both complex (intricate) and a complex (network). It is an account that seeks to highlight fundamental issues not just in the regime, dominant ideologies and ambiguous ideals, or negotiated roles, but the ‘nature’ of the entire complex, the frameworks and scopes of operation. Hence, the troubled statues as subjects of this discussion are situated within what Gary Minkley identifies as ‘post-apartheid memorial complex’, a complex arena of ideas and meanings of ‘the symbolic’ represented discursively and materially.³⁴ The historicising discussion featuring in the previous sections is therefore important in highlighting the genealogy, development and changes of the South African memorial landscape in relation to statues.

Duncan Village Massacre Memorial and the Politics of Heritage in South Africa”, 2015.

33 Rassool, Ciraj. 2015. “Human Remains, the Disciplines of the Dead, and the South African Memorial Complex”. In *The Politics of Heritage in Africa: Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, edited by Peterson, Derek R., Gavua, Kodzo and Rassool, Ciraj. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

34 Minkley, Gary. “A fragile inheritor: The post-apartheid memorial complex, A.C. Jordan and the re-imagining of cultural heritage in the Eastern Cape.” *Kronos* 34, 2008.

The post-apartheid memorial complex

In his analysis of the work of culture, Tony Bennett considers the material processes through which culture is made as assemblages of networks of relations.³⁵ The processes involve accumulation, classification, codification, and ordering of varied kinds of objects, knowledge, and practices to constitute culture. Bennett likens these processes to, for example, ‘the bringing together of various kinds of writing to form literature, or of painting to constitute art’. Similarly, an assemblage of buildings, sites, objects, cultures, traditions, and knowledge systems that are produced, stored, accumulated, codified, and disseminated by a network of institutions and agencies, constitute post-apartheid heritage. As Bennett demonstrates regarding culture, designating heritage involves setting in place ‘specific relations between objects and practices’, ‘institutionally produced zones of cultural action’, and ‘institutional mechanisms and the forms of expertise’.

Thus, analysing the work of post-apartheid heritage involves attending to the assemblage of legislations and policies that set the work into motion. It involves attending to the varied structures and frameworks of the institutions and agencies established to facilitate the making of heritage. And, it involves attending to the different knowledges and meanings giving rise to differentiated ensembles, such as tangible and intangible heritage. In the gestation of post-apartheid heritage legislation, a heritage definition carried through the arts and culture and heritage commissions, and bills was that of,

*a sum-total of wildlife and scenic parks, sites of scientific and historical importance, national monuments, historic buildings, works of art, literature and music, oral traditions and museum collections and their documentation which provides the basis for a shared culture and creativity in the arts.*³⁶

35 Bennett, Tony. “The Exhibitionary Complex.” *New Formations*, 4, 1988.

36 This definition was adopted from the report by the Arts and Culture Task Group (ACTAG) and the *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*, 1996. In November 1994, following the National Museums Workshop in Pretoria where the Museums South Africa (MUSA) report was rejected, the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology in the new

The NHRA in particular amalgamates all these into an assemblage called the national estate. It entrusts SAHRA, which replaced the National Monuments Council (NMC), with the mandate to safeguard, protect, preserve, and conserve the national estate. The Act explicates the national estate in sections, which SAHRA has adopted as its structure and operational framework, as follows:

*Section 32 and 33: heritage objects; section 34: structures or built environment; section 35: archaeology, palaeontology and meteorites; section 35: maritime and underwater cultural heritage section, provided that the protection of any wreck in the territorial waters and the maritime cultural zone shall be the responsibility of SAHRA; section 36: burial grounds and graves; section 37: public monuments and memorials; section 39: national inventory; section 13: Centre for Training, Research and Education.*³⁷

A striking feature of the ensemble, particularly as assembled for SAHRA, is the missing category of national monuments, or replacement of the term ‘national monument’ with ‘heritage site’.³⁸ In Section 34, ‘structures or built environment’ is assumed to accommodate monuments such as statues, which upon declaration acquire the term ‘national heritage site’. The development signifies a conceptual deconstruction of the existing marble, concrete, steel and bronze blocks and structures, so that they are thought of as sites. It invokes meanings of openness and versatile utility of an open memorial landscape. The development also signifies an inclination towards a memorial complex of symbolic rather than monumental commemorations.

‘government of national unity’ appointed and commissioned the Arts and Culture Task Group (ACTAG). Its mandate was to review the heritage legislation existing at the time and recommend reforms. In its very first report, ACTAG noted in the National Monuments Act (NMC) and within the work of NMC a “bias” towards conservation of ‘heritage’ associated with European colonists. The group subsequently recommended among other things ‘inclusivity’ to include for example, “graves of all victims of conflict in South Africa, from land struggles to wars and the struggle against apartheid”. The *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage* was a combination of ACTAG’s proposals, investigations by the Department of Arts and Culture, inputs from the writers of the *Draft White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage* and its Reference Group, and the Arts and Culture Ministry’s own views based on its understanding of the workings, possibilities and constraints facing the Government. See, the Arts and Culture Task Group (ACTAG), *Second Draft Report*, May 1995: 80–81, and the *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*.

37 National Heritage Resources Act No.25 of 1999.

38 National Heritage Resources Act, 1999, S 58 (1) (a).

Besides, as was the case with the NMC, SAHRA is not mandated to declare and erect monuments, but to preserve, conserve, and protect the already declared monuments. Its role is to preserve the already declared monuments dotting the country, and identify, grade, and declare more undeclared monuments deemed of national, provincial, and local significance through a three-tier system.³⁹ It is the Department of Arts and Culture (DAC), through the Legacy Projects⁴⁰ under its heritage promotion and preservation programme, that erects new monuments. Some DAC monuments are even erected outside the borders of South Africa.⁴¹ The National Heritage Council (NHC) established by the *National Heritage Council Act* (NHCA) of 1999, to develop, promote and protect the national heritage, and coordinate heritage management, has its contribution in this regard, through projects like the Liberation Heritage Project.⁴² Nonetheless, SAHRA contributes in the post-apartheid monumentalisation through its protection of burial grounds and grave sites, on which SAHRA erects monumental memorials. There is therefore a multiplicity and duplication of outlets at which monuments are conceived and realised.

Moreover, SAHRA's management scope overlaps into the mandate of the NHC in many respects. Just like SAHRA's heritage impact assessments

39 In terms of the *National Heritage Resources Act* the three-tier system is such that Grade I, II and III are sites of national, provincial and local significance respectively. It is the role of provincial heritage authorities to manage Grade II heritage resources, and the role of local heritage authorities to manage grade III heritage resources. Where a provincial or local authority is deemed incompetent, SAHRA must take the responsibility of managing the heritage resources within the ambit of the incompetent authority.

40 In 1996 the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) planned Legacy Projects to 'establish commemorative symbols of South Africa's history and to celebrate its heritage'. In 1998 the Cabinet approved and budgeted some seven million rand for the initial eight projects. These were the Women's Memorial, Ncome/Blood River Project, Samora Machel Monument, Albert Luthuli Museum, the Constitution Hill, the Freedom Park, Nelson Mandela Museum and the Khoisan Heritage Project.

41 These include the Matola Monument in Matola, Mozambique, and memorials on burial sites in Cuito Quanevale in Angola, the Vienna Camp in Angola, the Augustino Netto Memorial in Angola, the Liberation graves in Angola, the Nelson Mandela training Barracks in Ethiopia and Liberation Graves in Tanzania.

42 The NHC launched the Liberation Heritage Route Project as part of a bigger African Liberation Heritage Route project. The South African leg sought to the identify, recognise and develop people, communities, events, places, icons which had a significant impact on the South African struggle for liberation. See, Bialostocka, Olga. "Liberation Heritage Route: Reminiscent of the Painful Past or a Road to the Future?", *Policy Brief*, Africa Institute of South Africa, November 2013: 100.

overlap with the environmental impact assessment systems operated by different government departments, such as the Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) which is required in terms of the *National Environmental Management Act*, Act 107 of 1998, or of the *Environment Conservation Act*, Act 73 of 1989 and Environmental Management Plans (EMPs) required by the Department of Minerals and Energy. One notable result of the overlaps, duplication of roles, ambiguities and contradictions between the work of SAHRA, the NHC, DAC and other government departments, is frustrations and inefficiency among these agencies and institutions of heritage governance.⁴³

Nonetheless out of this paradox, effective collaborations have seen new post-apartheid monumental projects, implemented by DAC and declared by SAHRA, or implemented by SAHRA, endorsed by DAC and promoted by the NHC. Another example is the survey of monuments and memorials in public open spaces (squares and parks) in Bloemfontein, Cape Town and Pretoria, which SAHRA undertook, upon the request of DAC in 2003. This saw entry into the inventory of the national estate in the custodianship of SAHRA a few colonial monuments and towns. It is also through such collaborations that the NHC occasionally intervened in the protection of monuments subject to vandalism, as in the case of the Duncan Village Massacre Memorial erected by DAC. The NHC commissioned a study on the matter and held public hearings, albeit in the interest of promoting the liberation struggle.⁴⁴

However, the post-apartheid monumentalising processes are generally protracted, intricate, and involve multi-layered bureaucratic consultative procedures. Where the processes are bottom-up, they involve,

- expression of concerns or interests at the levels of individuals, families, concerned groups, local communities, and local authorities;

43 Manetsi, Thabo. *Can Intangibles be Tangible? Safeguarding Intangible Heritage in the New South Africa: Towards Formulating Policy for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Heritage*. Masters' Thesis. Cape Town: University of Cape Town, 2007.

44 Minkley, Gary. "A fragile inheritor: The post-apartheid memorial complex, A.C. Jordan and the re-imagining of cultural heritage in the Eastern Cape." *Kronos* 34, 2008.

- the processing of nominations, recommendations and applications by the institutions of heritage governance, including government Arts and Culture ministries, Provincial Heritage Resources Authorities (PHRAs), SAHRA, NHC and their multi-level professionals, experts and consultants;
- research and assessments of significance and state of conservation, consultation of various departments, stakeholders, experts and public participation of not less than 60 days, as required by multiple laws, policies and regulations; and
- multiple stages of planning, designing, procurement, tendering, and back and forth reporting, and implementation by professionals and service providers, followed by other multiple stages of reporting and accounting.⁴⁵

Where the processes are largely top-down as in the case of the Legacy Projects, the same network of applications applies, not in direct reverse but intermittently. Such is the heritage assemblage, structures, and systems, part of which is the monumental work performed and deployed variously by local heritage authorities, PHRAs, SAHRA, NHC, and DAC. Apparently, post-apartheid monumentalising processes primarily empower structured forms of memory and knowledge production, and dismember unstructured creativity and in many instances, counter-hegemony. There is such hierarchisation and prioritisation of selected memories and knowledges that many processes have rendered themselves irrelevant to, for example, those pursuing new socio-economic struggles by means different from the anti-apartheid struggles. It is because of such that the hashtag movement masses were by 2015 increasingly distrustful of, for example, the ‘doctrines and talk of neo-liberal racial democracy’, while public institutions continued to exclude different epistemologies of thought.⁴⁶ Indeed,

45 This is a summary of processes outlined in NHRA, *SAHRA Minimum Standards for Heritage Impact Assessments*, 2007 and *SAHRA Guidelines for Site Management Plans*.

46 Kamanzi, Brian. “Rhodes Must Fall – Decolonisation Symbolism – What is happening at UCT, South Africa?”

The Postcolonialist, 29 March, 2015. Accessed 18 August 2016, <http://postcolonialist.com/civil->

graffiti messages accompanying the troubling of statues such as, 'I stole your land so what?', 'End White Privilege', 'Fuck Rhodes', and 'a black woman raised me' embodied counter-hegemonic discourses. Beyond this interpretation, however, is another interpretation transcending the simple dichotomies that slot these messages and the resisting voices into categories like black, white, poor, privileged, official, and vernacular. To interpret a heritage practice so complex, I prefer this approach as it irradiates those knowledge/power negotiations and dynamics. It acknowledges the agency of the statue-climbing and statue-defending masses as heritage makers and monumentalist in their own regard, rather than simple counter or anti-heritage revolutionists as a wide scholarship and commentary suggest.

Analysing the troubling of statues

The 2015 flurry of defacement of monuments had interesting surprises and unintended consequences for both heritage policy workers and the contenders. It seemed like heritage policy makers and bodies of heritage governance were caught by surprise by the sheer lack of public awareness of how to go about heritage-ising. The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the NHC, Sonwabile Mancotywa admitted that there was a 'policy vacuum' and lack of public discourse and consultation. At the same time, he relentlessly insinuated his custodianship of some correct versions of pasts and histories, through utterances like 'South Africans need to be taught their history because the history they were taught was distorted'.⁴⁷ But the arguments about 'lack of discourse', 'lack of policy', or 'need for policy review' were tenuous, since some of the contestations affecting monuments arose amidst an abundance of public policy and discourse.

Consider, for example, public policy and discourse before and after the removal of the bust of Hendrik Verwoerd by Midvaal Municipality from the municipal offices in Meyerton. This occurred two weeks

discourse/rhodes-must-fall-decolonisation-symbolism-happening-uct-south-africa/
47 Sosiso, Kwanele. "Heritage Council on back foot as Rhodes falls". *Mail & Guardian Online*, 10 April, 2015. Accessed 12 July 2016, <http://mg.co.za/article/2015-04-09-statues-you-cant-obliterate-history>

before South Africa's 2011 local government elections, in the spate of the ANC's condemnations of the Democratic Alliance (DA) and its monumentalising tendencies. Two things particularly irritated Pieter Mulder from the Freedom Front Plus (FF+) about the 'untimely' removal of the bust. One was the kind of 'selective removal' that left the statues of Jan Van Riebeeck and Queen Victoria in Cape Town untouched. Another was an attempt to 'make history complete' by removing old statues instead of erecting new ones.⁴⁸

According to media reports the bust was removed for safe-keep/ing by 'its owner', the Kultuurraad vir Klipriviervallei/Cultural Council for Klip River Valley allied to the Afrikaner heritage organisation named Federasie van Afrikaanse Kultuurvereniginge (FAK)/Federation of Afrikaner Cultural Organisations.⁴⁹ In that case the removal of the bust was an act of defence and protection from a potential defacement. Even so, the removal was in contravention of Section 27 of the *National Heritage Resources Act* (NHRA), Act No. 25 of 1999, which prevented damaging or unlawful removal of public monuments of any local, provincial or national significance. In terms of Section 8 of NHRA, a permit to remove the bust should have been obtained through due processes from a local or provincial heritage authority. If any of these authorities was incompetent or incapacitated, as assessed by an authority or agent at a higher level, the higher authority such as PRHA-Gauteng in this case or SAHRA, should have regulated the removal or followed through with a penalty, fine or conviction. The process would have lasted at least two months to accommodate the 60-day minimum period required for public participation.

Yet there was a contradiction. As a heritage object, the 'owner' had responsibility to conserve the bust in accordance with Section 32(15) of the same Act.⁵⁰ What's more, according to Section 55, 'no person is liable

48 Mulder, Pieter. *Press statement*. 5 May, 2011. Accessed 12 September 2016, http://www.archivalplatform.org/news/entry/toppling_verwoerd/

49 Moeng, Katlego. "Verwoerd bust gone". *Sowetan Live*, 6 May, 2011. Accessed 12 September 2016, <http://www.sowetanlive.co.za/news/2011/05/06/verwoerd-bust-gone>

50 According to NHRA, Section 32, a heritage object could be publicly or privately owned.

in respect of anything done in terms of [NHRA] in good faith and without negligence'. Besides, SAHRA, PHRAs or the nameless local authorities generally exercised their powers as far as establishing principles, advising, assisting, and providing professional expertise, although NHRA empowers them to convict upon contravention. Thus, the removal of Verwoerd's bust was not just subject to different interpretations of the law, it affirmed the complexity of the power/knowledge dynamics playing out in the post-apartheid monumental complex.

In April 2015, in the spur of countrywide #RhodesMustFall protests, the bronze sentries at the feet of the statue of Paul Kruger in Church Square in Pretoria were splashed with green paint. In protest and defence of the statue, singer Sunnetta Bridges and others in the Red October Movement and the *Front Nasionaal* party gathered in Church Square on the morning of 8 April 2015. Bridges chained herself to the statue until the protesters were prevented from 'taking hold' of the statue by a police barricade. As the Red October Movement gained momentum in the rest of the country, its supporters in Cape Town and other groups such as the Boere Krisis Aksie and the Western Cape Action Forum, also gathered in defence of the statue of Jan van Riebeeck. Like Bridges, Johan Willemse of the Western Cape Action Forum chained himself to the statue.

Safeguarding one's heritage in such a manner was also in contravention of NHRA, in the same way as defacing was. Hence, SAHRA responded by warning against contravention of Section 27 of NHRA, while contradictorily choosing to avoid meddling in 'matters with political connotations'.⁵¹ In one of its official statements, SAHRA advised of the bureaucratic processes open to anyone wishing to see changes in the post-apartheid monumental landscape, including adding or removing monuments. The process, as outlined in various policy guidelines, involved submitting notices and applications to 'relevant heritage authorities and stake holders', together with heritage impact

51 Bernado, Carla. "Heritage Agency Condemns Statue Vandals". *Independent Online*, 10 April, 2015. Accessed 13 September 2016, <http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/heritage-agency-condemns-statue-vandals-1843400>

assessments and ensuring adequate public participation lasting at least 60 days. Heritage impact assessments necessitated attention to technical details, expertise, and time, the pleasure of which many individuals or groups disputing the monumental landscape had not.

Even so, it was not the inhibitive bureaucratic processes, or a heritage constantly barricaded by police that concerned heritage bodies like SAHRA. Their preoccupation was ensuring adherence to rules and achieving change of public attitudes and regulation of behaviours. Much time and resources were spent on carefully crafting regulations, guidelines, codes and procedures, and on parading model post-apartheid memorialisation through grand unveiling ceremonies, launches, commemorations, and award ceremonies. At the same time, the defacing episodes not only violated the rules but illuminated contradictions and ambiguities in the rules, the knowledges informing them, and the structures of their implementation. How then does one avert an easy reading of these events?

In the few examples cited in this chapter, ‘races’ sometimes exchanged places in the show of climbing and defending statues. The 2015 occurrences were often so spontaneous that commentators had a wide range of guesses. The actions were slotted into racial, ethnic or class categories and then packaged as issues specific to a category. As ‘black issues’, they were linked with frustrations over poor service delivery⁵²; a general failure of the government to see to the needs of ‘the people’; a lack of, or insufficient consultation with ‘the people’; opportunism; criminal elements; and even illiteracy.⁵³ As ‘white (specifically Afrikaner) issues’, the occurrences were associated with unwillingness to embrace change; the sore-loser syndrome; disruptive right-wing forces; and the add-on approach and its intrinsic flaws.⁵⁴

52 Kamanzi, Brian. “Rhodes Must Fall – Decolonisation Symbolism – What is happening at UCT, South Africa?” *The Postcolonialist*, 29 March, 2015. Accessed 18 August 2016, <http://postcolonialist.com/civil-discourse/rhodes-must-fall-decolonisation-symbolism-happening-uct-south-africa/>; Nyamnjoh, Francis B. “Black Pain Matters: Down with Rhodes”, *CODESRIA Bulletin*, 3-4, 2015: 74-93.

53 De Villiers, Ockert. “Steve Hofmeyr blames statue defacement on illiteracy”. *Mail & Guardian*, 8 April, 2015.

54 Baines, Gary. “The politics of public history in post-apartheid South Africa”. In *History*

So convenient were the simple explanations that even the agents of post-apartheid heritage governance took a ride and blamed vandalism of monuments and statues on the overdue heritage policy review and renewal of public participation.⁵⁵ There was a huge banking on heritage policy review and renewing public participation as some holy grail for an impeccable post-apartheid heritage monumentalisation.

Yet, the existing heritage policy emerged out of vigorous processes involving and an overhaul of apartheid policies through public participation, which lasted at least four years from the appointment of the Arts and Culture Task Group by the Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology in 1995 to the promulgation of NHRA in 1999. The new legislation reflected an obvious departure from many colonial forms of representation. Monuments fell into a body of strategic resources that could be utilised for nation-building and social cohesion. Indeed, the legislation established a practice sustained by the 20 transformation imperatives,⁵⁶ which effectively achieved the ‘othering’ of colonial statues, through its obvious inclination to anti-colonial pasts, histories and memories. Its new monumental projects were a taunting juxtaposition with colonial monuments, as it was the case with the gigantic Freedom Park versus the Voortrekker Monument. The possibilities that SAHRA would ‘identify’ and declare the undeclared colonial monuments as ‘national heritage sites’ were minimal, as the legislation transition had left many of them in the jurisdiction of largely incompetent local authorities, or as mere entries in the registries held by SAHRA.⁵⁷

Making and Present Day Politics: The meaning of Collective Memory in South Africa, edited by Hans Eric Stolten. Uppsala: Nordica Africa Institute, 2006; Baines, Gary. “Site of Struggle: the Freedom Park Fracas and the Divisive Legacy of South Africa’s Border War/Liberation Struggle.” *Social Dynamics* 35, 2: 2009: 330–344.

55 Mancotywa, Sonwabile. *Critical Conversations About Heritage: Popularising Contemporary Heritage Issues*, edited by Denver Webb A. National Heritage Council, 2014.

56 The transformation imperatives were, human rights, freedom of expression, access, equity, redress, nation-building, multilingualism, diversity, autonomy, arms-length, participation, accountability, transparency, conservation, achievement, innovation, co-operation, exchange, security, and sustainability. See, ACTAG *Final Report*, 1994, *White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage*, 1996 and the *National Heritage Resources Act*, 1999.

57 Interestingly, the NMC had ‘forgotten’ to declare the Voortrekker Monument. It was only in 2011 that SAHRA declared the monument a national heritage site.

Notwithstanding this, Minkley has observed that 22 years into ‘democracy’ ‘the centrifugal heritage claims of diversity and multiculturalism seen reduced by the continuing presence of the real tangible signs of the existing visible built ‘South Africanism’ of the white settler ‘national estate’.⁵⁸ Despite all claims and pageants of newness, there is a taunting presence of the ‘old’ in the monumental landscape. While this is largely due to a ‘strategic’ retention of colonial monuments, it is also because the ‘new’ is to a great degree similar to the settler heritage in form and approach.

Reproducing the ‘old’

To a great extent, post-apartheid memorialisation manifests the ‘old’ ways of knowing and understanding pasts and histories. Firstly, the ‘new’ memorials primarily fail to deconstruct persistent hierarchical binary oppositions based on ideas of racial difference and timeless African cultures and traditions. Persistent utilisation of colonial categories like tribe in the constructions of, for example, monuments to Shaka, Chief Makhado, the Battle of Ncome/Blood River, Duncan Village Massacre Memorial, draws from forms of romance that fed into the settler notions of imperial conquests and *erfenis*. Also, the post-apartheid repatriation of human remains, identification of missing dead bodies, the rehabilitation of heroes’ graves, and the symbolic and physical memorialisations that goes with, are often not critical of knowledge generated by disciplines like forensic anthropology and archaeology. The remains of Sara Baartman and Klaas and Troy Pienaar for instance, although repatriated, reburied, and memorialised through grand ceremonies, were returned to the same categories that in the past rendered them subjects and objects of degrading scrutiny in the name of science.⁵⁹ They were returned as Bushmen and memorialised as such.

58 Minkley, Gary. “A fragile inheritor: The post-apartheid memorial complex, A.C. Jordan and the re-imagining of cultural heritage in the Eastern Cape.” *Kronos* 34, 2008: 24.

59 Rassool, Ciraj. 2015. “Human Remains, the Disciplines of the Dead, and the South African Memorial Complex”. In *The Politics of Heritage in Africa: Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, edited by Peterson, Derek R., Gavua, Kodzo and Rassool, Ciraj. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015: 145.

Secondly, the practice is ambivalent in the sense that on the one hand, it privileges the so-called living heritage through the superior powers and financial resources vested on the NHC, which include making policy and advising the Minister of Arts and Culture. On the other hand, it strives to catch-up or even supersede the apartheid regime in erecting monuments. As it was for the NMC, 'opportunity for far more creative and productive approach to memorialising cultural significance' is lost to 'costly large impenetrable blocks of black marble, massive concrete or steel structures'.⁶⁰ As seen in the examples cited in this chapter, even the newest and grandest of these could not deter the masses from contesting the monumental landscape.

Thirdly, the practice is more contradictory and productive of contestations than the harmonising unity in diversity it purports. While the post-apartheid heritage practice appears progressive and steering to new directions, its ambivalence in many areas apprehends the functionality of its apparatuses. Baines for example, notes that framing a master-narrative by selecting usable pasts for something called national identity and collective memory, while ignoring sub-national, ethnic, local and even family identities is ambivalent.⁶¹ Another ambivalence to note stems from the permissive nature and outlook of the practice. It is in the 'strategy' of not obscuring, relegating or destroying many features of the 'old' monumental landscape, which effectively renders the modern post-apartheid state and its preferred features visible to its citizenry. Indeed, the features of the 'old' left untouched are – for the benefit of the state – rallying points for a collectivised public to celebrate the defeat of an ugly past. But this also works contrariwise, in that the same symbols become rallying points for expressing discontentment with the state, regarding what some perceived as incomplete or botched transformation, and selective historicisation and heritagisation by the state departments institutions and agents.

60 Buchli, Victor & Gavin Lucas. *Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past*. London: Routledge, 2001: 90.

61 Baines, Gary. "The politics of public history in post-apartheid South Africa." In *History Making and Present Day Politics: The meaning of Collective Memory in South Africa*, edited by Hans Eric Stolten. Uppsala: Nordica Africa Institute, 2006: 173-176.

It is this progressive, yet regressive approach that artists like Beezy Bailey and Sithembile Msezane have drawn attention to. Bailey's daring refiguring of colonial statues, including dressing and making-up the statue of Louis Botha outside the parliament in Cape Town as a Xhosa male initiate, earned him death threats from 'passing Afrikaners'.⁶² The installation came across as unacceptably progressive for blurring the venerated fixed racial and cultural boundaries, but also unacceptably regressive for invigorating ostracized symbols of colonial domination.⁶³ The question of who was regressive between Bailey and the defenders of Louis Botha's statue is valid, and it highlights the complexity of the statue as a heritage piece. The heated reaction to Bailey's installation is comparable with Maximo Caminero's smashing of a vase displayed by Miami Art Museum, as a protest against 'the museum's failure to display works of local artists'. The act raised valid questions about who the vandal was between Caminero and Ai Weiwei, the artist who had appropriated the Han Dynasty urn and painted on it.⁶⁴

More than 10 years later, another artist Sithembile Msezane attracted both praise, humiliation and for her art performances, which involved dressing up provocatively and standing still for hours on plinths next to some of the highly contested monuments. Msezane turned herself into a living juxtaposition with the contested memorials, as an invitation for people to think about why such monuments had to 'fall'.⁶⁵ While Bailey and Msezane's statue-troubling was of a different kind, their works irradiated a memorial landscape that seemingly opened

62 Mbita, Tarzan. "Artist Beezy threatened over Xhosa Louis Botha". Beezy Bailey Press, 2015. Accessed 19 April 2015, <http://home.intekom.com/beezybailey/new/press/abakw/abakw.htm>

63 Tshabalala, Sibusiso and Botha Nadine. "8 things to do with unwanted statues and monuments". *Cape Town Partnership*, 31 March, 2015. Accessed 19 April 2015, <http://www.capetownpartnership.co.za/2015/03/7-things-to-do-with-unwanted-statues/>

64 See Jones, Jonathan. "Who's the vandal: Ai Weiwei or the man who smashed his Han urn?" *The Guardian*, 18 February 2014. Accessed 23 August 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/jonathanjonesblog/2014/feb/18/ai-weiwei-han-urn-smash-miami-art>.

65 Sethembile, Msezane. Interview with Buist, Erica. "Sethembile Msezane performs at the fall of the Cecil Rhodes statue". *The Guardian Online*, 19 April, 2015. Accessed 10 August 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/may/15/sethembile-msezane-cecil-rhodes-statue-cape-town-south-africa>

itself to open and ongoing construal, and yet offered an impression of decisiveness to the satisfaction of some.

Lastly, there are striking similarities between apartheid heritage designed to achieve governmentality of citizenry by means of suppressing, taming and othering, which resulted in 'blacks' climbing the statue of Kruger and 'whites' defending it in 1989, and the post-apartheid memorial practices. This is because the latter, corresponds with the former as it contradictorily straddles heritage between on the one hand, democratisation, an exhibitionary kind of open access, and unlimited creativity, and on the other hand, governmentality through regulation. The practice occasionally leans more to the former than the latter, and on other occasions, more of the latter than the former. The product of such ambiguity is therefore no less than another ambiguity such as the masses' occasional outbursts, which at one stage trouble statues to draw attention to the present, and at another stage uphold statues in advancement of selected pasts.

It also suffices to point out that such struggles have such agency as to transcend ordinary classifications as counter, alternative, vernacular, unofficial, or unauthorised. To make heritage is to choose whether or not to preserve, and what and how to preserve. It is in that light that climbing, defending or removing statues can be considered an act of memorialising, similar to constructing or erecting statues. Such acts contribute layers of complexity to the post-apartheid memorial complex. It is these surprises and unintended consequences that constantly prompt institutions of heritage governance and policy makers to want to review heritage legislation and re-design avenues of public consultation and participation.

In conclusion

The post-apartheid heritage practice is complex. Its sphere encompasses a wide range of sites, objects and places, as well as bodies, institutions, processes, practices, disciplines, and approaches. It is

complex in terms of size and gridded structure, and is complex in terms of the sophistication of its processes. With regards to monuments, the broad sphere ostensibly permits and even encourages massive memorialisation, while the bureaucratic structures through which the practice is governed can be considered inhibiting. The purpose of this chapter has been to evaluate the recent troubling of South Africa's statues in relation to the nature of this post-apartheid memorial complex. I have argued that while the monumentalising practice might seem simply hegemonic and driven by dominant ideologies, it is far more complex than a simple matter of hegemony versus alternative discourses, categories and binaries. I have shown that the practice seems well ordered, structured and well managed, yet excessive, contradictory, disorderly and unfulfilling. Heritage products like monuments are visual manifestations of layers of interspersed ideas and meanings. Therefore, their ever so often troubling should draw our attention to these layers and intersections than some imagined entities of absolute power.

Bibliography

Baines, Gary.

"The politics of public history in post-apartheid South Africa." In *History Making and Present Day Politics: The meaning of Collective Memory in South Africa*, edited by Hans Eric Stolten. Uppsala: Nordica Africa Institute, 2006.

Baines, Gary.

"Site of Struggle: the Freedom Park Fracas and the Divisive Legacy of South Africa's Border War/Liberation Struggle." *Social Dynamics* 35, 2, 2009: 330-344.

Bennett, Tony.

"The Exhibitionary Complex." *New Formations*, 4, 1988.

Bernado, Carla. Heritage Agency Condemns Statue Vandals. *Independent Online*, 10 April, 2015. Accessed 13 September 2016, <http://www.iol.co.za/news/politics/heritage-agency-condemns-statue-vandals-1843400>

Bialostocka, Olga.

"Liberation Heritage Route: Reminiscent of the Painful Past or a Road to the Future?" *Policy Brief*, Africa Institute of South Africa, 100, 2013.

Bucher, Jesse W.

Arguing Biko: Evidence of the Body in the Politics of History. 1977 to the Present. PhD dissertation. Minnesota: University of Minnesota, 2010.

Buchli, Victor & Lucas, Gavin.

Archaeologies of the Contemporary Past. London: Routledge, 2001.

Sethembile, Msezane.

Interview with Buist, Erica. "Sethembile Msezane performs at the fall of the Cecil Rhodes statue". *The Guardian Online*, 19 April, 2015. Accessed 10 August 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/may/15/sethembile-msezane-cecil-rhodes-statue-cape-town-south-africa>

Coombes, Annie E.

"Translating the past: apartheid monuments in post-apartheid South Africa." In *Hybridity and its discontents: Politics, Science and Culture*, edited by Avtar Brah & Annie E. Coombes. London: Routledge, 2000.

Coombes, Annie E.

History after apartheid: visual culture and public memory in a democratic South Africa. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Crais, Clifton & Scully, Pamela,.

2009. *Sara Baartman and the Hottentot Venus: A Ghost Story and a Biography.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

De Villiers, Ockert.

"Steve Hofmeyr blames statue defacement on illiteracy". *Mail & Guardian*, 8 April, 2015.

Foucault, Michel.

The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language. Pantheon Books: New York, 1972.

Frescura, Franco.

"National of Nationalist? A Critique of the National Monuments Council, 1936-1989." In *Proceedings of the National Urban Conservation Symposium, University of Witwatersrand, 12-14 July 1991*, edited by Derek Japha & Vivienne Japha. Cape Town: Oakville Press, 1991.

Frescura, Franco.

Who Needs Monuments? *Juta's SA Journal of Property* 5, 2, 1989.

Grundlingh, Albert M.

A cultural conundrum? Old monuments and new regimes: The Voortrekker monument as symbol of Afrikaner power in a postapartheid South Africa. *Radical History Review* 81, 2001.

Government Gazette, No. 30987, 25 April 2008.

Hall, Andrew & Lillie, Ashley.

The National Monuments Council and a policy for providing protection for the cultural and environmental heritage. Paper presented at Myths, Monuments, Museums: New Premises Conference. University of the Witwatersrand, history workshop, 16-18 July, 1992.

Hlongwane, Ali Khangela.

"Commemoration, memory and monuments in the contested language of black liberation: The South African experience." *Journal of Pan African Studies* 2, 4, 2008.

Jethro, Duane.

"An African story of creation: heritage formation at Freedom Park, South Africa." *Material Religion* 9, 3, 2013.

Jethro, Duane.

"Freedom Park, A Heritage Destination: Tour-guiding and visitor experience at a post-apartheid heritage site." *Tourist Studies* 16, 4, 2016.

Jones, Jonathan.

"Who's the vandal: Ai Weiwei or the man who smashed his Han urn?" *The Guardian*, 18 February 2014. Accessed 23 August 2018, <https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/jonathanjonesblog/2014/feb/18/ai-weiwei-han-urn-smash-miami-art>

Kamanzi, Brian.

"Rhodes Must Fall – Decolonisation Symbolism – What is happening at UCT, South Africa?" *The Postcolonialist*, 29 March, 2015. Accessed 18 August 2016, <http://postcolonialist.com/civil-discourse/rhodes-must-fall-decolonisation-symbolism-happening-uct-south-africa/>

King, Tony. & Flynn, M.K.

"Heritage and the post-apartheid city: Constitution Hill, Johannesburg." *International Journal of Heritage Studies* 18, 1, 2012.

Kros, Cynthia.

"Rhodes Must Fall: archives and counter-archives". *Journal of Critical Arts: South-North Cultural and Media Studies*, 29, 2015.

Mancotywa, Sonwabile.

National Heritage Council and its role, achievements and commitment to promoting cultural diversity museums in South Africa. Address made at the opening of the Inclusive Museum Conference held at the University of Witwatersrand, 2011.

Mancotywa, Sonwabile.

Critical Conversations About Heritage: Popularising Contemporary Heritage Issues, edited by Denver, Webb A. National Heritage Council, 2014.

Manetsi, Thabo.

Can Intangibles be Tangible? Safeguarding Intangible Heritage in the New South Africa: Towards Formulating Policy for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Living Heritage. Masters' Thesis. Cape Town: University of Cape Town, 2007.

Mare, Estelle Alma.

"Monumental complexity: searching for the meaning of a selection of South African monuments". *South African Journal of Art History* 22, 2007.

Marschall, Sabine.

"Gestures of compensation: post-apartheid monuments and memorials". *Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa*, 55, 2004.

Marschall, Sabine.

"Reordering the Past: Monuments and Architectural Heritage in Post-Apartheid South Africa". *Repenser les limites: l'architecture à travers l'espace, le temps et les disciplines*, INHA Paris, 2005.

Marschall, Sabine.

"Struggle Heroes: Constructing a Genealogy for the New South Africa". *International Journal of Heritage Studies*., 2006.

Marschall, Sabine.

Landscape of Memory: Commemorating Monuments, Memorials and Public Statuary in Post-apartheid South Africa, Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Marschall, Sabine.

"Commemorating the Trojan Horse Massacre in Cape Town: the Tensions between Vernacular and Official Expressions of Memory". *Visual Studies*, 25, 2010.

Marschall, Sabine.

"Targeting Statues: Monument Vandalism as an Expression of Sociopolitical Protest in South Africa. *African Studies Review*, 60, 3, 2017:203-219.

Mbita, Tarzan.

"Artist Beezy threatened over Xhosa Louis Botha". *Beezy Bailey Press*, 2015. Accessed 19 April 2015, <http://home.intekom.com/beezybailey/new/press/abakw/abakw.htm>

Meents, Tamara Leora.

Deconstructing museums and monuments in pre and post-apartheid South Africa. Masters' Thesis. South Africa: University of South Africa, 2009.

Minkley, Gary.

"A fragile inheritor: The post-apartheid memorial complex, A.C. Jordan and the re-imagining of cultural heritage in the Eastern Cape." *Kronos* 34, 2008.

Minkley, Gary & Mnyaka, Phindezwa.

"Seeing Beyond the Official and the Vernacular: The Duncan Village Massacre Memorial and the Politics of Heritage in South Africa". In: Peterson, Derek R., Gavua, Kodzo & Rassool, Ciraj (eds.). *The Politics of Heritage in Africa: Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Moeng, Katlego.

"Verwoerd Bust Gone". *Sowetan Live*, 6 May, 2011. Accessed 12 September 2016, <http://www.sowetanlive.co.za/news/2011/05/06/verwoerd-bust-gone>

Mulder, Pieter.

Press statement. 5 May, 2011. Accessed 12 September 2016, http://www.archivalplatform.org/news/entry/toppling_verwoerd/

Nyamnjoh, Francis B.

"Black Pain Matters: Down with Rhodes", *CODESRIA Bulletin*, 3-4, 2015, 74-93.

Rassool, Ciraj.

"Human Remains, the Disciplines of the Dead, and the South African Memorial Complex". In *The Politics of Heritage in Africa: Economies, Histories and Infrastructures*, edited by Peterson, Derek R., Gavua, Kodzo, and Rassool, Ciraj. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

Robertson, Iain J.M.

Heritage from Below: Heritage, Culture and Identity. Surrey: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2012.

Ryan, Rebecca.

"Truth and Healing: The Death of Steve Biko in South Africa's Truth Commission Special Report Television Series". *Southern African Digital South African History*, 2015. Accessed 28 May 2018, <http://dhsouthafrica.leadr.msu.edu/research-papers/truth-and-healing-the-death-of-steve-biko-in-south-africas-truth-commission-special-report-television-series/>

Sosibo, Kwanele.

"Heritage Council on back foot as Rhodes falls". *Mail & Guardian Online*, 10 April, 2015. Accessed 12 July 2016, <http://mg.co.za/article/2015-04-09-statues-you-cant-obliterate-history>

Smith, Janet.

"Monument to Biko". *Mail & Guardian Online*, 5 September, 1997. Accessed 12 July 2016, <https://mg.co.za/article/1997-09-05-monument-to-biko>

Smith, Laurajane.

Uses of Heritage. Oxon: Routledge, 2006.

Thotse, Mahunele.

"Contesting Names and Statues: Battles over the Louis Trichardt and Makhado City-text in Limpopo Province, South Africa." *Kronos* 36, 2010.

Tshabalala, Sibusiso and Botha, Nadine.

"8 things to do with unwanted statues and monuments". *Cape Town Partnership*, 31 March, 2015. Accessed 19 April 2015, <http://www.capetownpartnership.co.za/2015/03/7-things-to-do-with-unwanted-statues/>

Van Rensburg, Marissa & Tom, Siyabulela.

"UCT can remove Rhodes statue: ANCYL WCape". *Politicsweb*, 7 April, 2015. Accessed 22 August 2016, <http://www.politicsweb.co.za/party/uct-can-remove-rhodes-statue-ancyl-wcape>

Van Vuuren, Chisto J.

"The intricacy of intangible cultural heritage: some perspectives on Ndebele earthen architecture". *South African Journal of Art History* 23, 2, 2008.

Witz, Leslie & Rassool, Ciraj.

"Making Histories". *Kronos* 34, 2008.

Wren, Christopher S.

"Pretoria Stops Anti-Apartheid March". *Special to The New York Times*, September 24, 1989. Accessed 10 May 2016, <http://www.nytimes.com/1989/09/24/world/pretoria-stops-anti-apartheid-march.html>