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Introduction

Fascination
Like all the projects of ExploreLab, my graduation started with a personal fascination. My fascination lies with history, remains of urban fabric and traces from the past, together with the sustainable future of the heritage. During my holidays in Cape Town, South Africa, I discovered the traces of the Dutch East Indies Trading Company (VOC) in the middle of a thriving metropolis. On the gate of the Castle of Good Hope I saw the emblem of the VOC and, during my most recent visit, the coat-of-arms of the Hollandic cities of Delft and Amsterdam, cities that are very close to my heart. For me as a person who grew up in The Netherlands, this is heritage where I feel connected to, it’s an heirloom of my people at the other side of the world.

Of course the Dutch did have their reasons to settle in Cape town. In the 17th century they built this grand fortress. The sight of it must have been imposing for the native inhabitants of the area, as well as for the Portuguese and English vessels that passed around the Cape of Good Hope and the Cape Agulhas on their way to India and the Far East. The Dutch based the fortress in the middle of the ‘bowl’ below the Table Mountain, right at the beach, next to a new town which was based on a grid: Cape Town. The grid and the fortress still exist. Together with the Slave House, the Company’s Gardens, the Groot Constantia Wine Estate, street names like Heerengracht, Buitengracht and Waterkant Street, the Castle forms a, sometimes scattered, patchwork of heritage objects that still remind the South Africans and the tourists of the Dutch presence,
generations ago.

As much as this piece of heritage might interest and impress me and my fellow Hollanders, I wonder whether the South Africans have the same experience regarding these traces. With this fascination I started ExploreLab.

**Problem statement**

Over time, the relationship between The Netherlands and South Africa has drastically changed. The VOC Council of the *Heeren XVII* (English: seventeen gentlemen) isn't controlling the Cape anymore, there are no more slaves traded through Cape Town and The Netherlands has no claim on the lands of the Cape anymore. South Africa has known three major oppressors, the Dutch, the English and the apartheid government. Many South Africans still feel a grievance when it comes to the heritage objects from these episodes in their history. Many of the inhabitants of South Africa still don't share the same economic prosperity as the (white) elite and maybe the grudge and the feeling of injustice and inequality seem to prohibit the majority of South Africans to share in each other's heritage. This means the built heritage might not be sustainable anymore, because the values that guarantee the existence of this heritage have changed in time.

Since 2009, the Dutch government has started a programme on shared or joint heritage to incite collaboration with ex-colonies. Deliberately, there was chosen to call the heritage 'joint' or 'shared', to treat both the ex-colonial power and the overseas country as equal. The program is much focused on how to preserve the heritage and not on why we should preserve the heritage. It is based on mutual agreements, but dependent on initiatives from the former colonies. Why should they participate? Is the heritage as important to them as it is to us?

Specifically in South-Africa the history of the republic as it is now, starts with the first free election of 1994, where Nelson Mandela was elected president. Now that he has passed away that history is not tangible anymore. Will this be the new heritage of South Africa? And will it be the only heritage that is shared? Or is it even shared? As it is now, traces of the colonial history, the Boer history and the apartheid history are selectively deleted. Street names and town names are changed into indigenous or vernacular ones, f.e. Pretoria, named after Boer and Voortrekker Andries Pretorius, is changed into Tshwane, which is the name of a former Ndebele chieftain.

One of the pillars of the post-apartheid era is 'truth and reconciliation' (Dutch: *waarheid en verzoening*). Is that also what the built heritage should emit, the truth about that piece of history and the intention for reconciliation?

One of the more striking examples I found of what is called 'dissonant' heritage, was the 1820 Settlers National Monument in Grahamstown, Eastern Cape. The monument was intended to commemorate the influence of the first English settlers in South Africa. In 1994 a fire devastated the complex and after that the monument was rebuilt and reconsidered. In 1996 it was reopened by Nelson Mandela, of whom I quoted the complete speech at the opening. He strikingly pointed out the essences and the original intention of the monument, and what that intentions can still mean for the new South Africa, though people might have felt excluded from this heritage.
Your grace; Ladies and gentlemen,

There are monuments which stand as mute pointers to a fixed and ever-receding past. Void of life, they have little meaning outside the history books and the minds of learned people. This National Monument is not of that kind. If it were it would not have found the resources to recover from the devastation if suffered two years ago, and improve itself in the rebuilding.

There are monuments which are dedicated to commemorating the past in a way which nurtures a particular tradition of our land, contributing to its vitality and growth. Such living monuments make a contribution to our society and enrich the life of our nation. But they may also exclude others. The 1820 Settlers Monument, perhaps, started its life in that way.

There are monuments which open the past to scrutiny; recalling it in order to illuminate it and transform it into part of our living and changing society; and merging the tradition from which they emerged with the rich diversity of South Africa’s cultures. Such monuments, if they are successful, are a beacon for the future of all our people as much as a memory of the past.

Because this monument has set itself the goal of belonging to this last category, and because it has so forcefully identified with change and the reconstruction of our country, it is a great honour for me to share in its re-dedication today.

Pawns in a larger game, the 1820 Settlers came to the part of Africa at the behest of an imperial power seeking to use its own poor and unemployed in a bid to advance conquest and imperial ambitions. Though their own impulse to freedom rendered them largely unsuitable for that task, they were nevertheless caught up on the wrong side of history, unable or unwilling to acknowledge as equals those into whose homeland they had been implanted.

The founders of the monument two decades ago sought to redeem that limitation, without denying it, by dedicating the monument to the universal application of the ideals which the English Settlers cherished for themselves. Today, our country a democracy, and our people masters of their own destiny, we are re-dedicating the monument to the universality of those ideals at a time when we are working together to make them a reality for all.

Clearly, great strides have been taken in broadening the scope of the Monument’s activities and towards turning it into a national resource centre for the arts and culture. By providing the infrastructure for the National Arts Festival and the School Festivals; through the many cultural projects and teacher training and development which it makes possible, the Monument is making a significant contribution to our nation’s cultural life and the education of its people.

The plans for a National Festival of Science and Technology are most encouraging. Apartheid’s education system and the exploitation of science for repressive purposes have, for most of South Africa’s youth, robbed science and technology of the excitement and the attraction which it should have. Popularising science and demonstrating the capacity of technology to help us meet the challenges of improving the quality of life will enrich South African cultural and intellectual life.

These and other plans give reason for confidence that the Monument will rise to the challenge we all face, turning our goals into reality. In particular the far-reaching aim of making this national resource one which all our diverse cultures feel to be truly their own, will require hard work. But it is a task we must accomplish.

The coming of age of our democracy is also the recognition that national unity and reconciliation live in the hearts of our people rather than in law. The New Patriotism is a force that propels us towards a vital and unifying national culture which respects, promotes and celebrates our diversity.

To the extent that this Monument succeeds in achieving its goals, it will help us all to realise the broader vision of a new South Africa. In rededicating this restored and improved building, we are reaffirming the purposes for which it was built:

“That all might have life and have it more abundantly”

I therefore have the pleasure of unveiling the plaque commemorating the restoration and re-opening of this Monument.

My research goal is to find out how this phenomenon of dissonant heritage works, in the case of the Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town, as it was the building itself that fascinated me in the first place. To get a clear background at first, I need to know what the history of South Africa is, in which this monument was built. I need to know more about the current, post-apartheid, South Africa and about the theory of dissonant heritage. Secondly, I need to know what the essence of the building is right now, and how that changed over time.

By answering the main research question I can find out what the current problems are with the future of the Castle and what qualities of the Castle I can use or add, to give this piece of heritage a sustainable future.

Main research question:

**What is the future of dissonant mutual heritage, like the Castle of Good Hope in Cape Town, in post-apartheid South Africa?**

Sub questions:

**What is the mutual history of South Africa and the colonial empires?**

**What is the recent history of South Africa?**

**What is dissonant heritage?**

**What are (still) the essential qualities of the Castle of Good Hope and how did they change in time?**
Methodology

DIVIDING THE THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND THE CASE STUDY
To find an answer to the research question, as I said in the previous paragraph, it is important to know the situation of the piece of heritage, the context and the story around the heritage. I have to know how this piece of heritage came to be, who owned it and who changed it. And I need to know how the world around it changed, both in history and in spatial sense. To describe this I divided the thesis in two parts, the theory part, with the historical information on South Africa and the theory on dissonant heritage. The second part is the Castle of Good Hope as a case study, with the description of its spatial qualities and how they changed over time.

Theoretical background

PROCESS OF FRAMING THE THEORETICAL SUBJECTS
When I started this research, I drew several mind maps to frame the theoretical subjects that my thesis touches.

A mind map is not a static thing, which enables me to continuously add information. When you find some new information, the mind map shifts or changes. It helped me to define the chapters,
the sub-subjects of this research and to show the boundaries of my research.

In the first part, the theory part, there are three major topics that define the extents of my research. The first topic is the history of the large trading companies, the colonial powers and South Africa. It describes the history of the country and what the important turning points in history were. The second topic is South Africa as a country. It describes what the current issues are in the country, what the causes are of these issues and what the future might bring. The third topic is about dissonant heritage, heritage that has issues with the owners, the users and the message that is contained in the heritage.

**HOW TO RE(SE)(A)(R)CH THIS AND BENEFITS**
Most of these topics I can elaborate on by doing literature research and interviewing experts on these topics. I also share my personal experiences with the country, especially when it comes to the current South Africa. The conclusions of this theoretical part can provide some insight in the dissonance of the heritage in South Africa and why monument sites in South Africa have become disputed.

**Observation and site visit**
To support the research, stories from my personal experience in the country during my site visit are also used as sources. I will always note from what perspective I quote or refer. During my stay in South Africa I visited several museums and sites of heritage, reconciliation and apartheid. I also used my personal experiences there as a source. I understand that this is just a snapshot of the place, which isn't always representing the common.

**The case study of the Castle**

**FRAMING THE CASE STUDY**
For the case study in part II, the subjects are somewhat less defined. I describe the history and the evolvement of the Castle as heritage on three different scales: The Castle in its landscape, the Castle as object in the city and the story around the Castle. The landscape is the bigger context in which the heritage evolved, the bigger scale. The object itself are the stones of the building, the details and the functioning of the building. The story of the building is the last scale, which actually isn't spatial, and points out the messages that are in the stones, what the building stands for.

**HOW TO RE(SE)(A)(R)CH THIS AND BENEFITS**
In the case study the method is to research by drawing and mapping. The results, the conclusions of these drawings will help me conclude the case study and point out what the opportunities are for the future of this piece of heritage, which is the answer to my research question.

The conclusions that can be made at the end of part II are tailor-made conclusions for the Castle. My goal is to provide some recommendations for the future of the Castle, as an agenda for the future. In the last chapter of the case study I will reflect on what this means for the theoretical themes of part I, to provide some conclusions on colonial heritage and contested heritage in general, exemplified by the Castle.
Outline of thesis

By reading this dissertation, you will notice that the dominant lay-out of the chapters is defined as follows: Part I contains chapters on the general research themes, they form the library, the background for the case study. Part II is the case study itself, which is divided in the chapters: The Castle in the landscape of the city, The Castle as object in the city and The story around the Castle. Both parts are ended with their own summary and conclusion. The first conclusion about the theory, the second conclusion about the case study and the reflection on the theory.
The mutual history of South Africa and the colonial empires

A misunderstanding in the start of the history of South Africa: The Khoisan and the Bantu speaking societies

For a long time, the history of South Africa was taught and practised very Eurocentric. From a Eurocentric perception, the history started with the landing of Jan van Riebeeck at Granger Bay, 1652, or with the Portuguese traders and explorers who sailed along the shores in the 15th century. Before the coming of the Europeans, the continent of Africa was a dark and savage place, not worthy of a history (Thompson, 2001, pp. 1-2).

In nowadays South Africa the history always starts with the Khoikhoi and the San people1, the first human beings to populate the southern part of Africa. For a long time they could build up a harsh but stable society. When there was a food surplus, the people had time for social engagements or making artworks. There weren’t much differences between the Khoikhoi and the San people. The San, the hunter-gatherers were somewhat smaller than the Khoikhoi, who were cattle herders. Because the differences, other than the environment they lived in, were little, now most of the time both people are called Khoisan. The Khoisan are nowadays a scattered group of people, with no clear or direct lines back to their ancestors. The clothing and the dances, the rock paintings and the language and place names form the only heritage of this lost society.

1 Own observations. In their exhibitions, both the Museum of Natural History in Cape Town and the /hapo Museum in the Freedom Park in Pretoria display the natural riches, the rock drawings and the first society of San people as the start of the national history of South Africa.
From the north the Bantu speaking people gradually populated the eastern part of current South Africa, which is the part with the most intense rainfall. These Bantu societies used more advanced tools, had bigger settlements than the Khoisan and grew crops as well as herd cattle. By the 16th and 17th century, the Khoisan and the Bantu must have come in contact with each other, "(...) people interacted, cooperating and copulating as well as competing and combatting, exchanging ideas and practices as well as rejecting them" (Thompson, 2001, p. 11). The movement of the Bantu speaking societies south was not really a migration, according to Leonard Thompson (2001), but occurred more gradually, depending on the availability of farming grounds and the growth and splitting of families and chiefdoms (Thompson, 2001, pp. 3 - 30).

The coming of the Europeans

The second chapter in South African history is the start of the European influence on the country. Up to around 1600 the country was pretty isolated from the rest of the world. The only influence there was on the country, came from the Bantu speaking population of Africa, as explained in the former chapter. I will emphasize on the Cape area particularly, to keep it brief.

The Dutch East Indies & the Cape Colony

The first Europeans to settle in the Cape were the Dutch, united under the rebellious Republic of the Seven United Netherlands (or Provinces), shortly the Dutch Republic. The Dutch were at war with the Spanish Habsburgs, a war that was mostly fought in the southern part of the current Netherlands. In this vacuum of war, the northwestern part of the Netherlands, especially Holland, Zeeland and the quickly growing city of Amsterdam, could slowly take over the world trade, due to the large fleet and its military successes. From approximately 1600 on, the Dutch Republic began to expand its trading empire under the flags of the VOC (United East India Trading Company) and the WIC (West India Trading Company) (Emmer & Gommans, 2012, pp. 11-16). In the next paragraph I will explain how, in this global trading era, the Cape Colony was established.

SAILING AROUND AFRICA FOR SPICES

The VOC had a monopoly on the spice trade. The Venetians and the Arabs had it before them and they controlled the trade routes through the Middle East, around the Gulf and towards Silk Route in Asia. The northern- and western Europeans tried to bypass this route by sailing past the most southern point of Africa (Thompson, 2001, p. 32) (Preez, 2015). 1

1 Derived from interview with Hannetjie du Preez (2015). She told me the theory about the Europeans trying to bypass the Middle East by sailing around the African continent to reach the Far East. Thompson (2001)’s History of South Africa also brings up this theory.
The Portuguese explorer Vasco da Gama was the first one to succeed to reach India via Southern Africa in 1498, but Bartholomeu Dias was the first European to round the Cape Peninsula, to Algoa Bay, in the year 1487 (Thompson, 2001, p. 31). In 1510, a party of Portuguese had a clash with the local Khoisan, who killed the fellowship of 57 Portuguese men, including the Viceroy of Portuguese India, Francisco de Almeida. This incident, though based on miscommunication with the Khoisan, prevented the Portuguese from ever landing on that shore again (Thompson, 2001, p. 32). From 1602, the large emerging of the VOC as world trading power began, no longer the Venetians, the Arabs and the Portuguese had the overseas trade in hand, but the Dutch along with the Scandinavians, English, French merchant mariners were using the trade routes past the Cape of Good Hope as well, at the end of the 17th century (Thompson, 2001, p. 32).

**Van Riebeeck and the first European settlers at the Cape**

After the English ignored a proposal to annex the Cape in 1620, the Dutch were the first to try to build a permanent settlement at the Cape. In 1649, a group of sailors that survived a shipwreck had to winter in the Table Bay, convinced the Company to start a settlement at that place. Three years later Jan van Riebeeck set out with 80 employees of the VOC to build a fortress and a replenishment station in the Table Bay (Thompson, 2001, p. 32). They arrived in April 1652 and landed at what is now called Green Point. They immediately started building a fortress made of wood and earth, at the place where the Grand Parade is now. They also started to plant vegetable gardens and channelize the streams coming from the mountain, for irrigation (Johnson Barker, 2003, pp. 11-13).

**Freeburghers and the first slaves to enter Cape Town**

Mainly sailors of the Company built the first fortress, but after a couple of years two important things happened. Firstly, in 1657, the first 9 Company employees were dismissed from service and proclaimed **burghers** (free citizens) of the Cape. They were appointed land, somewhere around Rondebosch, and could grow crops there to sell it at a fixed price to the Company (Thompson, 2001, pp. 33-34). They became the first land owners in the Cape, besides the VOC. Secondly, in 1658, the first ship with slaves arrived in Cape Town. In the 100 years after the landing of Jan van Riebeeck, the free burghers claimed more and more land, and the slave population in Cape Town overgrew the amount of Europeans. In 1707, the last white settlers arrived from Holland, after which the settlement grew out of itself (Thompson, 2001, pp. 33-35). Emmer and Gommans (2012) call it peculiar that the Cape Colony emerged without the actual intention from the homeland, the settlement in the Cape was never meant to become a self-supporting Colony (Emmer & Gommans, 2012, p. 244).

From these European free burghers, the trekboere (English: nomadic farmers) were born. They were poorer white burghers who were mainly herding cattle stock extensively and hunting at the side. In the 1770’s, the coverage of the lands of these trekboere was about 500 kms north, 600 kms northeast and 700 kms east, all the way to the current Port Elizabeth at the Algoa Bay. The only governmental institutions were the landdrosten (English: bailiffs) in Stellenbosch, Swellendam (from 1745) and Graaff-Reinet (from 1786). They only had few personnel and relied on the prominent members of the trekboere for support. These farmer communities were harsh and none of them were educated, as there were no schools. Even further away from Cape Town, groups of criminals, outlaws and runaway slaves formed communities of their own. Later they became known as Griekwa’s (English: Griquas) (Thompson, 2001, pp. 45-52).
FORTIFICATION OF THE PENINSULA
As replenishment was the only reason for the VOC to grab hold on the Cape Peninsula, there was no organization or authority to protect the burghers that lived far beyond the borders of the Peninsula, as I explained above. Only in 1660, when Jan van Riebeeck planted a hedge alongside the Liesbeek River, the free burghers received protection from the VOC. But that was probably because Van Riebeeck had property at Rondebosch himself and the crops that grew on that side of the mountain were necessary to survive.

The VOC put a lot of effort in the protection of Cape Town and the Table bay (Tafelbaai) to prevent attacks by external fleets. Walls and batteries defended both the Bay and the supply and access roads from the east. Cape Town was a fortified city, it had a city gate for most of the 18th century (Preez, 2015).

In 1664, the first war between the English and the Dutch Republic started. This directly caused the start of the building of the new Castle in Cape Town, because the old one wasn’t strong enough. After choosing the site, the construction started in 1666. In 1679, the five pointed star fortress was finished, after several delays, primarily in the years of peace between the English and the Dutch (Johnson Barker, 2003, pp. 22-33).

The constant threat of the English to gain power over the world trade was reason to strengthen the position of Cape Town more and more. In the mid-18th century several batteries alongside the Bay were built. When the French allied with the Dutch Republic against England in 1781, the French started to build fortifications in Cape Town, the Amsterdam battery and the French lines in current Woodstock. By 1795, the total amount of fortresses protecting the Cape Peninsula counted 33 (Johnson Barker, 2003, pp. 42-47).

No wonder the battles between the Dutch and the English, at the end of the 18th century were fought in Blaauwberg and Muizenberg, resp. 20 and 30 kilometres from the Castle of Good Hope. As Table Bay & Simons Town were the only harbours used in 18th century, and they were both fortified, landing was only possible at the beaches outside the Peninsula (Thompson, 2001, p. 47).

3. The Battle of Blaauwberg (1805), with the Dutch (Batavian) garrison on the left, in blue, and the English troops on the right, in red.
The English Empire

SECURING THE STRATEGIC POSITION OF CAPE TOWN

Twice the English landed on the shores of the Cape Colony to enter and conquer Cape Town. First in 1795, when France had invaded the Netherlands as a result of the French Revolution in 1789. Stadhouder Willem V of the Netherlands fled to Great Britain and supported the invasion party, but in the Cape that message wasn’t trusted and commissioner Sluysken of the Cape started a war. The British landed in Simon’s Town and they bombarded the Dutch cannons at Muizenberg, winning the battle easily. When the English annexed Cape Town, they immediately started strengthening Cape Town more, by building another five fortress towers.

In 1802, the treaty of Amiens concluded the war between England and France, a war that started again in 1805. The Cape Colony was returned to the Dutch (Batavian) Republic from 1803. But in 1806 the British landed on the shores of the Cape for the second time, now north of the town, at the Table Bay. The British wanted to prevent the French from ceasing control over the Colony. With the battle at Blaauwberg (1806) the Dutch were defeated and the Cape was in British hands again (Johnson Barker, 2003, pp. 50-55).

Internal conflicts

The period after the victory on Napoleon in 1815 was very quiet for Cape Town. The first British settlers arrived in 1820 and they chose to settle around Port Elizabeth and Grahamstown, further to the east of Cape Town. The problems they encountered were at first the Xhosa Africans who stirred in the east and secondly the trekboere, who were rebellious ever since the end of the 18th century. The English had inherited a country full of ethnic and social difficulties. But in Cape Town, the fortifications were offered to let, except for the Castle, which was now used as military office.

After a long struggle and some ignorance from the orders from the homeland, slavery was abolished in 1828. Though the Khoisan, the coloured people¹ and the black Africans were poorer than the white citizens and were therefore intrinsically forced to work for them (Thompson, 2001, pp. 52-69).

VOORTREKKERS AND THE WARS AT THE EASTERN FRONTIERS

The coming of the English settlers and the cultural and political changes the English implemented caused unrest, especially among the inhabitants of the eastern part of the Cape Colony. In the 1830s and 1840s a quarter of the Afrikaner (Dutch speaking) inhabitants of the eastern Cape territories took part in an exodus known as the ‘Great Trek’. By 1840 there were 6,000 Afrikaners on the move, taking almost as much Coloured servants with them. The Voortrekkers, as they are called, declared that they were forced to find themselves a new homeland, because of the constant raids on their cattle by black and coloured groups and the restricting (religious) norms of the English. In the eyes of the Voortrekkers, the English government had done too little to compensate the losses the farmers had encountered by Xhosa raids and the abolition of slavery (Thompson, 2001, pp. 66-69).

Between 1840 and 1870, the whites had reached as far as the Limpopo River, which forms the current border between South Africa and Zimbabwe and part of the border with Botswana. There was a constant rivalry between the English colony and the trekboere. Drought and the expansion of the black African chiefdoms and tribes in to the East of the colony caused rivalry.

¹ The term coloured is used to describe the people originating from a mixture of races, including indigenous Khoisan, whites and slaves from Eastern Africa or Ceylon.
and poverty among one another, which was an incentive for quarrel. Wars were fought between the English and the Xhosa, the trekboere, on their way north, were attacked by the Ndebele first, and then tricked by the Zulu negotiations with chief Dingane, which led to war in the Natal.

By 1870, South Africa was divided into multiple republics, chiefdoms and colonies, constantly struggling with poverty, poor government and lack of control over its ‘subjects’. The black Africans were divided in chiefdoms, looking for the fertile grounds to claim. Migration, even from the English Indian colony, caused a patchwork of different races, religions and cultures over the area between Cape Town and the Limpopo River. The newly founded, fragile states in the northeast were underdeveloped, in comparison with the Cape, and Cape Town, which had around 50,000 inhabitants. Soon the odds were to change, in December 1867, ‘(...) a prospector named Carl Mauch was in Pretoria, claiming to have found gold in Tswana country (on the Highveld), and a stone was on exhibition in Cape Town that had been defined as diamond.’ (Thompson, 2001, p. 107), (Thompson, 2001, pp. 70-109)

Both the wars and afterwards the political games between the English and the trekboere, resulted in the declaration of the independence of the ‘Highveld’, which was the area across the Vaal river (Transvaal) and the Orange Free State, the so called Boer Republics. The white population, though, was thin and constantly threatened by the increase of black African immigrants in their lands. The English annexed the Natal region, because the Dutch-speaking trekboere who settled there couldn’t govern the lands and the influx of immigrants.

By 1870, South Africa was divided into multiple republics, chiefdoms and colonies, constantly struggling with poverty, poor government and lack of control over its ‘subjects’. The black Africans were divided in chiefdoms, looking for the fertile grounds to claim. Migration, even from the English Indian colony, caused a patchwork of different races, religions and cultures over the area between Cape Town and the Limpopo River. The newly founded, fragile states in the northeast were underdeveloped, in comparison with the Cape, and Cape Town, which had around 50,000 inhabitants. Soon the odds were to change, in December 1867, ‘(...) a prospector named Carl Mauch was in Pretoria, claiming to have found gold in Tswana country (on the Highveld), and a stone was on exhibition in Cape Town that had been defined as diamond.’ (Thompson, 2001, p. 107), (Thompson, 2001, pp. 70-109)
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The fights for a Union of South Africa

CECIL JOHN RHODES VS. PAUL KRUGER

Within no time, the area where gold was found, the Witwatersrand, grew in population and economic importance. By 1899, 27.5 % of the worlds gold was found in South Africa. Johannesburg grew out to a city with 175,000 inhabitants. Most of the export from the Boer (or Afrikaner) states had to be exported through English cities at the sea. At Kimberley, diamonds were found. Kimberley was situated in Griqualand, which eventually became part of the English Cape Colony. This gave men like Cecil John Rhodes, one of the greatest mine tycoons of that time, to seek their fortune in the north and northeast of current South Africa (Thompson, 2001, pp. 110-122). At the end of the 19th century, all the African tribes that lived in Southern Africa were incorporated in white colonial states, by means of war, political intrigues or western (cattle) diseases (Thompson, 2001, pp. 122-132).

In the 1870s, Great Britain tried to annex the Transvaal (officially the Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek, English: South African Republic), at first without much resistance. However, Paul Kruger, senior military officer in the South African Republic, started a protest movement around the annexation of the independent Boer republics. In 1880 and 1881 this led to the first Anglo-Boer War, which was eventually won by the boer commandos at Majuba (1881). Paul Kruger became president of the Transvaal Republic

5. Edward Linley Sambourne, "The Rhodes Colossus", caricature of Cecil John Rhodes after he announced plans for a telegraph line and railroad from Cape Town to Cairo (1892).
and was immensely popular, also in continental Europe. In 1890, Cecil John Rhodes, who had become an extremely wealthy British imperialist, became the prime minister of the Cape Colony. Transvaal had established its own trade route to the outside world, via the Delagoa Bay (current Maputo, Mozambique), had close relations with the German Emperor, a vast new rival of the British Empire, and they had the world largest gold stock in hand (Thompson, 2001, pp. 132-138).

THE SECOND ANGLO-BOER WAR
Through Leander Starr Jameson, a Scottish doctor, Rhodes tried to persuade the Transvaal Republic to join sides with the British Empire. Negotiations failed and Jameson committed the ‘Jameson coup’ on January 2 1896 during which he was captured outside Johannesburg. In the meantime, lots of foreign white workers, many of them from Anglican countries, were working in the gold mines. As the culture and language in the mines was mostly English, the Dutch-speaking whites were afraid that giving these workers voting rights would change the political weather, to the benefit of Great Britain. Joseph Chamberlain, the newly appointed state minister for the colonies, refused to agree with the proposal that Britain would have no interference in the internal affairs of the republic. Armies had already been mobilized and Kruger declared war after his own determined ultimatum, October 11, 1899 (Thompson, 2001, pp. 138-141).

In the beginning the war seemed to have a positive outcome for the Boer republics, but around 1900 there was a turning point. The British were able to break through the sieges of Kimberly, Ladismith and Mafekeng, and captured Pretoria and Johannesburg, in the heart of the Boer republics, and the mining area. The war continued to have a guerrilla status until 1902, when the Peace of Vereeniging was signed, between the British high commissioner Milner and the Boer commandos (Thompson, 2001, pp. 141-144).

TOWARDS A UNION
Milner had great plans for the future of the colonies of South Africa. Whites would rule the lands and companies, supported by "well-treated and justly-governed" (Thompson, 2001, p. 144) black labour. His plan was to denationalize the Afrikaners (the term that is more often used for (trek)boere from the end of the 19th century) and create a strong healthy nation like the United States, under the protection of the crown. Though when the first elections were held (under white men), all but Natal voted for Afrikaner national parties. Smuts and Botha were the maesters of the politics in the former Boer republics, and they sought conciliation with the English, in a progressive attempt to create a union of South African states (Thompson, 2001, pp. 144-149).

In October 1908, delegates from all four colonies, Transvaal, Orange River Colony, Natal and the Cape, came together in Durban and drew up the new constitution of South Africa, based on an English system, with electorates based on the white male population, and on voting.


7. Unknown photographer, “Lizzie van Zyl”, (1900 or 1901). Emily Hobhouse, an English journalist, reported the dreadful circumstances in the concentration camps for displaced Boer women and children. This picture shows the emaciated Lizzie in concentration camp Bloemfontein.
districts. English and Dutch would become the two national languages of the country. Though the parliament in London was sceptic about the discrimination of races in voting rights, the amendments didn’t receive enough votes. With the hope of a better future for the black Africans, the parliament agreed with the Union of South Africa, which was constituted in 1910, with Louis Botha as, surprisingly Afrikaans, prime minister (Thompson, 2001, pp. 149-153).

8. Sir Herbert Baker, first drawing for the Union Buildings in Pretoria, (1909). The Union Buildings are up to today the most prestigious government buildings of South Africa, built as administration offices for the new Union.

9. 1895 map of the independent South African Republic. On this map, the Transvaal (green) and Orange Free State (yellow) are shown, surrounded by the English colonies of the Cape, Bechuanaland (Botswana), Rhodesia (Zimbabwe) and Natal. Source: http://schotanus.us/Angola/Angola_links/Angola_links.htm
This chapter starts with the history of South Africa of about a hundred years ago, when the Union of South Africa was installed. After this I use my personal experiences during my field trip and travels to the country in combination with actualities in the current South Africa to explain what the state of the country is now.

The road to apartheid 1910 - 1950

I think it is best to start with the period the (mostly) non-whites call ‘the struggle’, as it was their struggle to freedom. As explained in the former chapter, the black Africans and coloured people had no chances to occupy the higher positions in politics, in landownership or in business. In the beginning of the South African Union, roughly from 1910 to 1950, the economy of the country grew very stable due to wide availability of resources. Especially the involvement of South Africa in the Second World War made the industry grow and that provided the black Africans more and more labour. The wages of the black labourers were kept 10 to 15 times lower than white labourers, and the blacks were not allowed to congregate in worker’s associations, they weren’t allowed to bargain. In this era of the start of racial segregation, as Leonard Thompson (2001) puts it, the ANC, the African National Congress that was formed in 1912, was the most successful instrument of resistance during the whole of the 20th century (Thompson, 2001, pp. 154-157).

When you look at these decades from the perspective of the Afrikaners, the white population of South Africa before the 1820 settlers, you see...
that they owned lots of farmlands, but their position was more fragile compared to the English, who held the higher positions in the business, mining and trading companies. An interesting quarrel started between the English and the Afrikaners. Some of the Afrikaners were not approving the membership of South Africa in the commonwealth of Great Britain and the policy of reconciliation with the English, after the Boer Wars. The former Boer frontmen and politicians Botha and Smuts moved towards the English camp, and joined the English in one political party in 1921 (Thompson, 2001, pp. 157-158).

Under the rule of Botha's South African party, a crucial law was enacted in 1913, the Natives Land Act, ensuring the availability of farming lands for the white farmers and declaring parts of the country as African reserves. 7 percent of South Africa's total surface was reserved for the Africans, and by 1939 'charity' funds had increased that share to approximately 12 percent of the surface by 1939 (Thompson, 2001, p. 163).

Barry Munnik Hertzog’s National Party, founded in 1914, increased in popularity among especially the lower and middle class Afrikaners, whereas the South African party of Botha and Smuts decreased in popularity. This was also caused by the inflation in the beginning of the 1920s and the high costs for white labour in the mines. The mines were allowed to put more blacks on higher positions, because their wages were lower. This caused tremendous uproar with strikes and white mineworkers taking up arms. The South African party of Smuts (Botha deceased) chose to take up arms against the white mineworkers and use violence (Thompson, 2001, pp. 157-160).

The Nationalist party won a victory in the 1924 elections and formed a coalition with the labour party. They enforced the Afrikaners' position, replaced the Dutch national language with the Afrikaans, replaced the Union Jack with a new, hybrid, flag and demanded voting rights for white women. Especially in the Cape Province, the voting rights of the Africans were almost depleted by the Nationalists with the granting of votes to white women and ‘The Natives Representation Act’ of 1936. In 1934 the Nationalist party of Hertzog merged with the South African Union party of Smuts, forming the Union party. Merging these parties meant the emerging of the Purified National party of D. F. Malan and the Dominion party. The Purified National party stood for Afrikaner "solidarity in the face of alien Western influences" (Thompson, 2001, p. 162), so no mixing between Afrikaners and other races, by the will of God (Thompson, 2001, pp. 160-162).

The Natives Land Act had caused many Africans to have the lowest living standards, because the lands were unfertile, dangerous, dried up and closed off public transport. There was hardly any funding for these African reserves, while the agriculture, mostly run by Afrikaners, was subsidised. This caused major differences between the white, who became more educated and less poor and the black population, who became poorer and lower educated (Thompson, 2001, pp. 163-165). The Nationalist party of Hertzog accepted these harsh living (and working) conditions and euphemized the argument to "they
are used to it, because they have the necessities of life as understood by barbarous and undeveloped people” (Thompson, 2001, p. 168).

Africans were allowed to work outside the reserves but only when they had a pass to work. Farmers often abused this rule by not giving workers, who lived and worked on their land, a pass to leave the premises, causing social exclusion and isolation. The flow of black people to the towns was limited by means of the same passes of identification. From 1923, the Natives Urban Act allowed towns to allocate blacks to townships, making the towns in South Africa based on three or four districts: the business area that was mixed and located in the city centre, the white suburbs, the townships and sometimes a coloured or Indian mixed area (Thompson, 2001, pp. 169-170).

When Hitler invaded Poland, Britain declared war on Germany in September 1939. Now the South African House of Assembly had to decide on what to do. The Union party split between the two camps again, with Smuts willing to join the war and aid Britain and Hertzog wanting to remain neutral. Smuts won that election and South Africa joined the war (Thompson, 2001, pp. 160-163).

The War drove up industrial production and that resulted in a growth of the towns even more. There was no support for housing for black Africans neither from the government nor from the companies and factories. Therefore large slums emerged outside the South African cities, Soweto in Johannesburg being the most famous (or infamous) (Thompson, 2001, pp. 177-179).

The government, during the Second World War and after, tried to maintain the Acts they had passed to ensure the stability for the white population and diminish chances for the black population. The Natives Representative Council, a white council installed to ensure the rights of the black natives, adjourned in 1946, because they held the opinion that the government had taken away all the hope for the African population (Thompson, 2001, pp. 182-183).

In this circumstance, with massive strikes among the black mine labourers, with a disputed alliance with Britain in the Second World War and Smuts as, in the eyes of the Purified Nationalists, failing prime minister, the term 'apartheid' became common language. The solution of the Purified Nationalists was to completely separate the white population from the non-white population, each group taking care of themselves. With the elections of 1948, the National party won most of the seats in the House of Assembly, though they didn’t get most of the votes, because of the voting system that favoured the rural voters (Thompson, 2001, pp. 183-186).

Apartheid institutionalized 1950 – 1990

GROWTH OF APARTEID
From the election of 1948, the apartheid regime turned the country into an Afrikaner country, with Afrikaners on the higher positions in government and subsidizing the Afrikaner farms. Economic growth of the country and increasing wealth was mainly beneficial for the white population. In 1961, South Africa was elected a republic, and (unintendedly) lost its place in the commonwealth because of apartheid.

Unfortunately, the term ‘apartheid’ is incorporated in the English language. The original Dutch/Afrikaans word can be literally translated as separate-ness (apart-hed).
Firstly, the marriage and sexual intercourse between races was banned. Black Africans and Coloured people lost all voting rights during the 1950s. The ‘homelands’, the areas that were appointed for landownership of black Africans, were granted more and more self-governance. This was used positively in the propaganda, because the whites were backing off and decolonized some parts of the country. But in fact the ‘homelands’ were excluded from the growth and increasing wealth of the country. Most of all, the people and the different tribes were separated from each other, something that wasn’t ever the case before the coming of the Europeans. These ‘homelands’ were hardly viable, as economic incentives made black Africans trying to move to the cities. When you lost your job in town, or weren’t able to farm on the land anymore, you were obliged to return to your ‘homeland’, dependant of your classified race stamped on your pass. From 1950 on, towns had divisions in spatial planning based on race. In Sophiatown, Johannesburg, and District Six, Cape Town, non-whites were removed and relocated to the outer areas of town, to the designated townships. From 1960 to 1983, almost 3.5 million people were moved by these acts. The ‘homelands’ became the drains for unsuccessful non-whites, overpopulated compared to the rest of South Africa, struck by poverty, undernutrition and disease (Thompson, 2001, pp. 190-194).

Education for black Africans and coloured was available, but at a much lower level and in worse facilities than education for whites. Higher education was available for black students, but only in separate classes. By 1978, 80 percent of the students in the South African universities were white. Education was taught according to Afrikaner nationalist ideas, making heroes of militant trekboers and associating God with the historic victory of Blood River on the Zulu’s (Thompson, 2001, pp. 197-198).

In public spaces, signs with "Whites Only" or "Europeans Only" and "Non-Whites Only" were installed (Thompson, 2001, p. 197).

The country slowly turned into a security state, with a strong police force and 21 percent of the government budget being spent on defence. The police had a special security unit that interrogated political prisoners and tortured them. The state television (only operating from 1976) was censored (Thompson, 2001, pp. 198-200).

RESISTANCE
Opposition came from churches, student organizations and even politicians, but many of them were put to jail because of creating uproar and undermining the government. Even great business- and industry owners supported the cause of the black majority, but they also kept to the usage of cheap labour from the black African population (Thompson, 2001, pp. 204-207).

In 1949, Walter Sisulu, Oliver Tambo and Nelson Mandela were elected national executives for the ANC. The first large movement of resistance started. In 1955 the Freedom Charter was adopted in Kliptown, Soweto, Johannesburg. It was a statement towards equal rights for all. Peaceful protests continued towards the 1960s. The ANC split up in 1959, because the Pan-Africanist Congress (PAC), under Sobukwe, found the ANC too peaceful towards the whites. In 1960 they launched a big campaign to boycott the passes. In Sharpeville, near Johannesburg, the police opened fire and killed 67 protesters. A week later there was a march towards the Parliament in Cape Town of about 15,000 to 30,000 people, which ended peacefully. However, the leader of


12. CIA, (1979). Map showing the territorial four main ethnicities of South Africa in 1979: Whites, Coloureds, Blacks and Indians. The gray areas indicate the apartheid-era Bantustans, which are almost exclusively black.
the protest, Philip Kgosana, was arrested with a trick of the police (Thompson, 2001, pp. 207-210). The government acted fiercely, arresting and jailing thousands of people. In 1976, thousands of school children demonstrated against Afrikaans as institutional language in schools; the police shot a 13 year old. In 1977, SASO, the association for black South African students was banned and Steve Biko, who was associated with SASO, was arrested and beaten to death.

After these violent events, a guerrilla war started, and black South Africans were trained in Tanzania and Angola to attack public spaces in the country.

Meanwhile the position of South Africa in the world economy remained strong, because of the propaganda to the outside world and the availability of resources. America didn’t want these resources to fall into the hands of the Soviet Union and Britain had both business and lots of family bonds with the white South Africans. South Africa could import oil from Iran, from the Shah and weapons from Israel, despite embargos on these goods. There was an anti-apartheid lobby, but South Africa had a strong position on the world market, with its gold and diamonds (Thompson, 2001, pp. 211-220).

DECLINE OF APARTHEID

However, the country soon began to understand that the world they had in mind, a world where the races lived apart, would not work. It was too difficult to execute the ideas and above all, immoral.

The government under leadership of Pieter Willem Botha tried to reform the apartheid, by approving the union of workers, soon to see that these unions became militant after ten years. The coloureds and Indians were given a minority of seats in the House of Assembly and in 1986 a couple of laws and enactments were approved that tamed some strict laws. Nevertheless, these changes were not sufficient to make men equal in South Africa. Education funds were still unfairly divided.

During the 1980s violence was widespread among the townships. Black counsellors that were appointed by the government were attacked, the election of the coloured and Indians was disturbed and there were strikes everywhere. Adding to that, there was a rise of black gangs fighting for mastery.

From 1986 on, the international pressure on South Africa took great measures. A delegation of commonwealth countries visited South Africa and drew up a plan for a new South Africa. Negotiations failed when South Africa attacked ANC bases in Zimbabwe, Botswana and Zambia – all members of the commonwealth. South African government called out a state of emergency and reacted with police actions. The white electorate remained supporting the apartheid approving parties, the ANC turned more violent, attacking major public venues in towns with bombs.
South Africa stopped the military occupations in Angola, Namibia and involvement in the war in Mozambique in 1989 and 1990 (Thompson, 2001, pp. 221-240). "By 1989, it was evident that the policies of the Botha government were bankrupt" (Thompson, 2001, p. 240).

THE LAST LEAPS FOR FREEDOM

The country of South Africa was in a state of paranoia, when the transition to a democracy awakened. Thompson (2001) names a few reasons for the decline of the regime and the untenable situation the country was in. The population growth among the black South Africans was enormous, and in the 1980s the amount of people living in the townships had doubled in comparison to the 1950. More and more blacks were contributing to the consumption economy in the country, whereas the economy that was managed by the whites, was deteriorating, with high inflation rates and little interest for foreign investments. The third reason was the decline of the Soviet empire, which revealed the cover of the apartheid government that claimed to fight against the threat of communism spreading through Angola and Mozambique (Thompson, 2001, pp. 241-244).

A line of talks started between apartheid government committees and the representatives of the ANC, with Nelson Mandela as most prominent member. The negotiated actions were the removal of troops from townships, the emergency state of the country lifted and the stop of hunting and imprisoning political dissidents. On the other side, the ANC would stop the guerrilla they had started. President Botha didn’t complete the negotiations and his own cabinet overruled him in January 1989. On February 2nd of that year Frederik Willem de Klerk succeeded Botha. He lifted the ban on the ANC, the PAC (Pan African Congress) and the SAPC (South African Communist Party). Nine days later Nelson Mandela was released. Finally, the negotiations were successful. Mandela and De Klerk travelled around the world and were welcomed as heroes (Thompson, 2001, pp. 244-247).

But in South Africa, a dangerous situation emerged and almost got out of hand. The white population was in favour of a peaceful negotiation toward a new constitution, but they were afraid that they would be supressed by the black population. The apartheid government between 1990 and 1994 continued the raids on political dissidents and the execution of political prisoners. The police continuously ended uproars in townships with blood and violence. Multi party negotiations were disrupted and failed. Despite the violence and the degrading bond between De Klerk and Mandela, an interim constitution was drawn and the first free election was planned (Thompson, 2001, pp. 247-258).

Organizing free elections proved to be a struggle, because the governments of the free ‘homelands’ at first didn’t want to join the free elections. They rather remained sovereign states. With military pressure, the leader of the Inkatha Freedom Party...
(IFP), who wanted to pronounce the Zulu areas as sovereign, had to be persuaded to join the elections. Only a week before the elections, the IFP joined the list of parties. On April 26th 1994, the first free elections began. Though the elections were not flawless and completely fair, according to international observers, after three days the election was done. The ANC received almost 63% of the votes, the National Party 20% and the IFP 10%. As leader of the ANC, Nelson Mandela was the first black African president of the Republic of South Africa (Thompson, 2001, pp. 259-264).

In this paragraph I explain the current situation of South Africa, from my perspective, supported by statistics of the government, Frans Cronje (2014)’s book about the future scenarios of South Africa and recent articles by journalists.

Experiences in the current South Africa

In this paragraph I explain the current situation of South Africa, from my perspective, supported by statistics of the government, Frans Cronje (2014)’s book about the future scenarios of South Africa and recent articles by journalists.

Gini coefficient come to life

When you see the urban areas in South Africa, Pretoria, Johannesburg, Soweto, Cape Town, you see the differences between the rich and poor, and the social and racial segregation that was the heritage of apartheid. Looking down from the airplane at arrival, what you can see are the massive suburbs in and around Johannesburg and Pretoria. The houses are divided in areas that are sort of enclaves with walls around them. The more expensive areas are mixed with foreigners, rich blacks and a lot of whites. It is hard to say how the segregation of races has changed during the last decades. I feel like it is becoming more a segregation between rich and poor than segregation between black and white.1

In numbers of income the segregation becomes more clear, about 50% of the households spend less than R 1,799 per month, which is about £ 130. The relatively rich group of 10% of the households earn more than R 10,000 per month, which is about £ 700. 36% of the people of South Africa were poor in 2012 (poverty per capita). The Gini index, showing the economic inequality, was a tragic 0.631 in 2009.2 In 2012, the percentage of poor people among black people was 42%, among white people 0.8%. I thought the division of riches was shifting more gradually towards a racially equal level, but it seems only several black Africans become extremely rich and none of the whites become poorer. In 2012, one third of all the suburban property was bought by blacks, which shows that there is a certain middle class emerging from the black population, which is only as high as 10% of the black population. Fighting the poverty and inequality problem with higher taxes is probably not a solution, because only 20% of the population pays income taxes (Cronje, 2014, pp. 54-59) (SSA, 2010, p. viii).

Despite the economic situation of the country, since the end of apartheid, the basic needs, such as water and electricity, overall have improved and so have the social funds and wages (Cronje, 2014, pp. 8-15).

According to Cronje (2014), another economic problem is the decline of foreign investors in the large industries in the country. The political power is seen as not reliable and there were never more strikes in the mining industry than between 2010 and 2013. The economic growth is less than in the other BRICS countries.

1 This was a personal hypothesis, drawn from the first experiences in South Africa.

2 The Gini index is an indicator for economic inequality, with 1.0 being total inequality and 0.0 being total equality. The Gini coefficient for Norway was 0.227 in 2013, for the Netherlands it was 0.261. High inheritance and income taxes often cause a low coefficient.
Overcoming social barriers with language

When you have 11 official languages in a country, you would expect a multi-lingual country. In fact, most of the white population cannot speak a ‘black’ language, because all their lives they were just separated from these foreign tongues, only to hear them spoken by the domestic workers. There are some Afrikaners in the remote areas of South Africa that don’t speak a word English (Dis, 1996), just as there are many Sotho’s, Venda, Zulu’s and Xhosa that have difficulties with the English language.

What I noticed is that some progressive members of the white population of South Africa are willing to learn the foreign language that is mostly spoken in the area they live in, just to understand more of the people around them. Also white children sometimes learn a third African language from their black nannies.1

What I’m trying to say is that language is an enormous social barrier, because if you want to come closer to each other and experience reconciliation between one another, you need to be able to communicate well. More than often I was called ‘boss’ by beggars on the street, which for me symbolised the domination (still) of the English language, the English word for someone who holds power over you.

The search for an African identity

When I was at the UCT for a meeting with students, I found out that especially the young South Africans, the young students, are not content with the current educational system in South Africa. There are still too many differences between schools in white areas and schools in black areas. The education is still very Eurocentric, with history focusing on the history of continental Europe, the economy taught only from a western view.

The students wanted to attend an African school, with African history and topics viewed from an African perspective, not from a western perspective. But what is this African way of education? Is there an African identity, an African way of thinking? It is very difficult for this country to find a new identity. Mandela and De Klerk tried to reunite black and white in a rainbow nation, but that hasn’t proved to be a solid identity, yet strong enough to prevent civil war.

I think the white domination in South Africa has disrupted the wishes of the other groups in the country, their wishes for an own identity. It seems that they don’t even have a clue what they want as an identity: choose the western way of life, with opportunities in business and making money, or the more communist way of life, sharing the riches of the country with the people that actually work for it. At a student discussion in UCT I found out that students see China as an example for South Africa, as it is a big country with lots of natural resources, just like South Africa, as well as a country that is solitary and has an independent economy.²

A wave of xenophobia and #RhodesMustFall

In the last five to ten years, millions of immigrants from all over Africa have (illegally) come to South Africa, causing a lot of unrest among the South Africans. There have been several attacks on immigrants in the townships, during the last years. Estimations of the amount of immigrants in South Africa differ from 2 to 8 million. The same happens in Europe and the United States, where people are desperately trying to enter a relatively wealthy country, to share in the socio-economic opportunities. When I thought of this, there were actually two sorts of opinions, regardless of which continent. On the one hand we have the progressive opinion, which is based on hope for a better future for everyone, sharing progress in wealth and intellectual development. This is based on humanitarian arguments, but quite rationally, maybe a bit naively explained: when we share, together we will prosper. The second opinion is more emotionally based, or nationalistic. There are invaders coming across our borders, we don’t feel comfortable with them, we don’t feel safe, so we don’t want them and we must protect

---

1 During my visit in South Africa, I stayed with my family in Pretoria, in Cape Town I stayed at an Afrikaans man. In both situations I discovered that more and more young white South Africans acknowledge the importance of knowing at least one of the black African languages.

2 On the 30th of April, 2015, I went to UCT, to join a public panel discussion about the theme: “An African University”, which discussed the (lack of) African identity at the UCT.
our borders. Max du Preez (2015), a prominent journalist in South Africa, wrote a blog on the 5th of May 2015, pleading for more optimism on this subject. Isn’t it a big compliment for South Africa that millions of immigrants want to share in the prosperity of the country? (Preez, 2015)

Together with this wave of violence, a rage against the statues began while I was preparing my trip to South Africa. On the day I arrived in South Africa, the statue of Cecil Rhodes was removed from its base at the UCT. This whole rage started with a student smudging the statue with human excrement. Though through the whole country, statues were vandalised, this was part of a movement to decolonize the university, as I explained in the identity paragraph. Nevertheless, especially the black South Africans are fed up with statues in the public space that remind them of a regime that oppressed them. It also reminds them of the current government that remains protective of the white heritage and still advocates reconciliation. However, not everyone is content with this reminder. Sometimes it is just a rage against authority. Journalist Bram Vermeulen (2015), in a lecture in May 2015, said there was even a statue of Mahatma Gandhi daubed in Johannesburg. Though the student accused of daubing the statue had its reasons, Gandhi was a racist that worked together with the British in sustaining racial segregation (Vermeulen, 2015). In Cape Town a group has actively started putting graffiti on statues about 1.5 years ago, a group called ‘Tokolos’. Their motivation was to get attention for their protests against the arty and gentrification plans for the city centre of Cape Town. They argued that the government invested too much money in upgrading the city centre, while the people in the townships don’t even have their own toilets.4

The difficult quest for heritage

In the next chapters about heritage, memory and reconciliation, I will write more on this topic, but there is also a lot of connection with the current situation of South Africa.

The rage on the statues show that not all of the South Africans are content with the heritage of the whites or the apartheid heritage in their country. Either there is hatred amongst the people, or indifference. For example, most of

---

1 Not proven academically, it is based on assumptions.

2 Derived from current events.


4 For information on the Tokolos group I visited the Facebook page of the organization.

---

the people have no associations with the Castle at all. Recent history is more important (Tobé-Blessie, 2014), for example the place where Nelson Mandela and other heroes of ‘the struggle’ were held captive, Robben Island.¹

All the different social groups in South Africa have their own heritage (Tobé-Blessie, 2014). This makes people indifferent of the heritage of the other groups (Martens, 2015). Then the only reason for existence of certain heritage is that it is important to a small group and should educate the other groups, to show the importance of that heritage in the history of the whole country. Is that the future of the heritage in South Africa? Will all heritage fit in the rainbow nation?

According to Laura Robinson (2015) of the Cape Town Heritage Trust and Heritage Western Cape, that is the main challenge of heritage practitioners in the country, to satisfy all the different groups in South Africa (Robinson, 2015).

The future

According to Cronje (2014), making future scenario’s is difficult. In the first chapter of his book about the future of South Africa, he quotes the American scenario consultant Ian Wilson: "However good our futures research may be, we shall never be able to escape from the ultimate dilemma that all our knowledge is about the past, and all our decisions are about the future" (Wilson, 2000) (Cronje, 2014, p. 4). Though the different ethnical and social groups in the country face the same questions, they often consider the other groups as the ‘other side’ or even ‘the enemy’ (Cronje, 2014, p. 6). Recent developments like the increase of inequality, financial crisis and an increasing beneficiaries demanding percentage of the population have caused a fear for the future of the country. The government is not capable of funding the increasing expectations of its inhabitants. Cronje (2014) calls this the ‘curse of rising expectations’, which is both a root for social instability in the country as well as a key to understanding the future of it (Cronje, 2014, pp. 4-10).

¹ On several occasions, I encountered taxi drivers in Cape Town (black or coloured), who were merely interested in visiting Robben Island and didn’t associate their personal experience of history and heritage with the Castle at all.
When it comes to the term ‘dissonant heritage’, there is only one major source that wrote about this phenomenon so extensively. In 1996, the professors Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) wrote a book about dissonant heritage. In this paragraph I will explain what this subject is about and what the term means. At the end of this chapter, I want to elaborate on the situation in South Africa. Interviews with several experts on site helped me to understand the situation better.

**Heritage in general**

To understand what dissonant heritage means, of course it is important to know what heritage is. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) call it “A relict physical survival from the past” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 1). This can be positive or negative, a building or an object, or a situation you are dealing with. It can be heritage in a high culture, national culture or (contemporary) cultural activity, but also songs, dances, rhythms. Heritage can become alive in products, mainly crafts, which represent a certain country or region. Heritage can be the pride of one group, excluding another group, saying, my heritage is worth more than yours, mine is purer, better. Heritage can obtain “a sinister meaning” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 3). Heritage is also something you can create, in a range of different sites and products. Heritage can also be an evasion to the past, avoiding nowadays’ problems and future challenges (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 3-4).

Halbertsma and Kuipers (2014) speak of the
connection between identity and heritage. Some countries or (ethnic) groups have connected their identity to their burdened past (Halbertsma & Kuipers, 2014, pp. 151-171). It is almost like they have stepped into the role of a victim, adjusting their identity towards this expected role. And where there is a victim, there is a perpetrator (Dutch: een "pleger" of een "dader"), something that will be discussed in the paragraph about the heritage of atrocities.

Heritage is thus something that is created for a certain group, or that a certain group has created for themselves, through time and events in time. That makes it different from history, where research of the validity of these events and the associations bound to it are researched. This doesn't mean that validity and authenticity are not important for heritage, but they are not necessarily requirements, which I will explain.

Validity

What is important is the difference between heritage and history. History is based on facts, heritage on associations. That makes history objective and heritage subjective, history true and heritage not explicitly true for everyone. With heritage it is difficult to prove if it is true. You need an historian to do research on it and prove scientifically that your associations are indeed reflected by this particular piece of heritage. Of course you can lie about this, and use the heritage to project something different than the truth (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 9-10). This is slightly different from authenticity.

Authenticity

Authenticity is important to acknowledge the heritage. There has to be some party that states the authenticity of the object of heritage. But not only the object determines the authenticity, context does as well (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 10). Stephen Townsend (2015) explained it with the example of a big painting in a church in Italy, which had been relocated to Paris, during the French conquest under Napoleon. The original is in the Louvre in Paris, the true, valid painting. But now they decided to reconstruct the painting, copy it, and place the replica in the church again. They used the best techniques possible to make the reproduction, but regardless of that, which one is more authentic? Probably the replica, because in the end, it is the people’s associations and how they see the object in a certain context that makes it heritage (Townsend, 2015).

Semiotics

Some buildings can have intrinsic meanings or artefacts attached to them, the message contained in the objects. There is a medium used between the owner of the building (or the builder) and the public. Or the object itself is the medium transmitting the message. That sometimes makes these messages political statements, which can be used and manipulated by the owners (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 14-16).

Concluding

To conclude, heritage can be any reminder or relic from the past, as long as there is an owner, which passes on the heritage to another. What makes this heritage authentic and valid, is mostly determined by what associations people have with it and what the context of the heritage is, which makes heritage different than history. Therefore, it is important to know the context, to understand what the meaning is of the heritage, what the semiotics are of the heritage. The danger with heritage is that it can be used or
manipulated by the producer or owner, to project intrinsic messages to the receivers. Possible dissonance in this can occur, which will be explained in the next paragraph.

**Dissonance**

Heritage dissonance occurs when heritage behaves different than expected, or when an individual behaves different than expected towards the heritage. Heritage is about owning a product and passing it on to another, which means that some people own it and others do not. How often dissonance is present and how big it is, is determined by the kind of message that is transferred, the usage of the heritage and the social groups that are involved (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 20-21).

**The message from one to another**

The dissonance of heritage is in selling the story. What do you see and what do you get? Do you actually see anything, is there something concealed? Do you understand it? Is it the right thing you are getting? Isn’t it something that you like to see because you are used to it? Or do you see something of another culture that you want to have too?

As heritage is often a place product, with a certain site, heritage can often be an assemblage, with different heritages within different places, or all at the same place, but differently ‘sold’. Multi-use of this heritage assemblage in itself is not leading to dissonance, but multi-use by different ‘markets’ that are not successfully segregated, is. So what story is transmitted? And what can go wrong?

- **Contradictory transmissions**: The same or related heritages projects different messages. This should not always be a problem. A multitude of messages also means a range of different experiences of the heritage.

- **A failure in transmission**: The message is differently received than intended, by some or all recipients. The wrong groups are approached. The initial message is distorted, ignored or incomplete.

- **Obsolete transmission**: The message is not relevant anymore, due to a change of society. Result is that the objects are not understood or not recognised.

- **Undesirable transmission**: The history that hurts, the things people don’t want to hear or don’t permit others to hear. (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 26-29)

**SCALE**

How big the dissonance is, is determined by who the groups are that are involved and how big the site is and the area of influence. Is it provincial heritage? Or National heritage? Or worldwide?
The ownership

Each generation has the choice what they want do with ‘their’ heritage. There can be disagreement on this subject, within a certain country, or external factors make the opinion on the heritage different. What does the next generation inherit? Who inherits?

Different ‘heirs’ of the same heritage can make use of the heritage peacefully, even when there is dissonance. In this case people just don’t care and leave the other group be (option 1), people just don’t know of each other or don’t care to know (option 2) or people join in each other’s heritage (option 3) (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 30-31).

When you look at heritage as a commodified good (Dutch: een product met marktwerking), “(...) differentiating the economic heritage product in order to broaden its market could be used as a vehicle for promoting recognition of all heritages in a plural society, and thereby promoting social equity and harmony.” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 33) Shortly said: "Why wouldn't you just sell the same heritage in more ways, so everyone can enjoy it?" Unfortunately, this doesn't always go well. When the one group experiences the heritage differently than the other, because there is social inequality, it becomes different. This might lead to marginalization of the heritage of the dominant group or a change in displaying the heritage. This is the mainspring of heritage dissonance (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 32).

The uses and misuses of heritage

I discussed that inequality between social groups and the manipulation of the message contained in heritage can cause dissonance. But what are these social groups and what are the possible uses (and misuses) of heritage? Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) name three uses of heritage, political use, economic use and cultural use. Cultural use is use as a museum, as a cultural hub or as a place for education on history and the heritage of culture. Political use is heritage used by political entities to create a unified sense among the electorate. UNESCO can be seen as a worldwide political organization in this sense, trying to unify all human beings in having a common world heritage. The third use of heritage is the economic use of heritage, especially for tourism, but also as a local asset.

All three heritage usages have their own restrictions, problems and potential for dissonance (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 34-68).

CULTURAL USE

When heritage is displayed in a museum(-like) environment, the difficulty lies in the manner in which the information is transferred to the public. Is it based on educational purposes or is the display solely meant to give a certain experience? Who then is it for? For school classes or for tourists? Or is it meant for locals? Or for tourists who don’t know a thing about the historical context? (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 39-45)

22. Heritage can have different meanings for different groups. The meaning of heritage, the message it sends, can also be distorted, or become obsolete because of a change of (political) context.
POLITICAL USE
Heritage is almost always politically used, because it represents the heritage of a certain group of people, a certain state or a certain company. It might not be actively politically used, but in every heritage there is a potential for political use.

In the case of political differences within a country, a dominant social group can preserve heritage of a minority group very well by displaying the group as a minority, as if they want to put them in a museum with their culture, minifying them. Note that history and archives are often written by the dominant, more powerful group that has the resources to keep up an archive (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 46-50).

Political use of heritage can cause weird things to happen with the heritage. It can be relocated, as the relocation of museum objects and art during wars or conquest. Heritage can be ‘stolen’, when for example Roman or Greek remains are found, the city becomes ‘Roman’. Example: Nijmegen in the Netherlands is proud to be the oldest city in the country, because it used to be a Roman town. Now this is used in the city marketing. Turning churches into mosques or the other way around is a way of religious political use of heritage. And in the worst case, of course, heritage can be destroyed because of the political situation or because of the political usage of the heritage in the past (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 50-57).

ON WHAT SCALE?
Again the scale determines the largeness of the dissonance. With transnational unions like the EU and UN, the political influences are global as well as local. This means that the same heritage can be used politically on different scales. What it means to a town is different than what it means on a global scale. This can cause dissonance between the local and the global (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 57-59).

ECONOMIC USE
This use has a lot of similarities with the political and cultural use of heritage, the difference is that it now has to do with commercial interests instead of political.

The commodification of heritage makes it more important that it is clear what is sold, what the target groups are and what they want. Here the difference between the local and the global ‘consumers’ is again a challenge.

What is also important is the total heritage area, where there are mostly lots of shops, craftsmen and antiquaries around. Is what they sell adding to the total authenticity of the place, or is it Disneyland full of fakery? (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 59-68)

The social groups
When there is dissonant heritage in question, it is always the case that there is an owner and a non-owner, who is not inheriting the heritage. When there is any form of majority and minority, both groups have their heritage, causing dissonance. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) differentiate three forms of inequality or differences between social groups. Cultural and ethnic difference, social differences and political and ideological differences.

CULTURAL/ETHNIC DIFFERENCES
Each ethnic group has its own languages, its uses, its ways of enacting culture and religion. This is often associated with race and race is close to it, but never fully the division of cultures and ethnicities (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 70-76).

SOCIAL DIFFERENCES
Class is probably the most severe means of inequality, segregation and dissonance in heritage. Gender inequality in heritage is probably mostly experienced with female heroes and heroic stories. In countries where woman are abstained from experiencing certain heritage, that could also be a source of dissonance. The same occurs with homosexuals and disabled persons, who are an intrinsic part of all cultural, ethnic or class groups, but do form a different group in experiencing heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 76-84).

POLITICAL IDEOLOGY
The political ideology is closely linked to all aspects of social groups. Everything can become political or be politically used by one group or another.
ON WHAT SCALE?
Again, it is important to know the scale of these groups. How big are they, where are they living? What are the differences between the groups in for example income, or criminality? Also settlements that are politically based, removals or spatial segregation of minority groups have impact on heritage and dissonance of heritage. People can be spatially kept away from heritage or even (unwantedly) confronted with the heritage (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 86-92).

Heritage of Atrocity
In case of severe events, like war crimes, bombardments, or continuous discrimination of a minority group, reminders of these past events in essence work the same as all other heritage objects. There is a group that claims the heritage and there is a certain message that is transferred to its users. In the case of atrocities, we speak of the perpetrators, the victims or the outsiders, which are mostly tourists, but sometimes spectators or unwanted or –predicted keepers of the heritage.

The difference with ‘normal’ heritage is that the heritage of atrocities is ever more capable of creating a feeling of unitedness among, mostly, the group of victims. It also serves a more educational or touristic purpose, to become an example of how things should not happen (again) (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 94-95).

Can you use the heritage of atrocity?
You can imagine that major dissonances can occur in the heritage of atrocities. And that occurs in the uses of these heritages. If the atrocity can be ‘used’ depends on several things, the nature of the cruelty, who the victims were, who the perpetrators were and how well documented the event is. How the victims and perpetrators behave towards the heritage is essential, both the role of the victim and the perpetrator can be manipulated, or glorified. The most difficult quest with the heritage of atrocities is to use it for the purpose of reconciliation, to personalise it, but not too much, to not scare spectators with horrifying experiences. In most cases of heritage of atrocity, it depends on the way the memorial or the relic is positioned in its current use, whether the outcome of the message that is intended, is actually received correctly. “Interpretation and reinterpretation may vary widely in space and time, far beyond the scene of the crime and the lifespan of its surviving participants” (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 128), (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 94-129).

AN EXAMPLE OF THE USAGE OF ATROCITY HERITAGE
To give an example, Robben Island is a successful example of heritage that can be experienced as heritage of atrocities. Because I visited the site, I can sum up the successes and dangers of the usage of this heritage. Firstly, Robben Island is one of the main ‘attractions’ of Cape Town. Outsiders from all over the world, tourists that haven’t experienced the atrocities from up close, can share in this heritage and the story of the victims. In all the tours, a former convict tells
his story personally. This means the heritage is used for educational purposes, to show the world what happened here and that it will hopefully never happen again. Secondly, victims of the apartheid regime can re-imagine the past and recognise something of their own stories. Thirdly, for perpetrators, in this case the group of white South Africans, going to Robben Island would probably feel uncomfortable, as they are confronted with this heritage from another role. Though often the perpetrators find a way to demonise a smaller group of perpetrators, Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) mention in their book, They blame a smaller group within their group for the atrocities. This can dissolve the uncomfortable dissonance of this heritage, but prevents it from having a function of reconciliation between the actual perpetrators and the victims. Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) also mention the danger this can have on the future, as the educational message towards (future) perpetrators is evaded by everyone. Everyone agrees that they will never support a government like that again, but will they?

Dissonance in South Africa

In this paragraph I will reflect on the previous chapters of this dissertation. To look at the theory of dissonant heritage of Tunbridge and Ashworth (1996) and put it in a South African perspective. In fact the professors use Southern Africa as one of their case regions in the book. Especially South Africa, which until the 1990s had a society based on inequality, and which is a country that knows a lot of heritage dissonance. As advice to the people of South Africa they say: "seek to reduce urban heritage dissonance more rapidly in order to motivate the democratic leadership not merely to soften the process of postcolonial heritage reorientation but also to defend heritage in general from the environmental stresses, especially crime, which are developing" (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, p. 258). This to prevent minority groups, now for example white Afrikaners, to create enclaves of their own culture, and leave the inner city with its monuments to the fate of criminal gangs. Making the monuments of the old colonial powers useful and meaningful to more than one group of people, helps this heritage to survive (Tunbridge & Ashworth, 1996, pp. 223-262). But this is, when atrocities have taken place, a difficult solution.

Whose heritage?

I think South Africa still has problems with targeting the heritage to certain groups. Or maybe they are successful with it but the targets are very different, as is the heritage. For example, the Voortrekker monument in Pretoria is on a hill right next to the hill where the new Freedom Park was built, an apartheid memorial park. Both places are targeted towards the social
groups that they represent. The Freedom Park for those who weren’t free during apartheid, the Voortrekker monument for Afrikaners who feel associated with the Voortrekkers. In the Freedom Park, the messages at the museum displays are literally written from the perspective of the black Africans, it is ‘our’ struggle, ‘our’ ancestors were discriminated and treated unequally. That makes it difficult to share this heritage, as a white person. The Voortrekker monument has a lot of symbolic strength over it, displaying the boere as healthy, muscled, attractive men and women, zooming in on their adventurous ox wagon-migration, their heroic battles against the Zulu and their struggle for their own free states. Here the heritage is also targeted towards one group, the Afrikaners, but more in a symbolic way by the statues and the presence of the building.

In my preparations to go to the Freedom Park and the Voortrekker monument I read that the president had opened a road of reconciliation recently, between both places. When we drove there the road was closed off with fences. I guess the road wasn’t a strong enough gesture to bring the two structures together and let the people share each other’s heritage.

My quest in the Cape

Of course the example explained above can be sustainable, when both groups have their own heritage and live peaceful next to each other, indifferent of each other’s ways of heritage. But in a city like Cape Town, an urban area, people are encountering the colonial heritage in the public space whether they want it or not. In the case of the Voortrekker monument in Pretoria, the building is towering over the city centre, imposing power over it. In Cape Town, the Castle and the Town Hall are two colonial buildings that are amongst the eye catchers of the town. At the University of Cape Town (UCT), a university with a growing amount of black students, the statue of Rhodes was towering over the campus, until protests caused dismantling of the statue in the beginning of 2015.

When this heritage comes in the domain of other social groups, groups that might feel offended by its presence or existence, there is a dissonance in that heritage emerging. Heritage that has no (other) uses, like mere symbolic statues, is then vulnerable for demolition.
The first topic I addressed was the history that South Africa has as a former colony of both the Netherlands and Britain. Often the historians started the history of South Africa with the landing of Jan van Riebeeck, the first Dutch settler on the shores of the Cape in 1652, and Bartholomeus Diaz and Vasco da Gama, who were the first European explorers that sailed around the Cape of Good Hope, a hundred years before that.

**THE DUTCH AT THE CAPE**

As a matter of fact, the Dutch weren’t the first to establish a society in the Cape region. The Khoikhoi and San hunters and cattle herders, now referred to as Khoisan, had already built up a society in the south western part of Africa. The Cape was one of the few places where the drought of winter wasn’t affecting them. Though the Dutch weren’t supposed to settle outside the fortress and the vegetable gardens, the VOC stirred something that changed the future of South Africa, they granted former employees the status of free burgher, which meant that they could claim land and settle outside the premises of the VOC replenishment station. This was the start of a long series of clashes between the indigenous people of the Cape region and the Dutch. The Dutch also started to import slaves, a couple of years after arriving on the shores. This in combination with the free burgher-ship caused the Dutch colony to grow and become self-sufficient. In the mid 1700’s the colony was expanded hundreds of kilometres outside of Cape Town, at the cost of the Khoisan.

**Summary and Conclusions Part I**

**Mutual history**

The first topic I addressed was the history that South Africa has as a former colony of both the Netherlands and Britain. Often the historians started the history of South Africa with the landing of Jan van Riebeeck, the first Dutch settler on the shores of the Cape in 1652, and Bartholomeus Diaz and Vasco da Gama, who were the first European explorers that sailed around the Cape of Good Hope, a hundred years before that.
Though there was some kind of government outside Cape Town, the amount of VOC officials outside of Cape Town was less than 10. The goal of the VOC was to have a heavily fortified replenishment station at the Cape of Good Hope, so their trade routes to the east could make a half way stop. That’s why the regions of the colony outside Cape Town were not military protected, making the free burghers, later called trekboere, to be dependent on their communal protection commando’s. Cape Town, on the other hand was protected by a line of 33 batteries and fortresses, by the end of the 18th century. At the end of this century, the town was fortified with the help of the French, an alliance between the Netherlands and France that evoked a British landing in 1795, one that was won by the British. The colony was given back to the Dutch (Batavian) Republic in 1803, only to remain in Dutch/French hands for three years.

**THE ENGLISH AT THE CAPE**
The English settlers started to arrive in 1820. They settled far to the east of Cape Town, establishing for example Grahamstown and Port Elisabeth at Algoa Bay. The English inherited a country full of internal conflicts, with the Bantu speaking Africans stirring in the east, the revolutionist and rebellious trekboere in the Cape and the vast socio-economical differences between the Europeans, the (free) slaves and the Khoisan.

The trekboere were unhappy with the stirry conditions at the borders and decided to move out of the Colony. They started to call themselves the Voortrekkers, going on an Exodus which was called the Great Trek. During their journey, they were constantly fighting the Ndebele and Zulu, to the northeast of Cape Town. The English continued their war against the Xhosa and Zulu to the east of Cape Town. By 1870, Southern Africa was completely colonized by whites, with the republics of South Africa (Transvaal) and Orange Free State, governed by the Voortrekkers (the Boer republics) and the Cape and Natal by the English.

**The fights for a Union of South Africa**
War broke out between the Boer republics and Great Britain two times, because the English tried to get a hold on the gold mines around Johannesburg, defending the interests of the white mineworkers, who mostly came from English-speaking countries. In 1902 the Second Anglo-Boer War ended with the peace of Vereeniging, putting the Transvaal and Orange Free State under the control of the commonwealth. Together the leaders of the states of Southern Africa, including Jan Smuts and Louis Botha, came together to create the constitution of the Union of South Africa, which was constituted definitely in 1910.

**Current situation of South Africa**
The second topic was the situation of South Africa, with the recent history from 1910, towards the freedom of 1994.

**ROAD TO APARTEID**
The recent quarrels between the English and the Afrikaner Boere (former trekboere) were still present up to the Second World War, when the prominent nationalist Afrikaner party questioned the allegiance with Britain. But in politics, the English and Afrikaners found each other in their will to establish the wealth and power over South Africa for the European colonists. The poorer Afrikaner farmers were subsidised, so they could become wealthier. The English held most of the positions in business and government administration, so their position was already stronger. In 1913, the Natives Land Act was installed, granting 12 percent of the surface country (in 1939) to the ‘natives’ of the country. Only men that worked in town or in the mines were allowed passage outside of the premises of the native homelands. In 1923 the Natives Urban Act was installed, starting the urban segregation of black, coloured, Indian/Asian and white.

Because the black Africans provided cheaper labour than the white, the larger companies started to place blacks on higher positions during the 1920s, a time of high inflation. This caused strikes among the white labourers and a growing anxiety towards black Africans. In this
situation the Nationalist party could win a victory at the elections of 1924. After installation the party installed Afrikaans as national language, the British flag was replaced with a new, hybrid flag and the white women were granted voting rights, diminishing the electoral power of the black men. The sentiment in politics switched again and again between pro-British and pro-Afrikaner frontmen. In 1948, the (Purified) National Party, a new party that emerged from the pro-Afrikaner wing of the Nationalist party, won the elections, with a minority of votes. From this election onward, we can speak of an apartheid regime.

**APARTHEID INSTITUTIONALISED**

From 1948 on, the segregation was severely enacted. People were removed from their houses and replaced in a ‘homeland’ or a designated township. Education and basic sanitation was of very low quality for the black Africans. Public spaces were separated and sex and relationships between people of different races were prohibited. 3.5 million people were relocated because of the Natives Acts, between 1960 and 1983. The country became a paranoid police state, with 21 percent of the budget spent on defence. In 1960, 1976 and 1977, great marches of resistance ended up in massive arrests or as a massacre. The country slowly became isolated from the world trade and politics, with pressure on the government increasing.

From 1986 on, a global mission started to end the government in South Africa, that mission failed and South Africa continued its paranoid state. Around 1990, the involvement of South Africa in Namibia, Angola and Mozambique ended. The decline of apartheid had finally begun.

**EXPERIENCES IN THE CURRENT SOUTH AFRICA**

The influence of apartheid is still present in the current South Africa, though there is an emerging black middle class, almost half (42%) of the black population is poor, in relation to 0,8% of the white population. Still there is a culture of striking, which makes the amount of international investments in the country lower than the BRIC countries. Basic needs of sanitation, water and electricity have improved substantially in the past 20 years.

Language is still a great barrier between whites and non-whites. Though the young South Africans try to learn two or three languages, communication is still an issue, especially because language segregation still exists in lower education. Sometimes white people are still referred to as ‘boss’, by poor black people, showing the dominance of English language on them.

South Africa, especially the young South Africa, is still looking for a new identity. The image of a rainbow nation was a strong means to overcome the apartheid trauma, but hasn’t proved strong enough to give the country a national feeling of economic independency and equality. The education system is still based on the British system, which makes it very hard for black South Africans to finish it. A strong movement against these colonial systems has emerged from especially the black student population. Symbols of the colonial era are vandalised throughout the country.

The last couple of years though, the freedom and the opportunities in the country have drawn a lot of illegal immigrants, causing unrest and violence between the lower and middle class population and the immigrants. The search for an African identity and the rage on symbols of colonialism make heritage a difficult subject in South Africa. The heritage is still very segregated and it is a challenge to satisfy all the different groups in the country in this sense.

**Dissonant heritage**

The third theoretical subject of this dissertation is dissonant heritage, or contested heritage. This chapter started with a notion on heritage in general, followed by the theory of heritage dissonance. In the last paragraph I reflected on the situation in South Africa, as addition to the former two chapters.

**HERITAGE GENERAL**

Heritage literally means some relict from the past that you can inherit, which can be an object, a building or an intangible relict like a story or a memory. This indicates that you can own heritage, produce heritage and sell heritage to others. Heritage is strongly attached
to a certain group that owns the heritage, identifying themselves with it. Because heritage is something that is created, it is different from history. Validating the information you have from the past is history, with heritage validity is less important. Authenticity is important to make the heritage credible, and authenticity is not always defined by the validity of heritage, more on the context of that heritage. In the built heritage, symbolics or semiotics are often used to transfer the heritage message to the consumers or users of the heritage.

**DISSONANCE**

Dissonance in heritage occurs when the messages are transferred from the owner or designer to the user or consumer. What do you see and what do you get? There are several things that can go wrong in transferring this message. The heritage is experienced in multiple ways, the message is wrongly posed, the message is not relevant anymore or the message has become undesirable. It is up to the owner to decide what to do with the heritage and if the message is to be changed.

**THE USES AND MISUSAGE OF HERITAGE**

According to Ashworth and Tunbridge, heritage is used for three main purposes, often overlapping each other.

*Cultural use*

The first use is cultural, using the heritage as cultural, museum-like, based mostly on education or experience.

*Political use*

The second use is political use, heritage used by a certain political entity as ‘theirs’. Strange things can happen, such as copying from old cultures, relocating objects, demolishing objects, changing the religious goals of a building etc. Also certain political entities can contradict each other, posing national heritage against heritage of the world, or a continental organization like the EU.

*Economic use*

Here instead of a political entity, a commercial entity uses the heritage, to gain profit from it. Heritage is a proven asset in a certain area, where shops and antiquaries benefit from the existence of heritage. The danger lies in authenticity here, what if they sell fakery?

**THE SOCIAL GROUPS**

As you have the side of the owners or the producers of heritage, you have the side of the consumers, the society. With heritage there is always a group that associates with the heritage and a group that is excluded from the heritage. There are cultural differences between people, social differences and political differences. It is important to know the scale of these differences and what the differences are on a certain scale.

**HERITAGE OF ATROCITY**

In essence, heritage concerning atrocities that occurred in the past, works the same as ‘normal’ heritage. Only now a clear group of victims can be designated, as well as a group of perpetrators.

The dissonance with heritage of atrocity is always more present and emotionally more sensitive.

Heritage of atrocities can be used, for educational purposes or even for tourism. It is important to keep in mind what the role of the victims and the perpetrators was, and if this role can be manipulated, or glorified. To use the heritage for reconciliation is very difficult.

**DISSONANCE IN SOUTH AFRICA**

The threat for South Africa is the deterioration of the heritage of the white minority group. As spatial segregation has allowed them to create enclaves of their own, the relation with the old monuments in the town centres is gone, leaving them to other groups that don’t associate with it.

The heritage in South Africa is still very targeted towards minority groups. Even the new monuments like the Freedom Park in Pretoria are targeted towards the black population of South Africa. That is understandable because it was their struggle for freedom, so it is their heritage. This can be a sustainable situation, if the groups would accept each other’s heritage. But that isn’t the case, proved by the recent attacks on white heritage. Especially structures that are positioned in mixed used public spaces, like libraries or universities, or in primarily black populated spaces, like city centres, are painfully symbolic and painfully misplaced. The context has changed and now the heritage is there without the right context.
SUMMING UP THE CONNECTION BETWEEN DISSONANT HERITAGE AND SOUTH AFRICA
As heritage dissonance is a difficult subject, I will try to summarize and conclude on the theory of dissonance in combination with the situation in South Africa.

There is in fact no problem, when the different groups live together in one country and don't care about each other's heritage, or just leave them be. Sharing in each other's heritage doesn't have to be problematic either. But, what you see in South Africa, is that there is...

...firstly, a big problem with the segregation of people according to race, which creates different population groups, who each have their own heritage, their own memories. The black Africans remember their struggle to freedom, the English suffer from their role as colonial imperialists, the Afrikaners consider themselves victims of the Anglo-Boer Wars and at the same time the oppressors controlling the apartheid regime.

...secondly, a certain stock of monumental buildings from the colonial and apartheid times, clearly 'misused' by a certain group. The most important of them being public government buildings, which are public within the democracy, and thus been 'taken over' by the majority of black African voters. The buildings are positioned in the centres of the towns, which are not the areas where it is safe. Whites, the former 'owners' of this heritage, are living in enclosed communities outside the city centres, separated from the heritage.

...thirdly, a new regime, of which the intention is not to oppress and impress. Glorification of colonial or imperialistic power is not relevant anymore. A new narrative of the South African Republic is emerging from the last 20 years of independence.

So in the case of the heritage which was described as 'problematic' in South Africa, the main solution is to use the heritage for reconciliation or as an educational reminder of the past that is regarded as negative. In the case of shared heritage of atrocities, which is shared by different social groups, a neutral display of the victims as well as the perpetrators is essential. This is to personalize the experience of the heritage and to make the users/visitors understand the correct intention of the heritage.

Towards Part II
In the next part of this dissertation, part II, I will use the Castle of Good Hope, one of the first buildings that was built by the Dutch settlers in Cape Town and a major example of dissonant heritage, as a case to explain the dissonance of that heritage. In this case study, I will also explore what this object in its place means for the city or to the world, to find out what the current intention and meaning of the building could be, for the current South Africa and for the future. At the end of the case study I will reflect on the theory part, part I, and try to find out what can be done in a spatial way to dissolve, or deal with dissonance in heritage.
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