REFRAMING REMEMBRANCE: THE POLITICS OF THE CENTENARY COMMEMORATION OF THE SOUTH AFRICAN WAR OF 1899-1902

Albert Grundlingh

University of Stellenbosch

The passage from the 20th to the 21st century was an occasion to recall one of South Africa's most devastating wars. The British scorched earth policy during the latter part of the conflict reduced the republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State almost to a wasteland. Boer women and children who died by the thousands in the hastily constructed British concentration camps to house those being swept from the veld, far outnumbered republican battlefield casualties and constituted about ten percent of the total Boer population. Moreover, the war involved all groups in South Africa and had a significant social and political impact on black people. It was indeed a war that had the potential to be remembered, even a hundred years later.

What has been called the "cult of centenary", has become increasingly important in "perpetuating, revising or creating public perceptions of past events and people." [1] A centenary becomes even more potent if it deals with dramatic events such as wars. Much academic work relating to the processes of remembrance has focused on war and collective memory. Enquiries in this area have usually revolved around a cluster of questions as Martin Evans and Ken Lunn have indicated:

> What are the function and place of historical memories of war? How do they relate to concepts of national identity? How have the memories of war been constructed? What have been the contours of these memories and how have they altered over time? How do memories of war circulate and how are they transmitted from one generation to the next? How are memories of war constructed in terms of race, gender and class? [2]

This paper does not pretend to deal fully with such a formidable range of questions. Its main aim is to analyse the dynamics of commemoration, bearing in mind that the contours of remembrance have been substantially revised through major political changes in South Africa. Of particular importance is to explore the way in which the political dimension in itself, in various guises, helped to give shape and form to the commemorations.

---

[1] R Quinault, "The cult of the centenary, c.1784-1914", **Historical Research,** LXXI,176, October 1998, p 303.

[2] M Evans and K Lunn (eds.) **War and Memory in the twentieth century** (Oxford,1997), xvi.

The state and commemoration of the war

The advent of the centenary of the war was marked by considerable ambiguity in African National Congress (ANC) circles. The public representation of the war, as a seminal event in Afrikaner history, had a long association with sectarian nationalist politics. Moreover, it was not a war which was made to loom large in the memory of black oppositional groupings under apartheid; they had more than sufficient other armoury in their ideological arsenal to draw upon for historical legitimization.[3] The question then arises why a new government should wish to help commemorate a war that has been a white public reserve for the greater part of the century.

For the predominantly white National Party, whose support base included many Afrikaners who could claim a direct historical interest in the war, there was no doubt that the event should be commemorated. Apart from the significance of the war for Afrikaners as such, it was argued that the war was the biggest colonial conflict in Africa and therefore had a significantly wider reach. Afrikaner spokespeople took umbrage that the ANC "wants us to forget all together. But we won't. It is an opportunity to place the country's history in perspective." [4] Overseas interest in the event was mounting, it was claimed, whilst through the inertia of the ANC government, commemorations could not be properly planned.

The initial indecision of the state on the matter led to some strange prohibitions. At Bloemfontein during a show in March 1998 to promote tourism in the Free State, a planned war exhibition was vetoed by the local legislature on the grounds that it was too "sensitive." The exhibition would have consisted of British uniforms, the Union Jack, the old Free State republican flag and for the sake of inclusivity a variety of African drums. The person responsible for the exhibition deliberately refrained from portraying a Boer fighter, as she was apprehensive that it might be regarded as offensive. She was too timid; it was not, so it transpired, the nature of her exhibition that irked the local authorities, but the fact that at the time no official decision was taken as to whether the state would put its weight behind the commemorations.[5]

It was only towards the end of 1998 that the state decided through a cabinet decision to support the centenary. For the Department of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology (DACST) an alternative was to play down or officially ignore the event. The risk, however, it was argued, was that the commemorations might have developed their own

[3] B Nasson , "Commemorating the Anglo-Boer War in post-apartheid South Africa", **Radical History Review**, 78, 2000, 150. See also T Lodge, "Charters from the past: the African National Congress and its historiographical traditions", **Radical History Review**, 46/7, 1990/91,161.

[4] **Die Burger**, 12 May 1998, "Wes-Kaap sal oorlog herdenk (Translation) **.** See also **Beeld**, 10 September, "NP wil regering betrokke hê by oorlog"; **Rapport,** 3 May 1998, "Staat erken nog nie eeufees."

[5] **Die Volksblad**, 11 March 1998", Anglo-Boereoorlog is te sensitief vir Bloemfontein"; **Die Volksblad**, 2 March 1998, "Kenner verstom oor verbod op uitstalling".

dynamics, not unlike the 1938 Voortrekker centenary celebrations which saw a massive mobilization of Afrikaners across class and other divides. Although such a possibility, given the dramatically different circumstances between 1938 and 1999, was rather remote, the spectre of spirited right wing Afrikaner resistance kept preying on the minds of those in power. The other option was that the decision should be left to the individual provinces, but a strong counter argument was that the provinces lacked the necessary capacity to undertake a project of this kind. The possibility of embarrassingly contradictory interpretations emerging from the provinces as to what the centenary is supposed to mean in a new dispensation, was considered a further risk. The decision then was to adopt the commemorations as a national legacy project, alongside other initiatives such as the Nelson Mandela museum, the Constitutional Court in Johannesburg and Freedom Park in Pretoria.[6]

Besides these considerations it also has to be borne in mind that the centenary was the first major heritage event to be marked under an ANC government. Moreover, it promised to attract international attention, particularly as the advent of commemorations was to overlap with the Commonwealth conference to be held in South Africa at much the same time. Many commonwealth countries, of course, participated in the war and this provided further impetus for the ANC to highlight the passing of a colonial world and to put the spotlight on the new incumbents of power.

Over the years the years the memory of the war has congealed into a particularly solid body of cultural and historical understanding and the government might well have wished for more pliable material to work with. The timing of the centenary could obviously not be changed, but the state could still try and leave its imprint on the commemorative proceedings. Ministers and directors of arts and culture in the various provinces were advised to take a particular interest in the event so as "to broaden its representation."[7] Government also made its influence felt by renaming the war as the Anglo-Boer South African War;[8] a clumsy composite of names that had little chance of being generally accepted. The Anglo-Boer War, a more traditional name for the war, proved difficult to dislodge in the public mind. Most scholars, though, preferred the term "South African War" to indicate that all groupings in the country were affected.

The National Party in pressurizing the ANC in 1998 to take a stand on the centenary had hoped that the state would be involved as a facilitator in supporting the event, but that it would refrain from exerting control.[9] The arrangement was not to be that simple.

---

[6] G Dominy and L Callinicos, "Is there anything to celebrate? Paradoxes of policy: and examination of the state's approach to commemorating South Africa's most ambitious struggle", **South African Historical Journal**, 41, November 1999, pp 389-391. See also **Rapport**, 18 June 1998, "Regering en oorlogsherdenking".

[7] Dominy and Callinicos, "Paradoxes", p 396.

[8] DACTS notes on government programme for the commemoration of the centenary of the Anglo-Boer War, Octtober 1999. (In private posession).

[9] **Die Burger**, 12 September 1998, "Regering moet nou alles insit om ABO herdenking te laat slaag"

Although civil society was to be allowed a certain latitude, once the state had decided to participate it could not afford to be outflanked and had to give a particular emphasis to proceedings.

This much became clear when the War Museum of the Boer republics in Bloemfontein which since 1994 had played a leading role in planning the commemorations, suddenly found itself under siege. Advisors close DACTS had some appreciation for the fact that the institution was aware of the need for a re-interpretation of the war and that it has also sponsored research into black participation in the war, but ultimately, "given the previous ethos and uncertain institutional positioning of the museum, it is perhaps not the most effective institution to drive the process."[10]

With little regard for the museum work that has been patiently and assiduously performed since 1931, much of it voluntarily, the state moved in under the banner of restructuring and transformation. As the museum received a subsidy from the state, it was financially vulnerable. But the state did not use an economic weapon; it targeted the museum council. The existing council was not opposed to adjusting their composition after consultation, but that was not enough. With the stroke of a pen the entire composition was swiftly and drastically changed. Predominantly Zulu speakers, with no or little knowledge of the war, were imported from Kwa-Zulu Natal to fill six of the nine positions on the council. The original council was decimated; only three members from the Free State who had a direct and longstanding interest in the work of the museum were allowed to remain.[11] Not surprisingly, this development gave rise to considerable dissatisfaction on the part of the museum establishment. The impression was created, it was argued, that the state " wished to deny Afrikaners even their own memories and sentiments related to key events in their history."[12]

The museum hierarchy decided to retaliate. Having their representation on the council slashed to an absolute minority and having members without the necessary expertise unilaterally foisted upon them on the eve of the commemorations, were considered ill advised if not perverse. They prepared a court interdict against the relevant minister, Ben Ngubane, in which he was accused of not applying his mind to the matter and being unduly influenced by officials with "irrelevant, ideological and prejudiced motives."[13] Wiser counsels then prevailed and the matter was settled out of court with a new board consisting of seven members appointed by the minister and seven by the museum.

---

[10] Dominy and Callinicos, "Paradoxes", 396.
[11] **Beeld,** 22 April 1999, "Nuwe herrie oor museum"; **Beeld**, 29 April 1999, "Minister, oorlogsmuseum skik oor raad."
[12] **Beeld**, 19 April 1999, "Twyfel heers oor maghebbers se siening van Afrikaners" (Translation).
[13] Court Papers, Supreme Court of South Africa, Case 99/1457, 9 April 1999, War Museum vs Minister of Arts, Culture, Science and Technology. (Translation).

The official launch of the centenary commemorations was planned to take place in the Free State. Initially a large sports stadium in Bloemfontein was considered as a venue. However, the plan was rejected and the reasons for not following through reflected the state's anxiety about publicly moving into uncharted cultural waters. DACST advisors made these reservations clear:

> There is a strong possibility that a public event will not turn out the way the organizers designed it. The ABSAW is not yet seen by the majority of black South Africans as a significant event in their history and there is a strong possibility that the crowd in the stadium will be very small, despite the presence of the president. Another possibility is (particularly if there is little black participation) that the event may be used as a rallying focus for right wing minorities.

In the light of this, a "more appropriate form for the launch" was considered to be a "small elite event with a high media presence."[14] The masses, so it seems, could not always be relied upon.

Eventually it was decided to have a launch just outside Brandfort, a small town north of Bloemfontein. It was ostensibly a suitable place as there were war graves of Boer and British combatants, as well, it was claimed, of a black concentration camp victim. Brandfort is also the town where Winnie Mandela, the former wife of Nelson Mandela, was held under house arrest by the apartheid government, but whether this also fed into the choice of venue is conjectural.[15]

The launch indeed turned out to be a grand affair as seven luxury air-conditioned busses left Bloemfontein on Saturday 9 October, followed by a cooling truck with refreshments, cooldrinks and mineral water for the hordes of ambassadors, politicians, invited guests and hangers-on.[16] Clearly, the launch was not meant to be a re-enactment of what happened a century ago when a solitary Boer fighter might have left his family and homestead on his trusty steed with provisions for thirty days to join his comrades on commando.

The crowd who gathered at Brandfort was predominantly black, comprising many school children. They gathered some distance from the dignitaries congregated at the fenced off podiums. Conspicuous by their absence were the whites who traditionally attended public ceremonies of this kind in the halcyon days of Afrikaner nationalism. As one journalist observed:

---

[14] Undated DACT notes on government program for the commemoration on the centenary of the Anglo-Boer War. (In private possession)
[15] http//woza oct 1999/ 25.htlm, "Whose remembering the war ?
[16] **Die Volksblad**, 11 October 1999, "Party bly weg omdat regering herdenking kaap".

> Nary to be seen were the bearded, solid pipe-smoking Afrikaners of yore in velskoens, slouch hats and colourful "kappies" and Voortrekker dresses. Nowhere in sight was a Vierkleur or even a venerable ox-wagon. Instead, virtually the only white man in view were the substantial numbers of uniformed police and military personnel who lined the perimeters of the various ceremonial sites – and, of course, a smattering of gorgeously attired members of the diplomatic community.[17]

The appearance of President Thabo Mbeki was met with shouts of "Amandla Baba" and shrill ululation. Not everything proceeded as planned. There were shouts of glee when a burly white sergeant- major slipped and fell as he clambered to a vantage look-out point on a rocky outcrop. But this was followed by a respectful silence as "Baba" himself raised an admonishing hand.[18] It is somewhat doubtful how many of the crowd had a fair grasp as to what they were supposed to commemorate. Many had just come to see Mbeki and others with placards thought it was the opportune time to make known some more pressing concerns: "We beg our second black president to alleviate the poverty in Brandfort."[19]

A distinct African flavour was added to the occasion in an unmistakeable attempt of symbolic inversion by having young black girls dressed up in white bonnets and Voortrekker dresses to represent Boer women, and black boys were put on display in red coats and bobby helmets to represent British soldiers. "While one must presume that the intention was not to be comic," a bemused historian commented, "this outlandish spectacle certainly took some planning imagination."[20]

Mbeki's oratory was to be the high point of proceedings. In a speech finely crafted for the occasion he hit all the right notes; paying homage to all those who fell, emphasizing the importance of black participation and dwelling on the need to use the past in a positive way for nation building purposes. Complete with a couple of Afrikaans sentences added in praise of the "dapper boerevegters" (brave boer fighters), his pleas for reconciliation in the aftermath of strife were well received by the Afrikaans press.[21] Equally well received was the Duke of Kent's speech, on behalf of the British government. It came as close as British reserve would allow to presenting South Africans with a public apology for the loss of women and children in the camps.[22]

The potential impact of these speeches, however, was somewhat blunted through planning oversights, deliberate or otherwise, which contrasted badly with the nation

---

[17] **The Citizen**, 11 October 1999, "SA War remembered in different style".
[18] **The Citizen**, 11 October 1999, " SA War remembered in different style."
[19] **Die Volksblad**, 11 October 1999, "Party bly weg omdat regering herdenking kaap."(Translation).
[20] Nasson, "Commemorating", pp 155-157.
[21] **Business Day**, 11 October 1999, "Mbeki praises Boer fighters"; **Beeld,** 12 October 1999, "Versoening"; **Die Burger,** 12 October 1999 "Oorlog en versoening".
[22] http//www. afrika.nl/news/09.10.99.htlm. Text of speech.

building rhetoric of Mbeki. The organisers neglected to invite an Afrikaner representative to the podium, ostensibly because the Boer republics no longer existed and therefore a suitable representative could not be found. This questionable defence only rankled Afrikaners further; it was like having a wedding without a bride they retorted. When wreaths had to be laid on Boer graves, the director of the War Museum had to be hastily summoned.[23] It is for this reason, it was claimed, that the white inhabitants of Brandfort stayed well clear of proceedings. A spokesman said:

> The government hijacked the commemoration of the war between Boer and Brit. The Duke of Kent passed by, giving us a royal wave and was afforded the opportunity to speak. A descendant of the Boers, however, was not allowed to pay tribute to the Boers. The descendants of the Boers feel that their faces have been pushed in the mud. Some of them even regarded it as the final victory for the British.[24]

The launch was not only less inclusive and representative than history would have dictated, but also more carefully stage-managed than what it appeared. It transpired that the grave of what was supposed to be the black concentration camp inmate which Mbeki paid tribute to, was actually that of a farm worker buried at the time of the war. Authentic black concentration graves were two kilometers away. The director general of DACST virtually admitted that they were aware of this, but "that it would have spoiled the ideal of single commemorative event in one place ---."[25] The matter gave rise to considerable controversy, but ultimately it was glossed over by emphasising the symbolic nature of the grave as representing all black victims, regardless of the historical accuracy of the particular gravesite.[26]

It was not the final embarrassing note to the official launch. During February and March 2000 rumours started to surface about financial irregularities related to the government allocation for commemorative events. A former National Party member of parliament, Leon de Beer, who was imprisoned for electoral fraud in the 80's in Hillbrow, was fingered in the subsequent inquiries and an audit firm was called in to investigate matters.[27]

---

[23] **Die Volksblad**, 9 Oktober 1999, "Onmin in herdenking"; **Die Afrikaner**, 15 October 1999, "Net Swartes by herdenkingsfees"; **Die Volksblad**, 11 October 1999, "Party bly weg omdat regering herdenking kaap."

[24] **Die Volksblad**, 11 October 1999, "Party bly weg omdat regering herdenking kaap." (Translation).

[25] **Cape Argus,** 15 October 1999, "Row over black Boer War monument".

[26] **Die Volksblad**, 2 February 2000, "Regte begraafplaas van ABO slagoffers opgespoor"; **Die Volksblad**, 9 Februarie 2000, " Besluit oor begraafplaas geregverdig"; **Beeld**, 2 Febraury, "Monument se ligging is beslis verkeerd".

[27] **Mail and Guardian**, 17-23 March 2000, "Boer War events turn to farce"; **Die Volksblad**, 7 February, "Vrae oor ABO geld"; **Die Volksblad,** 4 November 2000 "Bekende firma ondersoek ABO herdenking".

These subterranean currents had little overall effect on the first wave of commemoration. Despite omissions, inaccuracies and allegations of fraud, the state had succeeded in staking its official claim in the moulding of the war heritage. This was to be carried over into the public arena.

Public discourses on black participation in the war

On the eve of the centenary, RW Johnson, a scholar with a long-standing interest in South Africa, commented in the British press:

> Given the ANC's endless invocation of a 'non-racist, non-sexist South Africa', there is nothing more politically incorrect in the new South Africa than a white male. Accordingly, it seems certain that whatever remembrance of the war takes place, a great effort will be made to stress that this was essentially a conflict between white males. There is also a tremendous keenness to seek out the role played by blacks---.[28]

Such an emphasis did indeed occur. As far as general awareness of the nature of participation in the war was concerned, the issue of black involvement made a long overdue entry onto the public stage. It was somewhat misguided though to claim, as one journalist did, that historians had "torn out the page" on black vicissitudes during the war.[29] On the contrary, progressive historians working on the war had all but exhausted the topic during the previous 30 years.[30] That the issue only surfaced in the public arena after such a lapse of time, had all to do with an altered climate of public opinion and little with the alleged neglect of professional historians.

Once in the public sphere, the question of black fatalities became a matter of considerable interest. A salient feature in the discourse of the commemoration of the war was the discovery of an increasing number of black war graves, especially concentration camp victims. Both the Afrikaans and the English language press announced these findings in banner headlines.[31] The keenness to report on this, prompted one reporter to take a rather jaundiced view:

> Some --- newspaper coverage seems to have been reduced to only one aspect of the war: the participation of black compatriots, and some journalists have without a

[28] **Times,** 2 October 1999 "Bitter legacy of the 'white man's war'".
[29] **Saturday Star**, 14 September 1996 "How Boer war historians tore out the page on blacks".
[30] Nasson, "Commemorating" p 162; A Porter, "The South African War and the historians," **African Affairs,** 99, 397, October 2000.640-641; C Saunders, "Blacks in historical writing on the Anglo-Boer South African war", **New Contree**, 47, 2000, 127 –136.
[31] For example **The Star**, 14 September 1999 "Search for site of black camp"; **Cape Argus**, 11 October 1999 "How blacks died"; **City Press**, 18 April 1999 "South Africa's forgotten POW's"; **Cape Argus,** 26 Septembeer 2000 "Graves rewrite history of blacks in Boer War"; **Sunday Independent**, 16 May 1999; "Deaths of thousands of Africans come to light"; **Die Volksblad**, 26 May 1999 "Nog swart grafte ontdek; **Beeld,** 17 April 1999 "Speurtog na Anglo-Boereoorlog se swart konsentrasiekampe"; **Die Burger**, 11 November 1999 "Nog swart grafte"; **Die Volksblad**, 9 February 2000 "Nog ABO begraafplase kan later ontdek word".

> hint of irony turned to serial gravediggers. So caught up are they in this new assignment that they can't see the war for the graves. [32]

The rate, at which black graves were claimed to be discovered, caused a measure of concern for certain Afrikaner groupings. They saw in this a deliberate intention to inflate black casualties so that, for political reasons, these could surpass the number of whites who had perished in the camps. With this accomplished, ran the argument, the Afrikaner history of suffering could be proportionally reduced and presented as of lesser importance than before.[33] This, however, was somewhat of a minority view. Less suspicious and more pervasive was a pragmatic attempt on the part of Afrikaner cultural brokers to welcome the new development and to project, under the rubric of nation building, a common bond of suffering between Afrikaners and black people. The British could now be put in the dock and on the basis of a conveniently constructed "common" anti-imperialist past the old white elite could try and speak to the new black elite.[34]

Such an interpretation which failed to take into account the subsequent apartheid interlude, was just too ingenuous to make much headway. It also underestimated the extent to which the new black elite sought to manoeuvre itself onto the moral high ground and preferred to conduct exchanges on nation building on their own terms. Ben Ngubane, opening an exhibition at the War Museum in Bloemfontein on 8 October 1999, started his speech off cautiously enough by genuflecting to the notion of mutual suffering, but could not restrain himself for too long before he had to claim "that notwithstanding the general suffering across the colour divide blacks suffered even more" during the war. [35] The tragedy of a hundred years ago was now recast as an almost tawdry spectacle of the Olympics of suffering. Afrikaner nationalists, of course, were past masters of invoking the concentration camp catastrophe for political purposes particularly in the thirties and forties.[36] Sixty years later, a "new set of skeletal people were to rise up from those terrible days" of the war to participate in the seance of a new round of politicians.[37]

Although there can be no doubt as to the tribulations of black people in the war, it is an oversimplification to emphasise this to the exclusion of much else. Black people were not only victims. Some tried to be master of their own fate as far as circumstances allowed; there were those who decided to join the fighting forces on specific terms if possible, while others profited from increased agricultural markets brought about by the need to feed British troops. There was also an awareness in certain areas of the Transvaal that as

---

[32] http//woza.za.forum2/Oct 99.boer war25.html.

[33] **Die Afrikaner,** 17 January 1999 "Segsman vir die swartes"; **Rapport,** 17 October 1999 "Moenie boere uit die oorlog skryf nie".

[34] **Rapport**, 17 October 1999 "Erken Swartes se rol in die oorlog"; **Die Burger**, 9 October 1999 "Oorlog skep band Afrikaners en Swartes; **Financial Mail**, 2 October 1999 " A congress of anti-colonial victims". See also G Cuthbertson and A Jeeves, "A many-sided struggle for Southern Africa", **South African Historical Journal**, 41, 1999, 7.

[35] Address of Ben Ngubane, 8 October 1999. (In private posession).

[36] A Grundlingh, " The War in Twentieth-Century Afrikaner Consciousness" in D Omissi and A Thompson, **The Impact of the South African War** (London, 2002), 24-28.

[37] Nasson, "Commemorations", 163.

a result of the war the props of colonial society were being loosened and that this offered new opportunities to try and reclaim land that has been lost before.[38]

These specific and more varied dimensions of black involvement failed to enter into the public arena during the centenary. A partial explanation for this may simply be that the full extent and nuances of black participation were not that widely known at the time of the centenary. However, a more convincing argument is probably that even if such information was more readily available, the "suffering" dimension would still have surfaced as the prime commemorative aspect. While the other angles were not completely without the potential to be codified into useful ideological constructs to be used in the present, there is little to compete against "suffering." Having already laid claim to the high moral ground as a result of the iniquities of apartheid, the additional revelation of black vicissitudes a century ago was a bonus to be timeously deployed, if so required, in the public sphere. The discourse of victimhood is a powerful one; particularly when there is a convenient and rich fund to draw upon.[39] Moreover, "suffering" also allowed for competition with the erstwhile Afrikaner rulers for the highest honour, whilst the other dimensions even if they demonstrated African initiative and resilience, still had the drawback that they ultimately reduced black participants to a marginal role in the conflict which did not quite square with the assertiveness of a new elite in power.

The enthusiastic endorsement of "suffering", however, was not welcomed across the board. In certain unreconstructed Africanist circles, it was argued "that the obsessions of black politicians to claim the Anglo-Boer War reflects, if anything, the extent of psychological damage suffered by black people as a result of colonialism." [40] In this view the war was viewed merely as a squabble between colonial overlords, and black people "could'nt even sit down comfortably and watch the fight, because they no longer owned any land to sit on." Since neither side asked black people to enter the conflict on equal terms, "there is nothing in this centenary for their descendants to celebrate."[41] Any association with the war was accordingly inappropriate and showed an "unhealthy identification with the master" and "to emulate him is a pathology that afflicts the oppressed all over the world."[42]

Both discourses had their own internal political logic, but in terms of the impact and cultural purchase, it is probably safe to claim that despite the media prominence given to black participation and the jockeying for moral positions, the centenary failed to stir the imagination of black people to a significant degree. "The vast majority of ordinary black South Africans has little knowledge as far as the Anglo-Boer War is concerned", one

[38]Nasson, "Commemorations", 163. The standard work on the topic is still that of P Warwick, **Black people and the South African War of 1899-1902** (Cambridge, 1983).
[39] For a discussion on on victimhood see **New York Review of Books**, 8 April 1999 "The joys and perils of victimhood".
[40] **Sunday World,** 17 October 1999 " Victims of the white man's war". **Mail and Guardian**, 15 October 1999 "It was a white man's war"; **Sunday Times**, 17 October 1999 "Boer War had nothing to do with blacks."
[41] **Mail and Guardian,** 15 Octboer "It was a man's war".
[42] **Sunday World**, 17 October "Victims of the white man's war".

black commentator noted.[43] It was after all a war that had taken place well outside living memory and even if some oral recollections survived, as they certainly did,[44] it was too much to expect, given the tumultuous twentieth century and the predominant effect of apartheid, for one distant event amongst many other more recent ones to be etched in collective memory. Neither was it necessary, beyond the ritual incantation of a superior moral position, for those in power to invoke a particular legacy of the war to bolster their political legitimacy. With an overwhelming majority in the 1999 election, the ANC hardly needed an unlikely platform such as a war between whites a 100 years ago, to cement its position.

Afrikanerdom and the commemoration of the war

While the war was deeply woven into the fabric of Afrikaner national consciousness during the first half of the century, it did not present itself as an occasion to celebrate. The Boers after all has lost the war and one does not celebrate defeats. This was in contrast to the Great Trek centenary commemorations in 1938 which had much more of a celebratory ring, linked to the successful 19th century Boer settlement in the interior of South Africa. The fiftieth anniversary of the outbreak of war in 1949, a year after the narrow National Party victory at the polls, allowed some respite from the historical legacy of loss which had permeated so much of Afrikaner thinking after the war. Afrikaners could now start to put the war behind them; in 1948 they had regained what they had lost in 1902.[45] The future seemed bright and so inviting that the historian, DW Kruger, could confidently proclaim on the anniversary of the war in 1949 that "the sun has risen for the Afrikaner and now it was Africa for the Afrikaners."[46]

In 1999 with a black government in power this vision has all but evaporated. Nor was it possible to rekindle the embers of the memory of a war that helped to stoke the Afrikaner nationalist fires of the thirties and forties. Whereas impoverished whites had formed a substantial section of Afrikanerdom at the time and political hostility was mainly directed at against imperialistic English speakers, sixty years later Afrikaners had become predominantly middle-class and no longer felt inferior to English speakers. [47] Symbolically there were parallels between an emasculated Afrikanerdom of 1999 and the defeated Boer republics of a 100 years ago. However, in terms of realpolitik in 1999 only the foolhardy would have thought of invoking a receding memory as a viable political rallying point.

Nevertheless, it was in the arena of cultural politics that the war could still speak to Afrikaners in a meaningful way. Much of this had to do with the re-negotiation of identity. The commemoration of the war coincided with a period of considerable drift in

[43] A Sekete, "The black people and the Anglo-Boer War: How did they see it?" **Knapsak,** May 2002, 41.
[44] See for example **Die Volksblad**, 28 March 1999 "Oorlog te sensitief"; **Die Volksblad**, 19 January 1997 "Dinamiese wêreld gaan oop toe navorsing oor oorlog begin." These articles contain evidence of black recollections of the war.
[45] A Grundlingh, "The war in Twentieth Century Afrikaner consciousness," 29.
[46] DW Kruger, "Die Tweede Vryheidsoorlog in ons nasionale ontwikkeling 'soos die son uit die môrewolke'," **Koers**, xvii, 2, 67.
[47] H Giliomee, "Streef na onafhanklikheid van gees", **Afrikaans Vandag** , 6, 4,Oktober 1999, 2.

Afrikaner society; besides the loss of political power old cultural sureties had disappeared or were under threat while the future looked increasingly uncertain. One Afrikaner commentator summed this up:

> "since the election of 1994 there was a notable escapist tendency among Afrikaners. Some escaped into the other worldly idea of nation-building, others fled overseas, whilst a larger number sought their salvation in individualistic --- economic prosperity and personal enrichment".[48]

To this can be added that the commemoration allowed some Afrikaners another escape hatch – that of the past. In the run-up to the centenary, Afrikaners as a group had to come face to face with disturbing presentations of their immediate apartheid past. Unsettling revelations from the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, reflecting Afrikaner excesses during apartheid, added to a sense of unease and disillusionment. Under these circumstances, the coming centenary of the war was viewed in some circles as an opportunity to showcase an heroic period in Afrikaner history for which they did not have to apologise.[49] More generally, the commemoration provided an opportunity to withdraw from a present where tensions between black and white seem to persist, and to find relative solace in what now may appear as an almost brotherly conflict between white and white that had already fully exhausted itself and no longer presented a threat of any kind.[50]

Woven into this mode of remembrance was a certain strand of nostalgia. The conditions, indeed, were conducive for the emergence of nostalgic thinking. A sociologist, writing in general on nostalgia, has noted:

> in its collective manifestations nostalgia thrives --- on the rude transitions rendered by history, on the discontinuities and dislocations wrought by such phenomena as war, depression, civil disturbance---, in short these events cause masses of people to feel uneasy and to wonder whether the world and their being in it are quite what they always took it to be."[51]

In the Afrikaans press, a noted author, Etienne van Heerden, aptly noted that circumstances were ripe for nostalgic indulgence and that the centenary offered a mythological space where ethnic nesting could take place.[52]

Particularly for an older generation with longer historical memories, remembering the war was a process that incorporated much of the trails and tribulations of the Afrikaner in 20th century South Africa. Thus one elderly correspondent to the **Beeld** newspaper used the war as a point of departure to explain:

---

[48] D Goosen, **Voorlopige aantekeninge oor Politiek** (Orania, 2001) 63. (Translation).
[49] A Grundlingh "The war in Twentieth Century Afrikaner Consciousness", 34; **Southern Cross,** 6 October 1999 "A century on."
[50] P Louw, "Gee swaarkry van die oorlog nuwe sin", **Afrikaans Vandag** , 6,4, October 1999, 15.
[51] F Davis, **Yearning for yeaterday: a sociology of nostalgia** (London,1979), 49.
[52] **Die Burger,** 1 October 1999 "Oppas vir goedkoop nostalgie".

> The damage which the war did a century ago to our development was incalculable and unthinkable. --- We were a true example of how a disadvantaged nation could recover; and half a century after the worst form of degradation achieved a position of strength from which we could dictate. But in the meantime our fellow citizens have awoken; and we were too jealous to share the wonderful infrastructure of our country with them and we thought that the best way out would be to establish homelands and we invested millions in this, only to witness how these noble attempts were total failures ---. And now our fears have become true and there is not a single aspect of our country's administration which is properly maintained.[53]

Recalling the war and extrapolating from that in such a way allows for the juxtaposition of a somewhat idealised, yet troubled past, with a foreboding present.

Centenaries present themselves as crafted occasions for the merging of past and present, and nostalgia is one binding element in this process. As such the commemorations of the war, as we have seen, involved a fair amount of nostalgia. Yet, it was not unthinking, uncritical, non-reflective immersion in nostalgia that marked the way in which Afrikaners remembered the war. There was a strong awareness that the apartheid past has failed and that Afrikaners now had to adapt to a new order. In line with this realisation, for the most part a deliberate attempt was made to acknowledge the role of black people and view the conflict not only in local but also in international terms.[54]

There were, however, select groupings clustered together as the "Volkskomitee vir die herdenking van die Tweede Vryheidsoorlog" which harked backed to distant memories of a time when the war explicitly provided an ideological arsenal to promote Afrikaner ethnic politics of the day. [55] The basic message stayed the same, even if it was dressed up in a more modern idiom than 50 years ago.[56]

Such exceptions apart, overall there was a tendency to downplay the potential political ramifications of the war and to steer away from active public promotions of such agendas. The trend, in fact, was towards personalising and privatising the memory of the war – a notion which involved safeguarding a realm of experience from being appropriated and moulded by agencies with overt political aims.[57] The war was not expected to perform a specific wider function. The politics of the personal took a cultural form; for example the re-recording, recollecting and preserving of material related to the war. Many of these narratives were of a purely anecdotal nature and were devoid of

---

[53] **Beeld**, 21 August 1998 "Wat ongedaan gemaak is, weer opgebou'? (Letter from Dr WF te Water, Standerton, Translation).
[54] F Jacobs " Die herdenking van die Anglo-Boereoorlog in oënskou", **Knapsak**, 14,1, May 2002., 3-10.
[55] S Agten " Een veranderende oorlog: de Geschiedschryving van de Anglo-Boereoorlog, 1899-1902" (Licentiaat verhandeling, Catholic University, Leuven, 2002) 92-93.
[56] **Rapport**, 2 Junie 2002, "'Heft burgers! Hoor Brandfort".
[57] Compare J Bailey, " Some meanings of the ' private' in sociological thought", **Sociology**, 34, 3, 384

explicit messages that could be construed to have a meaning in the present. [58] Of course, the very act of collecting can in itself be seen as ideological, as it is often, at times quite unwittingly, spurred on by wider pressures in society. Essentially though, the intention was not to make a grand political statement, but to accomplish memory work in a space specifically carved out for the retention and reworking of remembrances. "When memory is no longer everywhere, it will not be anywhere unless one takes the responsibility to recapture it through individual means," the French historian, Pierre Nora, has aptly noted.[59] What also prompted the cautionary salvaging mode of memory, was the implosion of much of the earlier Afrikaner ethnic constructs of history. Cultural entrepreneurs now had to dig carefully among the debris to recover and reconstruct those building blocks considered worthy to retain and that could be re-used in the overall construction of a new identity.

In form and content, the commemorations often bore a local character. Families visited gravesites of relatives or battlefields where ancestors fought, while many small towns used the opportunity to recall specific events that took place in the vicinity. The format of the commemorations varied: mock battles, community barbecues and dances, torch processions, marathon running, exhibitions and lectures or a combination of these activities.[60] Unlike the 1938 Great Trek centenary celebrations when the symbolism of the Trek was clearly defined and spelt out in a very deliberate manner way in every town,[61] in 1999 the commemorative proceedings of the war were not marked by an all encompassing single cohesive message of memorialisation.

Each town gave its own imprint to proceedings. Nor were all these gatherings sombre and solemn occasions. At Machadodorp, during the war a temporary capital for the Transvaal republic after the fall of Pretoria in June 1900, the high point of the proceedings was supposed to be the symbolic arrival of Paul Kruger. Once "Oom Paul" was duly received, the attention shifted to the tent where liquor was served. It was not too long before the townspeople turned the occasion into a festive one. The footstomping rhythms of American country and western music blared across the town square as Machadodorp made merry. Traditional Afrikaans music, once standard fare at such occasions, seems to have been forgotten. A reporter noted wryly: "Not the 'Hartseerwals'. Not 'Ou Ryperd'. No, it was 'Hand me down that bottle of Tequila, Sheila !'"[62]

---

[58] **Die Volksblad** in the Free State and **Die Burger** in the Western Cape published such material on a regular basis throughout the commemorative period. Some of those in the Free State were collected in two volumes: N Nieman, (ed) **Ons lesers vertel** (Bloemfontein, 2001 and 2002).

[59] Cited in J Gillis, "Memory and identity: the history of a relationship" in JR Gillis (ed.) , **Commemorations: the politics of national identity** (New Jersey, 1994) 14.

[60] For example **Die Volksblad** , 23 November 2001 "Louw familie hou saamtrek"; **Die Volksblad**, 9 October 1999 "Fakkels in Bethlehem"; **Die Volksblad,** 19 January 2000 "Colesberg wedloop"; **Die Volksblad**, 12 October 1999 "Herinneringe aan die oorlog word 'n werklikheid"; **Rapport**, 6 June 1999 "Feesprogram in 2001 en 2002".

[61] For the Great Trek centenary see A Grundlingh and H Sapire, "From feverish festival to repetitive ritual? The changing fortunes of Great Trek mythology in an industrialising South Africa, 1938-1988" **South African Historical Journal**, 21, 1989, 19-27.

[62] **Rapport**, 11 June 2000, "Paul Kruger ruk-en-rol op Machadodorp volksfees". (Translation).

What was particularly remarkable during the commemorations, was the considerable growth in Afrikaans literature on the war. At least a hundred titles, some of them reprints, appeared and sold well in a market not known for huge sales.[63] The literary explosion not only mirrored a revitalised interest in the conflict, but also a probing and questioning attitude. One bestseller was a novel dealing with the darker side of Boer treachery and war crimes. [64] Besides literary works, several plays were produced of which some focused on the ethnic and racial tensions spawned by the war. [65] In addition the South African produced television documentary, "Verskroeide Aarde" (Scorched Earth), which covered a variety of angles drew much praise as well as a considerable number of viewers.[66] Certain art works also sought to rework traditional themes. In an exhibition in Pretoria a bronze statue depicted a young Boer woman on horseback, wearing only a Voortrekker bonnet and what was described as a "very sado-erotic corset covered in sharp pins reminiscent of something between a punk and a porcupine."[67] This statue was seen as a way of crossing old boundaries and merging fashion, historical memories and eroticism into a new form. Overall these developments reflected intensive memory work in a designated cultural space and a creative engagement with identity through the reframing of remembrance.

Under the twin impact of the disintegration of apartheid and the declining power of the National Party, a gradual erosion of traditionally constructed Afrikaner culture has long been in evidence before the centenary.[68] This assisted in opening the way for a more varied approach. The commemorations then, provided Afrikaners with an opportunity to re-evaluate a particularly dramatic period in their history and to rework it, relatively free from previous political agendas and restraints, into a more kaleidoscopic whole without necessarily translating this into a fixed leitmotif for the future. Of course, some renditions of the war preferred to be rooted in an earlier period, but perhaps the outstanding feature of the commemorations was the cultural dynamism released to find new answers to abiding questions in a non-prescriptive way.

Tourism and the commemoration of the war

The rapid development of jet air travel after the Second World War, the abolishment of apartheid after 1990, the steady upgrading of tourist facilities, the more aggressive marketing of South Africa as a tourist destination and a favourable exchange rate, all

[63] **Die Burger**, 27 September 1901 "ABO steeds gewilde tema"; **Rapport**, 17 October 1999 "Oorlogsboeke verkoop soos soetkoek."
[64] **The Sunday Independent,** 2 August 1998 "Anglo Boer War spawns milestone in new fiction"; http//www.mweb.co/litnet/leeskring/mentz/ Chris van der Merwe, "Die verstommende verskietende ster ooit"; **Beeld**, 11 May 98 "Kragtige debuutroman"; L Renders, "Tot in die hart van boosheid: twee resente Afrikaanse romans oor die Anglo-Boereoorlog", **Literator**, 20, 3, November 1999, 117-121.The book was that of C Coetzee, **Op soek na Generaal Mannetjies Mentz** (Cape Town, 1998).
[65] **Die Burger**, 1 April "KKNK herdenk ABO met die opvoerings".
[66] Interview with H Binge, producer, at Stellenbosch, 2 March 2002.
[67] **Pretoria News,** October 1999, "A different angle on history".
[68] D 'O Meara, **Forty lost years: the apartheid state and the politics of the National Party, 1948-1994** (Johannesburg, 1996), 368-372.

combined to make war tourism a reality at the time of the centenary in 1999. .It was a niche market, specializing mainly in excursions to battlefields.

Particularly in Kwa-Zulu Natal, the politics of the commemorations played itself out mainly in the arena of tourism. There were high hopes, not always based on realistic assessments, that the centenary would bring in thousands of tourists.[69] The area had a number of battlefields such as Talana, Colenso, the dramatic setting of Spioenkop, Vaalkrans, Tugela Heights and of course also the siege of Ladismith, Mainly tourists from Britain, and to a lesser extent the Netherlands were targeted.

The logic of tourism dictated that the commemorations had to be cast in promotional language that offered an enticing package. One tour was advertised as a recreational blend of "Battle Fields and Outdoor Adventure"; tourists could "experience the echo of fierce clashes of gunfire" or visit "the lonely memorials of brave soldiers", while "the towns along the route have their own unique charm and attractions, scenic hiking trails, farm resorts, arts and crafts, game viewing and many more outdoor attractions." [70] Moreover, besides South African War battlesites, the area could also boast with very marketable sites from the Anglo-Zulu War of 1879. " Where else could you get two wars for the price of one and some magnificent scenery to boot?" was asked.[71] But it was not only the past in Kwa-Zulu Natal that was replete with military killing grounds – the present also had its fair share of danger, albeit of a somewhat different order. In some British publications potential tourists were warned that because of the crime rate in South Africa, they should "watch their backs on the battlefields." One booklet regarded it as "part of the adventure" in being in the vanguard of a "new breed of tourists" since the political transition in South Africa, though advised "normal commonsense" caution when traveling on rural roads and visiting battlefields.[72]

There was no shortage of tour operators, some styled as "Anglo-Boer War Tour Brokers". Thus Brigadier Jim Parker CBE assured potential tourists from Britain that he was "an acknowledged expert on inbound specialist military tours." [73] Not to be outdone was Major Jamie Bruce, a man who professed that "he just loves playing with toy soldiers." He promised to meet tourists in full military regalia; brown hob-nailed boots, turn-of-the-century British army regulation khaki and a pith helmet.[74] It was probably an appearance that would have appealed to the war "buff " tourist; the average British battlefield enthusiast who came to South Africa was middle-aged, had a military background and an ancestor who fought in the war.[75]

---

[69] **The Natal Witness**, 5 March 1998 "Will the Anglo-Boer War centenary see a tourist invasion?"
[70] Cited in P Maylam, " Not the South African War: Commemorating, commercialising and obfuscating the war" , Unpublished paper August 2000, 2.
[71] J Hattingh, "The centenary commemorations of the outbreak of the war as a tourist attraction", **Knapsak**, 14, 1, May 2002, 32-33.
[72] Cited in **The Natal Witness**, 23 November 1998 "Watch your back on the battlefields."
[73] **Official Guide to the Commemorative Programme in Kwa-Zulu Natal**, p3.
[74] **Business Day,** 6 November 1998 "Lord of the manor faces a battle".
[75] A profile of a "typical" war tourist appears in Hattingh, "Tourist attraction" , 33.

But there was more than meeting Major Bruce in store for war tourists. At the Talana battlefield, close to Dundee, the local museum recruited a cast of 75 "British soldiers", 35 "Boers", eight Indian stretcher-bearers and several black scouts to stage a mock battle. Locally manufactured uniforms were exact copies of the originals and period experts were called in to choreograph proceedings. Visitors were also able to stroll through the Boer and British camps, sampling bully beef or "moerkoffie en beskuit" (traditionally brewed coffee and rusks). The "battle" began promptly at noon with blanks being fired and stretcher-bearers clearing the "casualties" from the area.[76]

Underlying the tourist representation of the war were two related impulses. One was a strand of white male military culture with a long tradition which in part revolved around regiments like the Natal Carbineers amongst others.[77] Palpable interest in military matters of this kind was reflected in the opening of the Natal Carbineers museum just prior to the start of the war commemorations, and a flourishing military history society which made much of the battlefields of the province.[78] It was military enthusiasts from these ranks who had a strong guiding hand in commemorative proceedings and the packaging of battlefield tours.[79]

The other current has a bearing on the ideological ramifications of battlefield tourism. It is misleading to regard such tourism as value free, as its narrow focus tends to shut out a fuller understanding of the social and political impact of war and allows stereotypes to go unchecked. The "here we are lads" experience of a battlefield does not encourage searching questions as to what such a presence might have meant a century ago and even less what its significance is in the present. As the historian, Jeff Guy, writing on the representation of the Anglo-Zulu War battlefields, has noted:

> explanations why thousands of armed men from Britain were marched into foreign territory, looted cattle, burnt homesteads and killed their occupants, are unnecessary. The fact that an independent African kingdom was destroyed --- can be ignored. That this was done with deceit and racist brutality can be brushed aside.[80]

Much the same point in much the same language can be made as to the British invasion of the Boer republics.

The fact that Kwa-Zulu Natal had a ready and convenient supply of battlefields available for tourist consumption, made it easy to slip into a mode where unquestioning representation could prevail. Whereas both blacks and Afrikaners had in varying degrees to renegotiate their understanding of the war, for white English speakers in the province

---

[76] **South African Country Life**, October 1999 "Window on the world of Khaki and Boer".
[77] See R Morrell, **From boys to gentlemen:Settler masculinity in Natal, 1880-1920** (Pretoria, 2001) 139-175.
[78] **The Daily News**, 16 February 1998 "A museum at long last"; "Kwa- Zulu Natal", **Military History Journal**, 12, 2 , December 2001, 74.
[79] Compare **The Daily News**, 7 September 1998 "Tours of the KZN battlefields"; G Torlage, "World travel market and the South African war centenary commemorations", **Innovation**, 14, June 1997,19.
[80] J Guy, "Battling with banality", **Journal of Natal and Zulu History**, 18, 1998, 164-165.

this was not really necessary as they had their answer in tourism. They had, indeed, long lived in denial of the more unpleasant realities of the conflict, preferring for example, in 1939 to dismiss it as a best forgotten "sad happening" of an "unlucky past." [81] In 1954 it was stated quite unequivocally that "the red hot elements of Natal are afraid to tell their children the real facts of South African history, such as the capture of the Natal Republics, the seizure of the Orange Free State diamond fields, the Jameson Raid and the concentration camps."[82] In this context the anodyne effect of war tourism merely reinforced long established patterns of dealing with or denying such issues.

Besides the peculiar regional dynamics at work, the "tourist gaze" in itself also contributed to the way in which the war was represented. Not broadly interpretative history, nor the diverse considerations of local people essentially governed the commemorations, but first and foremost the dictates of tourism. Writing on the sociology of tourism John Urry has remarked:

> Isolated from the host environment and the local people, the mass tourist travels in guided tours and finds pleasure in --- contrived attractions, gullibly enjoying 'pseudo-events' and disregarding the 'real' world outside. As a result tourist entrepreneurs and the indigenous population are induced to produce ever-more extravagant displays for the gullible observer who is thereby further removed from the local people.[83]

Although battlefield tourists are probably more knowledgeable than most, they are also more demanding in what they want to see and this in turn determined the format of what marketing specialists glibly called "the battlefield product." [84]

Associated with the "product" is the perception that the killingfields of yesteryear are the potential moneyspinners of today. Whilst it would be churlish to suggest that a heritage industry that creates employment opportunities and brings in foreign currency should fashion itself along purist academic lines, commemorations and the commercialization of the past often trouble historians as they mask the deeper import and significance of history.[85] The centenary of the war was no different, nor given the imperatives of commemorations, could it really be otherwise.

Conclusion

The object of this paper was to try and explore the politics that fed into the commemoration of the war. It was not, in essence, concerned about the "accuracy" of historical renditions or not; such an investigation is more than likely to produce

---

[81] **The Natal Witness,** 14 August 1939 **c**ited in B Nasson, " South Africa's Post-Boer, Boer War" in P Dennis and J Grey (eds.) **The Boer War: army, nation and empire** (Canberra, 2000), 22.

[82] **The Rand Daily Mail ,** 18 October 1954 cited in FA van Jaarsveld, **Lewende Verlede** (Johannesburg, 1961), 59.

[83] J Urry, **The tourist gaze: leisure and travel in contemporary societies** (london, 2000), 7.

[84] Compare Hattingh "Tourist attraction", 34.

[85] For example P Maylam, " Not the South African War" 11; L Witz, G Minkley and C Rassool, "No end of a history lesson: Preparations for the Anglo-Boer War Centenary Commemoration", **South African Historical Journal**, 41 November 1999, 370-371.

predictable results that "history" was distorted. Commemorations by their very nature, give their own shape and form to public understanding of the past. Debates over commemorations, are not primarily to pit one version of the past against another or to assert the authority of academic scholarship, but are geared to invite inquiry to try and explain the way in which commemorations as such are constructed to derive maximum benefit from the past in the present.[86] In this respect Ian Buruma has made the salutary point that "memory is not the same as history and memorializing is different from writing history."[87]

In reviewing the construction of the commemoration, the apogee of the state's involvement was probably the official launch at Brandfort. For the rest of the almost three years the state only sporadically genuflected in the direction of the centenary. It would appear that once it has exhausted whatever political mileage it could get out of the occasion, it left civil society to its own devices. In public, a significant discourse was about black participation in the war and this was conducted along lines designed to establish the high moral ground. For Afrikanerdom the commemoration of the war involved much memory work as earlier received memories of the war ceased to have the same purchase for a new generation in a changed environment. In Kwa-Zulu Natal, the logic of war tourism ensured that existing perceptions remained largely outside the realm of critical interrogation. The nuances and differences that emerged during the commemorations served to underline the general assertion that historical memory is "always contextual, partial and subject to self-interested manipulation and obfuscation".[88]

---

[86] Compare P Carrier, "Historical traces of the present: the uses of commemoration", **Historical Reflections**, 22,2,1996, p 445.

[87] **New York Review of Books**, 8 April 1999, "The joys and perils of victimhood."

[88] M Kenny, "A place for memory: The interface between individual and collective history", **Society for Comparative Study of Society and History**, 41, 1999, 425.