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ABSTRACT

The year 2015 marked a significant year in South African History and it ignited a deep desire in the hearts of locals in Port Elizabeth, Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan to question and engage with the city’s ambivalent heritage landscape and heritage discourse. The year 2015 was the year in which the country witnessed the rise community movements that called for the removal of Victorian and Apartheid era heritages across the country. The year also saw a rise in violent service delivery protests and a rise in the amount of xenophobic attacks across the county, including Port Elizabeth. In this thesis, positioned within the field of heritage studies (Anthropology) and employing the concept of the *ubuhlanti* (Kraal) as a tool to understand the former within a heritage framework. The thesis unpacks and demonstrate how the city centre of Port Elizabeth can be likened to the concept of the *ubuhlanti*. The *ubuhlanti*: an intimate community space, which has the potential to double up as an exclusionary space, excluding those who do not possess the necessary social capital to enter its centre.

*Keywords*: Heritage, Xenophobia, Representation, *ubuhlanti*
Govan Mbeki Avenue, Port Elizabeth, South Africa
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INTRODUCTION

In recent years, heritages found in the ‘urban’ context have attracted the interest of government and increasingly the general populace. In this thesis, I propose that heritages in post-apartheid South Africa are tangible and intangible, as well as diverse, articulating the complexity of social life and identities in the country. The primary hypothesis is that if heritage is understood and framed as a locally generated and locally embedded concept, then South Africa (at least), would have more socially meaningful forms of heritage management. The case for local conceptualisation of heritage is supported by current thoughts on heritage in contemporary theory. In this literature, heritage is conceptualised as an amalgamation of diverse and integrated manifestations of the past that are used for political ends (Bouchenaki, 2003).

Heritage is also both tangible and intangible. It is expressed in multiple social interactions and via various social norms. The particularity and yet interconnectedness of heritage (itself a social creation), produces place, social meaning, value and social practices.

In post-apartheid South Africa, the past remains. There are still various settler monuments and memorials that now ‘sit’ alongside newly erected monuments that reflect the liberation of the country. Behind and beneath these overt and publicly displayed forms of culture, there is a long history and legacy of intangible cultural heritage: the oral histories, languages, folklore, song and beliefs of the many people living in the country.

Since the advent of democracy in 1994, new forms of urban governance, politics and laws¹ have been drafted and instituted to pave the way for the construction of tangible and new heritages, to represent previously marginalised communities. The latter not only informed the economic and symbolic coding and re-coding, valuing and re-valuing

¹ White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage (1996) and the Heritage Resources, Act 25 of 1999
of already existing urban heritages in the country, but it has also informed the political direction of the country.

This chapter contains a broad overview of the thesis. It gives an introductory context within which the study is positioned in the discipline of anthropology and sub-discipline of heritage studies. The chapter also introduces the research topic, research goal and framework.

**Us and them**

In post-apartheid South Africa, specifically in Port Elizabeth, black people (that is, individuals defined as black African under apartheid due to their skin pigmentation) are constantly engaging with social and physical environment (including cultural monuments) as well as newcomers in the city, especially foreign Africans (including lower income Zimbabweans). The latter individuals are also found in spaces that Black African South Africans consider intimate and ‘sacred’. In the much-quoted book, *Us and Them*, Thomas Hylland Eriksen notes that the process of creating the ‘other’ is convoluted, multi-stranded and largely disempowering. In South Africa, we find a similar situation. There are in groups and out groups, degrees of integration, as well as situational and momentary experiences of belonging.

In and out groups are created via a “cultural imaginary”, which refers to the intersection of fantasy and discursive interactions which cultural communities mirror and use as points of reference for their collective identity (Lykke, 2000). It is through the use of this imaginary that collective lexicon for their attributions of difference are created and used to inform ideas of the others’ shared identity (Spencer, 2014:XIX). The latter plays an important role in portrayals of difference; presenting people based on imagined cultural narratives about their identities and often denoting the norms of belonging and exclusion (Spencer, 2014).

---


3 The ethnographic fieldwork was conducted among isiXhosa-speaking South Africans and Shona-speaking Zimbabweans in Port Elizabeth, Eastern Cape, South Africa.
As humans, we create stereotypes so that we can simplify our social world. There is also a tendency to create social boundaries not only to define (and simplify) others, but also to delineate the self, so as to delineate resources set aside for the self and one’s ‘community’. In this way, the “other” becomes inseparable from the self, since one needs the other to self-define and for boundary-making.

In the colonial ‘project’, the re-imagining of others and the delineation of boundary occurred on a grand scale, entrenching violent domination and control (Spencer, 2014:10). These boundary-making and stereotyping processes were also useful in the creation of the “nation state” (Spencer, 2014:16). These boundaries create moral consensus, uniting people around ‘subjective’ societal values and heritages, and social institutions that continually use “us” as subjects of normality (Felluga, 2011; Spencer, 2014).

As I show in this thesis, the process of forging a salient identity at individual and group level is dependent on interactions with others (Spencer, 2014:10). While individuals are not aware of their actions on a daily basis, they are constantly subconsciously or consciously monitoring their environment, subjectively constructing and establishing reference points (race and ethnicity), alignments with shared values and beliefs, and establishing (often unequal relations) with others with whom they have less in common (Spencer, 2014:12). This leads to the creation of in groups and out groups; “a them and an us… affirming qualities and characteristic that the majority group sees as normal and as the rules by which they live” (Spencer, 2014:11).

**Constructing the other: Race**

Twenty-two years into South Africa’s democracy, individuals continue to “harbour anxieties about ‘race’ [and] feel that the subject is covered by taboo, but [they] do not know exactly what the rules of the taboo are” (Kohn, 1996:1) and as such they are not open to talking about race and its lived experiences (Spencer, 2014:XVV).

Alexander (2006) argues that race does not exist socially and biologically; but is a lived reality for a number of black and coloured people who are still suffering from the legacy of apartheid and are still trapped in the vicious poverty cycle that the apartheid
government designed to keep them down. It is impossible to define race, for it does not exist.

In South Africa, race is still a problematic term, because of apartheid. As Totemeyer (2012:1) outlines, race as an ideological concept was used by the apartheid government to promote its segregationist policies that claimed “that different human races exist, defined in terms of hereditary transmission, skin colour and body form, and that one race is ultimately superior to the others”. The apartheid government further believed that it was the right of the ‘superior race’ “of whites [to take] ownership and to rule over others” (Totemeyer, 2012:1). Since the end of apartheid, the concept of race and its use has been fiercely debated and contested; however, it remains in use, because it is intrinsically woven into the country’s social fabric, the country’s understandings and definitions of citizenship and lineage (Spencer, 2014:41).

The concepts of “race” and “ethnicity” are concepts that have a “historical genealogy: they are social constructions which became identifiable, where and when the boundaries between groups became noticeable, perhaps owing to competitive relationships or difference in cultural identity or practice” (Spencer, 2014:XVV). As such, the naming and categorising of individuals is a highly politicised act. The manner in which names and racial categories are established and interpreted is a way of establishing boundaries and admitting individual choice and self-determination, and is used to enforce dominance, power and government (Ember, Ember & Peregrine, 2013:79) the country’s understandings and definitions of citizenship and lineage.

**Constructing the other: Ethnicity**

To understand the concepts of race and ethnicity it is important to examine the process through which these categorisations come into operation (Spencer, 2014).

Ethnicity is a purely cultural concept and can be understood as “a social group or category of the population [which is] set apart [or] bound together by common ties of race, language, nationality or culture” (Sander, 1998:21). Leading on from Barth (1998), Totemeyer (2012) argues that ethnicity is the outcome of the establishment of social boundaries, which seek to separate one group of people from another. Through the “establishment of taboos on social interaction, especially intermarriage, and by the
selection of markers of ethnic identity to distinguish the group from others in the arena” (Herbert, 2012:66; Sanou, 2015:94).

Under apartheid rule, the government’s policy was to subdivide black communities into different sub-groups or ethnicities based on their cultural affiliations, customs and language, and to domicile them in so-called homelands or Bantustans. The apartheid government therefore racialised ethnicity for own ideological and political selfish purposes (Totemeyer, 2012:1). It is important to discuss this, because, in this thesis, a localised concept of ‘ubuhlanti’ will be used; however, the purpose of this is not to promote any form of tribalism, but to propose the possibility of an alternative framework of understanding heritage.

It is important to discuss and outline the concepts of race and ethnicity in this section, because even though they are not the direct focus of this thesis, the use of these political concepts influence local perceptions of heritage and its management. For example, these two highly contested concepts are used by research participants to define themselves or the people that they interact with. The same terms are used by the government in the public domains, i.e. on official forms, or in social cohesion celebrations where they urge citizens to celebrate their diversity and be united in their diversity.

**First contact: Engagement between locals and foreigners**

Engagements between lower income locals happen in small spaces and often at a superficial level. In Port Elizabeth, locals perceive migrants and ‘colonial’ heritages as the “foreign” and the distant other, that which does not belong within newly inherited intimate spaces. The presence of foreigners in these spaces is constantly questioned by the isiXhosa speakers I met. As such, this thesis, positioned in the field of heritage studies, considers how both colonial and/or apartheid heritages are treated as the ‘foreign’ by the black majority in urban spaces. It conceptualises urban spaces as recent inheritances of the isiXhosa majority in the Eastern Cape. What one sees is that this grouping is protective of such inheritances and do not want to share these, especially not with foreign nationals.
This thesis engages not only on the issue of heritage conservation in present-day South Africa. It also interrogates the representation of the majority population found in one part of Port Elizabeth. The thesis also investigates how dominant or hegemonic heritages convey meanings of the past and the ways in which such publicly interpreted meanings affect individuals and the broader community. Colonial heritages are currently perceived by the majority as largely one-dimensional, which invariably means that they are interpreted as being highly monolithic and exclusionary.

Successive apartheid regimes in South Africa sought to erase Africans’ memories of their past and cultures. This erasure formed a part of the domination process, for Africans’ cultural practices and value orientations were to be forcibly aligned with the dominant, Eurocentric ethos of self and community. Thus, in South Africa, as in the past, contemporary projects of commemoration and heritage management have involved a process of selectively remembering and selectively forgetting the past (Werbner, 1998). Projects of remembrance emerge at times and places when government seeks to achieve a conscious or constructed break from the past. The symbolic and nostalgic representations of the past seek to reinforce political legitimacy and reduce questions about the past and alternative representations. This results in the selection and/or creation of legitimated (neo-hegemonic) memories and imaginaries that hold specific social and political power4. These memories and ‘interpretations’ of the past are pieced together in order to create national heritage narratives that are ‘accommodative’ and ‘inclusive’ of all cultures, races and heritages in the country.

Over the past 22 years of democracy, government has used the concept of heritage to foster a sense of social cohesion and nationhood among the country’s formerly divided racial and ethnic groups. South Africa has not journeyed this path alone. There are many new nations whose governments attempt to use heritage to advance social cohesion and its preservation is of concern to many globalized citizens; heritage itself is identified is nominated and inscribed in the universally acknowledged World Heritage Lists (WHL). Although the globalized approach to heritage management has

4 Sometimes, using the same contradictory categories which they want to resist.
been widely criticised, heritage has become an asset for many governments, a means to publicly and overtly express and conserve culture, as well as commoditise it.

As a signatory to UNESCO’s WHL, the South African government has also identified and accepted inscription of several World Heritage Sites (WHS) in the WHL. In many instances, one can see that the heritages are not conserved merely for their intrinsic value, but rather for their usefulness to other ends.

To date, scholars such as Rassool, Gavua and Minkley, as well as Witz (2011), have engaged with and reflected on the role that a locally grounded heritage concept can play in South Africa. They generally perceive heritage as a tool that people use to actively interrogate history and heritage. An instrument which affords individuals (quite possibly engaging in cultural activity on an everyday basis) an opportunity to carve out their own spaces, draw attention to their own narratives and seek to benefit from the public articulation of such cultural outputs. In this, pasts are evoked and connected to contemporary culture and heritage now seems to function as the primary instrument through which individuals publicly construct their identity. In the contemporary space, heritage also seems to be an uncomplicated inheritance from the past (Garcia-Canclini, 1995). However, it is clear (at least from the authors cited above) that heritage is easily used to legitimise dominant narratives of identity and culture. This thesis shows that inequalities persist in the representation of heritage in South Africa’s urban landscape of Port Elizabeth. Here, the histories and ultimately heritages of the black majority are still under-represented and misunderstood, if not totally excluded from urban heritage landscapes which are dominated by exclusionary imaginaries of the past.

New imaginings of the past

Another major contribution to the discussion on and interpretation of heritage is the post-apartheid narrative of the “Rainbow Nation”, a vision of the South African nation espoused by Desmond Tutu who argued that, although diverse, South Africans were united in their diversity and therefore belonged in a multicultural nation where the

---

5 Robin Island is an example of this. It holds symbolic value for the country and is also a conservation area. However, it is also used to generate income for the country through heritage tourism activities on the island.
emphasizes integration into a dominant whole. From this perspective, heritage enables a discourse of diversity as difference. It suggests that all have heritage, but also that all contribute a unique set of cultural practices and values to the multicultural society. South Africa has non-cultural symbols (for instance a flag) that enable its citizens to subscribe to a unified identity when necessary (i.e. during major sporting events), however and given the Rainbow Nation metaphor, citizens are also encouraged to express their differences. The ‘Rainbow’ of course, excludes ‘outsiders’, people considered as members of ‘out groups’ (i.e. non-South African citizens) (Blaser, 2004:180).

The exclusion of Africans from beyond South Africa is not considered in the country’s supposed inclusive heritage narrative. Furthermore, it is apparent that the country’s colonial and apartheid architecture and monuments continue to dominate urban public spaces, serving as powerful narratives, which perpetuate and remind Africans in general of the cruel effects and continued oppression of the majority through colonisation and apartheid.

By rearticulating public memory and reshaping public space, heritages can tell the stories of previously marginalised individuals, whilst actively questioning Eurocentric interpretations of the past. However, and as expanded upon later in the thesis, the new monuments are being rejected or vandalised by various communities, attempting to bring their plight for service delivery to the government’s attention.

An historical and hegemonic national discourse has been instrumental in creating both in groups and out groups in South Africa and, by implication, Port Elizabeth. As elaborated by Anderson (1991), South Africa has imagined communities constructed under apartheid and used to distinguish between insiders and outsiders (Blaser, 2004:181; Mngomezulu, 2014). Having adopted the view of heritage as something that has use value, heritage has recently become a resource that communities can draw on to benefit from government programmes and services.

In ‘post-colonial’ South Africa, the current government is questioning, localising and erasing ‘past’ heritages, while simultaneously creating the idea that those who are locals and have South African citizenship belong, while those who are foreign do not
belong. In this case, foreign does not only refer to migrants from outside South Africa, but also to Victorian era and apartheid heritages that are foreign to the black majority, because these heritages are located in a space they were denied access to for centuries. The denial of access to black people is a result of the racialised apartheid state, which imposed racial and ethnic difference among its citizens through the creation of artificial homelands for African ‘ethnic’ groups and their subjugation and exclusion from urban spaces (Blaser, 2004:182). Black people were excluded from the social, political and economic benefits of apartheid South Africa and were systematically impoverished and disenfranchised.

After the first democratic elections, the new democratic government, led by the African National Congress (ANC), wanted to foster a sense of belonging and reconciliation among South Africans. It held the view that “people want to belong to a national group, that national identity or belonging is a reasonable ‘primary’ identity, [it, however, neglects] the existence of identities which may be equally important to its bearers” (Blaser, 2004:183). Even though individuals draw on the broad national identity, in the post-colonial context, identities are multifocal, fluid and ever changing (Blaser, 2004:183).

**Liberation heritage**

The present construction of identities by South African people draws on the notion of national ‘liberation heritage’ post-1994. The discourse appears as follows: Africans have been encouraged by post-apartheid leaders to reclaim urban spaces in order to showcase newfound cultural and expressive freedom and to publicly demonstrate both political action and agency (Gibson, 2011:113). However, this approach focuses on political freedom and political emancipation, it does not realise “full emancipation [as] it leaves the state of human emancipation unfinished” (Gibson, 2011:113). What is meant by this statement is that, currently, most poor, black people in general, and black Africans in particular, continue to lead double lives in their communities – in one, they have ‘real’ lives as citizens of the state with democratic rights on paper and, in the other, they have other lives, “as alienated and nomadic isolated being[s], and objects of the capitalist economy” (Gibson, 2011:115).
In these other lives, there are many symbolic and actual social worlds that shape their responses to their ‘public’ lives, in spaces often socially and politically constructed by the white minority. In the re-politicised post-apartheid state, however, their emancipation has been linked to political rights attained at the end of apartheid, rights that supposedly improved their lives, while simultaneously relegating them to a “voting block” that is only important during elections and ignored outside of election years (Gibson, 2011). It is proposed that marginalised poor black people in general and African blacks (especially those with a lower income) in particular are invisible and occupy the periphery, fuelled by frustration as spectators to those who have access to social and economic capital progress and those who pose any threat to the possibility of access to resources.

Gibson argues that since the end of apartheid, the social, economic and political progress that black people have made highlights the positive constitutional changes in the country and the improved standard of life for a small segment of the population (Gibson, 2011). Less emphasis is placed on the social challenges that the majority of poor black people continue to face. As Gibson argues, “their lived experience… [is] bracketed off or also considered in stages, reducing liberation to a question of access to basic services” (Gibson, 2011:112).

Thus and as this thesis alludes to, the attainment of political rights for black people has meant very little to the black population in general because the post-apartheid government has failed to address economic and social inequality holistically (Gibson, 2011:116). “These inequalities continue to further perpetuate the exclusion of black people from urban spaces, which could possibly benefit them. In the same breath, pockets of privileged white people, with their access to social, economic and political capital continue to influence key decisions excluding black people and fuelling their hatred for foreigners whom they see as a contender to limited resources” (Gibson, 2011:118).

Remarking on the issue of leadership, Fanon (1968) maintains that the leaders who ushered democracy and liberation in post-colonial states, those who “stood for ‘moral power’ and who, in almost a dreamlike way, embodied the aspirations of the people, play an important role in pacifying the people through drunken celebrations of
liberation” (Gibson, 2011:126). These actions elevated commemoration and public displays of restituted identity (Gibson, 2011:126) and ‘freedom day’, almost as a substitute for freedom itself. This is evident in post-apartheid South Africa where the government has started building more liberation heritage sites as a substitute for the social, economic and political transformation they had promised marginalised black people.

Over the past few years, the South African government has subtly initiated a process of ‘indigenising’ and localising urban spaces through the rebranding of the remainder of colonial institutions, street names and cities such as the City of Tshwane, Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan and Mangaung Metropolitan. Another move on the side of the state has been the newly enacted policy of 90 per cent local content on all state-owned radio stations in an attempt to make them representative of the country’s black majority. A concern of government is how to foster social cohesion and entrench equality, especially in the wake of a segregationist and particularist nationhood, as well increasing incidences of xenophobic violence in South Africa. In brief, the present government is struggling to transform the country’s landscapes through the use of heritage, as all attempts are consequentially segregational and exclusionary to smaller social groups like foreigners.

The use of heritage to transform the urban landscape has added a new layer and complexity to the issue of urban heritage studies. We are now encouraged to use heritage as a tool to foster social cohesion and unity among the county’s citizens. However, heritage remains a source of deep-seated division between South Africans as a whole, not only because of the ethnic and cultural divisions created under apartheid but also because the ANC-led government decided to maintain most of the colonial and apartheid monuments as a sign of goodwill and reconciliation (Ndletyana & Webb, 2016). The visible (monumentalised) heritages serve as a reminder of the cruel effects of both colonisation and apartheid to black people, and as such promote hatred on the side of black people. Moreover, insofar as ‘invisible’ or intangible heritages are concerned, the perception is that these are enduring and unique to objectified ethnic groups. In the urban context, the mostly Eurocentric and colonial heritages are exclusionary tools. These do not represent black African history and they are not representative of foreign African experiences either, thus contemporary
heritage has a triple effect: it confirms historical stereotypes, excludes the majority of Africans and serves to advance a limited narrative of political liberation.

As such and drawing on the above, it is argued that the current conservation of tangible heritage in South Africa is in some ways exclusionary in the sense that foreigners cannot, or may not in all instances be able to, lay claim to tangible heritages, nor are they able to gain symbolic, cultural or political value from these heritages. The exclusion of foreign Africans from the heritage landscape is also indicative of current and dominant view of xenophobia. As Marike Keller remarks, “[there is a] perception that xenophobia only happens in violent, sudden bursts that leaves a number of bloodied bodies and then dissolves, needs to be challenged and dispelled” (2015:1). This will be discussed in detail in Chapter Five.

**Port Elizabeth case study**

In the Port Elizabeth Local Municipality (Nelson Mandela Bay Metro), the municipality has constructed a freedom trail (Route 67) that outlines South Africa's transition to democracy. The trail, built around colonial architecture such as the statue of Queen Victoria, Donkin Light House and the Memorial Pyramid built for Elizabeth, draws on both ‘colonial’ and post-colonial heritages and feeds into notion of cities as “interfaces of different temporalities – past events, dreams for the future and contemporary constrains of urban heritage”6. This trail attempts to transform the urban heritage so that it can be reflective of the entire country’s population. The trail is inclusive of black people and representative of their pain and struggle in that the freedom trail outlines their road to democracy. However, it does not highlight the role that other African countries (predominantly those in the Southern African Development Region) played in aiding black South Africans in attaining democracy.

In this thesis, the framework of the *ubuhlanti* (Kraal) is used, to offer a locally embedded and informed concept of heritage, which I hope may bring a deeper, symbolic level of representation as a unit of analysis for my data. It is a local framework

---

specific to the region where the fieldwork was conducted; as such, it hopes to offer unique insights into unfolding identities and engagements with cultural and historical symbols in the NMB. It is through a reflection on the use of ubuhlanti that I sought to demonstrate that cultural heritage could be theorised differently.

Based on this, my research studies whether the former is successful in articulating local, perhaps localised representations of identity and heritage. Over the past few years, there has been an increased formation of new movements such as #RhodesMustFall and the Economic Freedom Fighters’ campaign to decolonise the South African society. These movements question ambivalent heritages and narratives (Gibson, 2011) and they not only deface heritages in order to transform spaces, but also take heritage hostage and use it as a bargaining tool when protesting for service delivery.

Based on the above discussion the key research question for this project is: “How do African South Africans in Port Elizabeth imagine, interpret and interact with individuals and heritages perceived as foreign?”

To answer the research question, I sought to understand how ambivalent heritages are treated as foreign by those living in urban spaces. It conceptualises urban heritages and how they were recently inherited at the end of apartheid and, as such, they are protective of it and do not want to share the social, cultural, political and economic capital that this newly inhered heritage bestows on them.

The intention is to pursue the goals of the research designed for this study in the following manner:

1. Investigate local interpretation of colonial and apartheid heritages in different settings around Port Elizabeth.
2. Understand how individuals interpret, construct and interact with foreign migrants (Zimbabweans).
3. Outline the socio-cultural and historical conditions that shape individual interpretations of colonial and post-colonial heritages.

---

7 This framework will be discussed in more detail in chapter two.
It is within this context that the fieldwork was done in the city of Port Elizabeth. The interactions that locals have with foreign heritages and with foreign migrants were studied. Drawing on this ethnographic fieldwork, the findings are presented in the following manner:

Chapter One sets the scene of the fieldwork locale. It reviews and discusses current literature in the field of heritage studies. It provides an overview of the cultural landscape in Port Elizabeth and offers a theoretical discussion, outlining the major theoretical lenses used when analysing the ethnographic data collected in Port Elizabeth. Post-colonial and heritage theory are used as the prism through which the findings are analysed.

In Chapter Two, the concept of the ubuhlanti (kraal) is introduced as an analytical tool to unpack the data. This chapter provides the background and context of the research, describing central Port Elizabeth and Govan Mbeki Avenue where the majority of the fieldwork was done. A description of the key research participants is offered as well as how they feed into the research. The research methods used to collect the ethnographic data are discussed and the chapter concludes with a discussion of the experience of fieldwork in Port Elizabeth.

Chapter Three focuses on how locals, through their various protest actions such as demonstrations and the vandalising of heritages, are attempting to dominate over the city’s heritage landscapes. This chapter considers protests occurring on Victorian era monuments and the acts of showing little or no regard for them by littering on them as a form of post-colonial performance.

Chapter Four reviews and discusses the impoverishment of black South Africans from a social and cultural perspective. It focuses on how the lack of access to land denied black people the right to erect their own tangible heritages in urban centres, from which they could draw social capital of their own. The chapter also looks at how service delivery and heritage are interlinked. It focuses on how and why different heritage sites, both colonial and post-colonial, are normally vandalised or held ransom during service delivery protests in Port Elizabeth.
Chapter Five examines how the South African urban space can be conceptualised as a heritage resource recently inherited by South Africans. The chapter considers why urban spaces are political and contested. It argues that the systematic exclusion of black people from urban areas during apartheid has contributed to their increased hostility and their desire to exclude foreigners from their recently inherited resources in the city centre.

Chapter Six discusses the significance of the research findings. The chapter integrates both literature and research results, showing how the concepts of foreigners in urban spaces cannot and should not only be applied to the African migrant, but how it can be and should be extended to included heritages.
CHAPTER ONE
UNDERSTANDING HERITAGES

1.1 Introduction
In this chapter, I consider heritage under conditions of colonisation and apartheid. I propose that, for many centuries, alternative heritage practices as well as potential frameworks for the understanding and management of heritage have been sidelined. In 2015, black\(^8\) South African students questioned the representation of black identity in public spaces. Of particular concern was the issue of Victorian era monuments in ostensibly public, multicultural spaces in which democracy was said to exist. In this chapter, a consideration of the marginalization of ‘black’ African South Africans is offered, as well as a discussion on the situation of black African foreigners in the post-apartheid narrative of identity, belonging and resource management. The chapter begins with an outline of Port Elizabeth’s settler history, proceeds with a discussion of the structuring force of the apartheid city, the impact of dispossession and its non-documentation. In the final part of the chapter, it is argued that existing heritage literature and theory (emanating from the global north) may not be useful for South Africans and those living in Port Elizabeth, because in many ways, this literature and theory excluded black South Africans.

1.2 The research context – Port Elizabeth
“The city of Port Elizabeth is dynamic, growing in population and changing in form” (Christopher, 1987:203). Port Elizabeth “aka the windy city or the friendly city” \(^9\) is one of the largest cities in South Africa and it forms part of the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality\(^10\), which it is one of the eight main metropolitan areas that dominate the South African economy and landscape (Barbali, 2009).

---
\(^8\) The use of the word/race black in this context refers to the one of the socially constructed ‘races’ in South Africa.
Originally established as a fort in 1799,\(^{11}\) which later evolved into a trading station to “handle and process goods and materials passing through the harbour” (Christopher, 1987:195), the township of Port Elizabeth was laid out in 1815 and formally named Port Elizabeth after the Acting Governor’s late wife, Elizabeth, in 1820 (Christopher, 1987). Initially envisioned as a pit stop for passengers on their way to Cape Town, the settlement grew and became one of the towns in the Cape Colony to receive the first major wave of 1820 settler migrants from Britain. With the arrival of the settlers and the continued exploration of the Cape Colony interior by the British, “the settlement grew as a result of the expansion of trade [in the 1840s], particularly the development of pastoral activities in the interior” (Christopher, 1987:195) and mining activities in the 1870s and 1880s (Christopher, 1987).

During this period of economic development and urbanisation, the prospect of a better life and access to resources attracted people from around the colony and surrounding rural areas to the town in search of better living conditions (Christopher, 1987). This meant that Port Elizabeth and similar towns in the Cape Colony such as Cape Town were multi-ethnic in their population composition, encompassing a variety of cultures, religions and people such as Indian and Chinese immigrants who had begun migrating to the town in the 1880s from all over the Cape Colony and various British colonies outside of South Africa (Christopher, 1987).

The early pioneer population of Port Elizabeth was diverse in origin, including “Whites (Europeans), persons classified as ‘Coloured’ [those] who were of mixed race, and Cape Malays” (Christopher, 1987:196), black people (Xhosa, Khoi-Khoi and San) from surrounding areas and other African Kingdoms and territories.

The constant influx and intermingling of people from different colonies and regions with the local population of Port Elizabeth meant that communities became vulnerable to contracting various diseases that they had never encountered before. The increased level of urbanisation, lack of proper planning and inadequate provision of sanitation meant that the entire city was at risk of contracting deadly diseases such as the “bubonic plague [which] struck Port Elizabeth [in 1901], mainly afflicting the poorly

\(^{11}\) Available at: http://www.portelizabethforever.co.za/history.html (Accessed on 09/09/2016)

The city council cited health reasons (i.e. the prevention of a plague endemic) to justify the removal of non-1820 settlers and their descendants from the city centre to its periphery in an attempt to control the plague, but also as a means of limiting the movement and amount of black migrants entering the city and their access to economic resources, which were distributed along informal racial lines. Commenting on the latter, Robinson argues that “some accounts of the emergence of urban segregation in South Africa stress non-economic aspects [i.e. health and sanitation] of the social processes that encouraged segregationist legislation and outcomes” (Robinson, 1997:368). However, these accounts failed to consider that there were always economic and political undercurrents at play in urban planning decisions. Hence, Swanson’s (1977) account of the Sanitation Syndrome states that “official concerns for public health in response to plagues, epidemics and more endemic slum conditions played a large part in shaping the form and timing of segregationist efforts” (Swanson, 1977 cited in Robinson, 1997:368). However, most official accounts of urban planning literature do not acknowledge that public health was one of the main reasons for the removal and isolation of black people from the city centre, nor do they acknowledge the link between urban public health discourse and the control of economic resources in urban spaces. Christopher (1987) summarises that most of the apartheid cities were founded as colonial cities with some economic segregation, which was reflected in racial terms (Christopher, 1983, cited in Christopher, 1987:195).

The removal of black people from urban centres was never formally legislated until 1923 when the Natives (Urban Areas) Act provided that all municipalities had to establish locations for their black population (Davenport, 1971) and the Natives Land and Trust Act of 1936 provided that blacks could no longer purchase land outside of these designated areas (Tatz, 1962 cited in Christopher, 1987:197). The official promulgation of these pieces of legislation, running alongside the Native Land Act of 1913, marked the beginning of an era of social, political and economic exclusion and domination of black people (South African and non-South African) in South Africa and their systematic expulsion from cities to underdeveloped rural areas, peripheral urban spaces and Bantustans.
In 1948, the National Party (NP) came into power in South Africa on a segregationist political platform. The party instituted a programme in an attempt to make major changes in South African cities through a refinement of the segregationist legislation already in place (Christopher, 1987:199). Using its majority in Parliament, the NP passed the Population Registration Act 30 of 1950 and the Group Areas Act 41 of 1950. The apartheid government used these two laws as the core pieces of legislation at the heart of its segregationist and separate development thesis. These draconian laws were used to enforce the further seclusion of black people from urban spaces (Christopher, 1987). From 1948 when the party came into power, until the late 1980s, the NP led an extreme and formalised programme of systematically “restructuring South African cities to achieve the maximum possible degree of racial segregation” (Christopher, 1987:195). During this period, “the organization of urban spaces was crucial to the construction of rudimentary state capacities, at the same time as it was central to the exclusion of African people from citizenship” (Robinson, 1997:365).

The apartheid government’s ultimate aim for the country and cities such as Port Elizabeth\(^\text{12}\) was to reverse “the flow of black migration into the town” (Christopher, 1987:200) and to move all black people to Bantustans where it was believed that they would develop better in their own traditional communities, among their own cultural people – an idea that was strongly supported by ‘Volkekunde’. However, this did not succeed because of the harsh living conditions, infertile farming land, over-grazed fields, limited economic, social and educational opportunities in underdeveloped homelands. Large numbers of black people migrated to urban areas in South Africa and within the so-called independent homelands in search of economic opportunities, which were not available in rural areas and Bantustans. Most of them did this with the full knowledge that they would be risking persecution by the apartheid government if they were caught moving into urban areas without being in possession of a valid permit.

\(^{12}\) During apartheid, the city was a stronghold and provincial capital of the Afrikaner-Broederbond; a secretive, all-Afrikaner, white male society, whose main aim was to “further Afrikaner nationalism in South Africa - to maintain Afrikaner culture, develop an Afrikaner economy, and to gain control of the South African government.” [http://www.sahistory.org.za/organisations/afrikaner-broederbond](http://www.sahistory.org.za/organisations/afrikaner-broederbond) (Accessed on 09/09/2016)
granting them permission to work or seek employment in these spaces. In essence, black people in South Africa were declared foreigners in their own country – ostracised and shifted to the periphery where they became ‘aliens’ on their own land.

1.3 The apartheid city
At this point in the discussion, it is necessary to offer some insight into historical and contemporary analyses of cities, especially African cities. Writing about African cities, the author Abdoumaliq Simone (2004) discusses these as spaces of potentiality. People arrive in big, bustling African cities to realize their dreams, but, in many instances, they find themselves in a precarious life in which they have to struggle to make ends meet. Thus, anthropologists of cities, such as Setha Louw and Leslie Bank, investigate the hegemonic structuring of cities by those in power, as well as the responses of those who were subject to such constructions. In South Africa, and particularly in Port Elizabeth, one finds that the segregation of people based on race had a huge influence on the form and pattern of urban areas and resulted in the emergence of the apartheid city (Christopher, 1982; Lemon, 1987 cited in Christopher, 1987:195). When black, coloured and Indian people were forcibly removed from urban centres, some of them were repatriated to underdeveloped rural areas or to their so-called homeland and those who were “fortunate” enough, were moved to government-built or subsidised locations on the periphery. Black people were moved as far as possible from resourced urban centres where employment and social opportunities were available, to underdeveloped and underfunded locations on the outskirts of cities where poverty, unemployment and illiteracy were endemic.

These locations or townships were strategically located and deliberately underfunded to ensure that black people remained trapped in a vicious cycle of impoverishment and therefore would be forced to continuously supply cheap labour to businesses and private employers in the city centre. Reflecting on the urban planning of townships, Robinson (1997:370) states that, in addition to using the locations as a labour reserve, cities like Port Elizabeth subsidised the construction of locations on the peripheries as a means to control and limit the movement of black people to the city centre. Location/township regulations provided for the registration of all location residents and set out rules that required visitors to report their presence in the area to the superintendent (Robinson, 1997:370). Failure to do so resulted in a heavy penalty or
expulsion from the city. These regulations therefore allowed the city to control and curtail all political activities and resistance in the various townships around Port Elizabeth.

Therefore, the apartheid city was created from the colonial, segregated city. “The pattern of racial sectors branching out from the White Central Business District and inner suburbs, as modelled by Davies and Western was reproduced in Port Elizabeth” (Christopher, 1987:202). The apartheid city was not only deeply rooted in colonial city planning and segregation; it was also paternalistic (Christopher, 1987).

By creating a distance between white and black people in the different cities and in the country…

The apartheid state attempted to conceal both itself and the brutal realities of everyday life and existence in South Africa though issuing an ink cloud of self-serving propaganda. Moreover, by manipulation, ordering and re-ordering of space, the state [wanted] to screen off the privilege and affluence of the white Valhalla from the experience or tragedy of black Africans (Parnell, 1986:16).

In 1986, as a means of aiding a system on the verge of collapse, the apartheid government relaxed controls over black in-migration to South African cities and trading in the predominantly white central business district was opened to all racial groups (Christopher, 1987). This was done in the hope that it would revive the country’s weakening economy, stabilise the country’s political situation and avoid an impending civil war. However, this was not enough, because Port Elizabeth still exhibited many exclusionary features (Christopher, 1987). The space was set up in such a way that the overall design of the city was intended to cater for total segregation, even if the racial zoning was relaxed and movement between the various racial group areas was permitted (Christopher, 1987:203).

1.4 After apartheid
After the demise of the apartheid state in the 1990s, South Africa went through significant political changes, which affected all aspects of national life, including the abolishment of statutory urban segregation (Christopher, 2001:449). These
changes included the election of the country’s first democratic government in April of 1994, which resulted in major structural reformations such as the incorporation of the former independent homelands into South Africa. The country’s former “racial order [was] now in the midst of a fundamental reformulation, although all vestiges of the past [were] by no means [completely] eradicated” (Robinson, 1997:365).

In the years after 1994, the majority of the white people that once occupied the central business district of Port Elizabeth moved out of the area and relocated to secluded affluent areas such as Bluewater Bay on the outskirts of the city. Over time, some of the buildings in the city centre became rundown, some to a complete state of disrepair. Those that were still inhabited became dilapidated due to a lack of maintenance. Property in the area became cheap, which meant that it was affordable for low-income migrants and immigrants that were moving into the city looking for a better life in South Africa.

In the early 2000s, the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality came to the realisation that the region was unable to attract investors to the city. In an attempt to change this, the municipality established the Nelson Mandela Bay Development Agency (agency), which was tasked with regenerating the inner city of Port Elizabeth in order to promote development and tourism (Barbali, 2009:59).

The agency considered the city centre to be the “heart of the city’s identity” (Barbali, 2009:59). Barbali (2009) further argues that because of this, a number of projects were identified as essential to the renovation of the city centre to make it safe and desirable to visit and to turn it into a place for investors (Barbali, 2009:59). Using the agency as its agent, the city renovated the city centre, upgraded the road, restored some of the buildings in the area and built trading booths for informal traders, and employed additional security guards to patrol the city centre and other parts of Central Port Elizabeth continuously (Barbali, 2009:60). Furthermore, to provide increased security, a group of cleaners were employed to ensure that the streets are clean (Barbali, 2009:60).

Since its inception, the agency has been able to attract some investors to the city, thereby contributing to the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan’s growing economy. With
the increased development of the city centre, Port Elizabeth is attracting migrants, as there they have a ready market, self-employment opportunities and the convenience of an urban centre such as access to the internet, telephone, a harbour and an airport (Barbali, 2009:53).

In post-1994 South Africa, those previously defined as black were able to live and trade in the city centre. They were able to take advantage of the economic opportunities in Port Elizabeth. However, the process of economic integration is not an even process and these people were not the only ones moving to the city to gain access to better social and economic opportunities. Over the past 20 years, more and more foreigners have also started to migrate into the city in search of better socio-economic opportunities and the opportunity to benefit from the city’s growing economy. However, locals are starting to feeling increasing “resentment towards African ‘others’, whose presence in perceived as a threat, a danger or an infection needing urgent attention” (Nyamnjoh, 2012:66).

What is clear from the previous account of Port Elizabeth’s history (and the fact that the city was named after the former governor’s wife) is the absence of a localised black African narrative of the city and, arguably, its history books on the subject tell a one-sided story about the formation of the city by European settlers. These accounts deny the contribution of the Khoe-Khoe and Nguni (including Xhosa) people who lived and thrived in the area before the arrival of European settlers. With the exception of the work of the anthropologist Monica Wilson and sociologists such as Tiyo Soga (and of course the powerful narrative of land dispossession by Sol Plaatje), South Africa seems to have few accounts of varied reactions to conquest.

The Xhosa and Khoe-Khoe people resisted and fought against their enslavement and colonization for longer than a century (Peires, 2003). Therefore, the notion that, prior to European settlement, Port Elizabeth was a *tabula rasa* is false and the notion that black people did not resist colonization and were bystanders is also false. Hence, when reading historical accounts such as this, one needs to be cognisant of the fact that we need to deconstruct such accounts, so that we obtain a more holistic understanding of the cultural landscape (Pels, 1997:167). It also needs to be noted that this account is presented by the author who attempted to remain objective at all
times. However, he was still influenced by a number of personal subjective factors that shaped his life and, to some extent, his work.

To do this we may we need more history on this, because the current accounts are not only dominant, but they also create a false perception of culture, identity and heritage. This thesis offers a view on an emergent layer of representation and identity, especially on Govan Mbeki Avenue in Port Elizabeth, including discussions on what this might mean for identity construction in postcolonial South Africa.

1.5 Re-making and reclaiming heritage
In South Africa, particularly in Port Elizabeth, we are witnessing a process of collective memory making. A process concerned with individual and community testimonies of apartheid (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:89), and the documentation of personal narratives “as part of the process of remaking collective memory of the past on an inclusive and national scale” (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:89).

The latter is about the consolidation of cultural and social meanings of memory as part of the process of ‘re-making’ collective memory, while dwelling on “the politics of memory in which the past is uncovered for purposes of political reconciliation” (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:89) or transformation, as a future-based notion, creating models for changing the terrain of heritage in South Africa and unpacking the types of knowledge produced.

However, when one does this, there is a need to question the selective nature of history, heritage and memory considering that:

Memory [as a by-product of history and heritage] is an act of defiance because erasure is an instinct of conquest. Cultural identity and truthful interpretation of the past are scarce currency in South Africa. This is largely because the official archives and accounts of political exploits and the historical context of apartheid and colonialism are constructed to privilege partisan political interests (Brink, 2014).
André Brink’s reflection on memory and ‘interpretations’ of the past are used by individuals to act as powerful counter-narratives and actual responses to the cruel effects of the past.

Based on this, “Memory remains treated as transparent, prior to history, and subject to verification. Memory in this view continued to belong to the imprecise world of the emotional, the inaccurate, whose validity depends on the reliability of remembrance” (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:95).

We need to continue questioning the selective nature of history because present interpretations and uses of history are created in opposition to the other and do not necessarily attempt to present the full view of the past. This is because “Fabricat[ed] metaphors – that, tell stories – in which not history, but imaginings of history are invented” (Brink, 1998:42), creating ‘false’ memories of the past in order to perpetuate selective narratives of the past in the present.

When South Africa started engaging with notions of the past, creating counter-memories to the silence imposed by apartheid (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:90), through the renaming of provinces and cities, it was able to symbolically transform these places (like the city of Port Elizabeth) into places of ‘inclusion’ with meaning and spaces with a history.

Renaming places constituted a powerful action, practiced by transitionary governments, because they replaced old names and their meaning with carefully selected memories; which served as the preliminary basis of redefining the past and transforming the heritage landscape.

Bakker and Muller (2010) suggest that memories (and their deployment in memorials) that are representative of the black majority are important, because in places where new monuments are constructed:

An abhorrent heritage, enacted as a form of ‘decolonization’, was subsumed by a more inclusive redress, namely adding new monuments and places of memory, or
adding layers of suppressed and or misrepresented history in existing places of commemoration (Bakker & Muller, 2010:48).

This is because “the documentation of these pasts conceived as ‘hidden history’ sought to democratise the historical record” (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:90).

What is done using selective memory as a tool, is not to democratise the historical record, but to add tools to aid the quest for social and economic change. A play-off of two narratives where the one in working force acts as an erasure of the other in which it is deeply imbedded. Therefore, “Heritage is not inherited but produced” (Minkley, 2008:26). Heritage is not rigid and monolithic, but is produced, interpreted, reproduced and repackaged.

As such, selective memory is problematic as it is not inclusive of the collective suffrage of those that came before us. It only serves social mobilisation and economic disparities (marginally so), yet the conceptual legacies and orientations to the cultures remain. This means that we will continue to criticise memories that serve a certain purpose or identity without ever actually producing ‘inclusive South African heritages’. This because those who used heritage as a tool for resistance against apartheid are still unable to move beyond that and use heritage as a tool of social cohesion instead of resistance.

The problem with South Africa’s heritage landscape is that even though the country was ‘liberated’ from colonial and apartheid rule after 1994, conceptual legacies and orientations to culture remained” (Webb, Boswell & Seshoka, 2017:1).

As such, we continue to understand heritage within the same colonial and apartheid framings that create the idea of colonial (modern and indigenous). Framings that suggest that there is a dichotomy between the colonial and indigenous, the modern and traditional model. A framing that fails to understand that the two concepts are not mutually exclusive. Therefore, we do not speak of the one without speaking of the other (Minkley, 2008:25)
The latter is unpacked by Minkley (2008) who remarks that branding and re-production are a:

living heritage as ‘indigenous’, African and as framed by the oppositional, or ‘resistance frame’, was visible, for example in the concern in regional heritage politics of representation to name the currently labeled ‘frontier wars’ as the wars of dispossession, in the concern to generate heroic and oppositional narratives for forts, battle-sites and colonial/settler buildings, and to celebrate and memorialise the chiefs and their ‘great places’ as sites of alterity (Minkley, 2008:27).

I am aware of this conceptual fallacy, but it is difficult to argue beyond it, given the fact that the academy is still engaging with it. As such, I attempt to understand how selective memories of the past are being used in the present in order to understand colonial and apartheid legacies in post-apartheid South Africa. As such, this thesis attempts to contribute to the developing literature on the former, but it does not provide distinctive answers and one of the reasons for this is that “the main roads into the past remain those tramped by class, communities, and organisations engaged in resistance in the form of a journey – a procession with an origin, a course, and a destination” (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:93).

However, it should be noted:

apartheid did not always produce resistance, and that resistance was not always occasions by apartheid. Rather, alongside difference and inequality lie more subtle forms of economic, cultural and intellectual exchange integral to the layers in which past and present are negotiated through memory, tradition, and history, both written and oral (Minkley & Rassool, 1998:94).

Therefore, the question that we are dealing with revolves around power and representation. Whose memories are validated and whose memories are discarded in the heritage landscape.

Moreover, the value chain between conceptualisations of heritage projects and tangible benefits to communities through heritage tourism appears to have a number
of missing links (Webb, Boswell & Seshoka, 2017). When dealing with or conceptualising issues relating to memory, history and heritage, it is always important to think about the complexities and nuances that exist within these concepts and their deployment. As such, “a cultural exploration and engagement of its general, changes, developments and [the] forms of constituting the modern power/knowledge complex of the post-apartheid” (Minkley, 2008:17) need to be questioned.

In post-apartheid South Africa, there is a need to empower those who were previously marginalised. This project of recovery is often done through the use of individual memory, which is often called up as “an indispensable source of evidence [to empower those who were previously marginalised] … But, human memory is given to error, misconception, disillusion, distortion, elaboration and downright fabrication” (Keegan, 1988:159 -162 cited in Minkley & Rassool, 1998:91).

However, without detracting from the latter, the argument that I am building in this thesis is that we need to question the ‘symbolic power’ that colonial memories, histories and memorials continue to have in society. Moreover, it is only once we have an honest engagement about the latter that we will be able to move beyond the dichotomy outlined earlier on. As such, until such time as South African heritage will continue to focus on the “material dimensions [which] become the exemplary heritage type (chief, hero, victim, indigenous) as the standpoint of standard notions of typicality and of inheritance, which is repeated across practically every new heritage site” (Minkley, 2008:29).

In effect, then, the documentary of heritage lists will continue to enable a transfer of the romantic anti-colonial/anti-apartheid form into writing, an understanding of this as document – as the carrier of information – before this information can be ascertained as factual and then effectively made fact in heritage registers, inventories and data-basis (Minkley, 2008:29).

How do we re-imagine different ways of producing knowledge? We should move towards more interdisciplinary ways of knowledge. Given this, South Africa’s “the colonial past may never let go’. This is a ‘hard truth’... and perhaps it is our fate to
never cease – rehearsing the paradoxical journeys of that tragic encounter” (Minkley, 2008:39).

Therefore, when unpacking both *ubuhlanti* (discussed later on) and the ‘colonial’ heritage, these should be understood in relation to each other, as they are about understanding what is going on. They are about questioning and understanding South Africa’s history and heritage, given that especially in “heritage, this seems explicable in relation to questions of class and power” (Minkley, 2008: 31).

It also seems fairly clear that while heritage has emerged as an important discourse for publicly redesigning the past and for imagining the post-apartheid nation, it remains a deeply problematic term in other ways as well (Minkley, 2008:32).

The question then becomes how do we find a way around this? The only manner in which we can move beyond this question of heritage is if we move beyond our current conceptualisations of heritage, which “pluralises tradition, to make traditions parallel to different modalities and marks of the alternative modernities of post-apartheid South Africa” (Minkley, 2008:40). Because we as have seen these pluralities tend to produce a “narrow one-sided sense of heritage as a cultural difference, race and bounded identity, without transcending the difference as that of apartheid” (Minkley, 2008:40).

We therefore need to consider finding alternative ways of heritage conceptualisation, which:

Doubled from the standpoints of both difference and equivalence – and thus as simultaneously spaces of social domination and vehicles of emancipatory possibility… this means locating disturbances, fragmentations and fissuring of tradition, of locating parallel, alternative and fugitive traditions, in associations with their modernities, in order to name more than a critical grammar of unsettlement, more than an intellectual project (Minkley, 2008:40).

As such, in this thesis, through the employment of the concept of the *ubuhlanti* to understand and question issues around memory, heritage, power, representation, inclusions and exclusion.
1.6 Post-apartheid discontent

Over the past two decades, there was increasing discontent amongst locals in Port Elizabeth with how the country has turned out. Slow service delivery, inadequate health care and poor education facilities have become increasingly evident. It would appear that local black cultures and practices are poorly represented in the country, especially amongst those politically and economically marginalised under apartheid.

Added to this, is the increased visibility of foreigners based on their “accents, hairstyles or dressing styles, or, in the case of Mozambicans, vaccination scars on the left front arm” (Bouillon, 2001a:38 cited in Nyamnjoh, 2010:67) in public spaces in the city. Those autochthonous black South Africans who were ‘waiting’ for restitution after apartheid feel sidelined by the current government and profoundly dissatisfied, mainly because of the lack of social and economic transformation. Along with this feeling and, as argued by Barbali (2009), it seems difficult to blame the heroes of the liberation struggle, but still foreigners, especially black Africans, have been blamed for a variety of social ills, the loss of potential resources, because they are seen as overcrowding South Africa and ‘stealing’ resources. “They are increasing becoming targets of abuse by South African citizens, the police, the army, the Department of Home Affairs and even the media” (Nyamnjoh, 2010:67). A major part of the discourse regarding foreigners is that foreigners physically inhabit meaningful spaces, transforming it in a manner that displays different cultural practices and values. These practices and values are said (by locals spoken to) to be undesirable.

This is all fuelled by the media and politicians who are constantly “ready to caricature and misrepresent [foreigners] as the great obstacle to the fulfilment of their (locals) dreams of material abundance and comfort” (Nyamnjoh, 2010: 68). The latter portrays African migrants in fixed and essentialist imaginaries that seek to disempower them

---

13 This also applies for a number of people from southern Africans and pretty much most of Asia, especially for those born in the 1950s, 60s and 70s.

14 It would seem that, Black and coloured locals do not want to blame liberation heroes and heroines for the lack of social and economic transformation in the city and country, because they feel that they are indebted to them for fighting and attaining freedom from apartheid on their behalf.
by means of “specific relations of power in accordance with hierarchies of race, nationality, culture, class and gender” (Nyamnjoh, 2006 cited in Nyamnjoh, 2010: 70). This in turn is used by locals to isolate African migrants through the use of “belonging and identity based on the logic of exclusion [and] informed by the erroneous assumption that there is such a thing as the ultimate insider, found through a process of selective elimination and ever-diminishing circles of inclusion” (Nyamnjoh, 2010:58).

1.7 The role of global literature and theories of heritage
The literature on heritage in the global space does not satisfy much either. Today, much of the conceptual architecture of Anglophone studies on heritage studies and heritage conservation relies on certain privileged histories and geographies. It ignores the divergent nature of heritage and its interpretations for both the west and non-west, and explores the conceptualisation of multiple heritages (Winter, 2014). As such, the purpose of this section is to engage critically with notions of heritage, questioning their application to the South African context. However, that does not mean they are disregarded, nor does it advocate for their removal. This section seeks to set out the parameters for a discussion on heritage and not a fight over heritage.

For a student whose heritage studies are embedded in the southern African context, the work is extraordinarily complex and profoundly political. One is encouraged to adopt theoretical perspectives on heritage deriving from the global north and one’s contribution is judged by the ability to internalise and apply such theories. In a culturally diverse and unequal society such as South Africa, theories deriving from the North may be experienced as an abstract and alienating process that does not speak to the specificity of context. Therefore, in this chapter I will offer a ‘southern’ interpretation/view of heritage to encourage a grounded understanding of heritage discourse and experience in Port Elizabeth, especially in Govan Mbeki Avenue. To do this, I offer the concept of the ubuhlanti (Kraal) and its relevance to the understanding of heritage practice where I did my fieldwork.

1.8 Official discourses of heritage and integration
In South Africa (and as indicated earlier), an official discourse of heritage has been constructed by the post-apartheid government and offered to citizens as part of the process of achieving, fostering and maintaining social cohesion. It is within a dynamic
and diverse space that an ‘official’ heritage discourse ‘must’ function. Motivated by the need to transform the country’s landscape and guided by the White Paper on Arts, Culture and Heritage, the national Department of Arts and Culture (Ndletyana & Webb, 2016) was mandated to question the official apartheid government’s heritage narrative in 1994. Weiss (2007:414) goes on to say that post-apartheid heritage management helped to resolve “the uneasy relationship between abstract idealized citizenship on the one hand and the valorisation of previously oppressed identity claims on the other”.

Over the past 20 years, South Africans have questioned the concept of the African identity. Inspired by Tutu’s identification of the nation as a ‘rainbow nation’, South Africans have been called upon to weave together a cohesive nationhood (Walker, 2005). Part of this call arises from concern about Africa’s varied and ongoing conflicts, especially “ignited by identity politics, in which ethnic, racial and religious divisions have produced a quagmire, that complicates the idea of a singular/homogeneous ‘African personality’” (Makhuba, 2013:9).

However, a major problem with Tutu’s concept of a ‘rainbow nation’ is that it draws on the idea of South Africa as a multicultural state, marked by different races, social levels and ethnicity, united in their diversity – like a rainbow (Walker, 2005).

South Africa’s model of multiculturalism is oriented to the integration and reclamation of identities in an imaginary post-colony, one in which citizens are rationally inclined to share in resources, whether these are of the material kind or the identity ‘kind’ (Makhuba, 2013:9). The goal of the post-apartheid government was to promote this imaginary so that liberalised economic development could continue after apartheid.

Championed by both national and provincial government, projects of social cohesion, economic development and localisation, have become key to achieving

---

15 However, the problem with these identities is that they continue to draw on the same categories created by systems of imperialism and apartheid in order to exclude other people.

16 The national government, spearheaded by Minister of Arts and Culture Mr Nathi Mthethwa, hosted a Social Cohesion Report-Back Summit in 2015 at the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University in Port Elizabeth, to
an idealised, and cohesive South Africa. The country’s ‘liberation struggle’ population is aging and it is a struggle for the youth to continue to believe in the older generations narrative of liberation. In this context, questions of collective memory are becoming increasingly popular. Public commemorations and personal selective forgetting are apparent amongst the older and younger generations. In various public spaces such as universities, the younger generation is tackling the role of place and material culture in perpetuating sites of dissonance (Winter, 2014:558). However, that is not all they are challenging, as Nyamnjoh (2007) remarks “youth movements are involved in renegotiations of the exclusionary bases of citizenship that have fuelled conflicts over belonging and representation” (Nyamnjoh, 2007:80).

The former does not involve a complete abandonment of ambivalent settler of heritages by a younger generation, but rather a scrutinising and proposition of new ways of thinking about, and interacting with, a culture that questions the role of culture in the political landscape. The suggestion is that, in South Africa, this process is contributing to new social movements that question the global political and economic status quo.

1.9 Theories of heritage – Heritage discourse and its implementation
When studying heritage then, and given what is being experienced in South Africa it is vital to locate the ‘conversation’ occurring. Moreover, in the context of a dynamic social context where there are centuries of disenfranchisement, one needs to consider local framings and possible alternative conceptualisations of heritage. However, as a scholar one must consider historical debates, Lowenthal (1998), cited in Winter (2014:557), states that, “heritage – as it pertains to identity, transmissions and the collective – is as old as humanity itself”. In De Architectura (a manual written by Vitivius in the first century BC to direct ancient architects on the planning and construction of buildings) it was outlined that architects ought to have a ‘wide knowledge of history’ in order to understand the symbolic context and meanings attached to particular buildings in the regions within which they were constructing them (Jokilehto, 2002:2

afford the nation a platform for reviewing progress on the implementation of the July 2012 National Social Cohesion Summit resolutions.
cited in Winter, 2014). This is because several structures such as monuments and memorials held numerous meanings and could either be used to celebrate, commemorate or symbolically showcase one society’s domination over another. Jokilheto (2002) remarks that the concept of memorials has been present in society since ancient civilisations such as the Egyptians. Gillman (2010 cited in Winter, 2014) notes how a sacred material culture of relic collection was crucial in influencing the cultural shift that occurred between Buddhism and Confucianism in Medieval China (Winter, 2014:557). He further notes the importance of symbols and material heritage and their function in rallying people for social, religious and political reasons (Harvey, 2001; Jethro, 2016; Azripe, 2004). From these two examples, we can see that the concept of heritage has been present in various societies for centuries and has predominantly been understood as only a tangible entity.

According to prominent and global scholar (Bouchenaki, 2003) on the subject, “heritage is an amalgamation of complex, diverse and integrated manifestations of the past, used and understood by people in the present context to make sense of their current situations” (Bouchenaki, 2003). It is within this new framework that heritage – an abstracted entity (may be either or both tangible and intangible). In this interpretation heritage is perceived as a result of multiple social interactions that gain meaning and in turn bestow meaning (Azripe, 2004). It is through these locally generated meanings that heritage is “deployed according to a familiar set of expectations having to do with identity rights or rights of recognition generally” (Weiss, 2007:414; Carruthers, 2006).

Therefore, in public, scholarly and social discourse heritage is perceived as a multifaceted, shared, learnt and socially constructed entity. If it is subject to change and interpretation, it cannot be placed nor understood within a singular theoretical framework.

Expanding on Miller (1999), Marschall (2009) proclaims heritage to be a “malleable, ambiguous concept, full of paradoxes, [which] lends itself to be utilised in multifarious ways supporting sometimes contradictory political, economic, social and cultural agendas” (2009:15). Concurring with Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007), Marschall (2009) argues that heritage has societal value and can be
conceptualised as a resource, extracted from the past to achieve the economic, political and social demands of the present, advancing an imagined future. In this re-imagined context “heritage, comes to designate a sphere in which the politics of negotiation [and] identititarian claims come to be thought of in terms of [monetary value], as well as the personal visions of site managers, curators” and politicians (Weiss, 2007:418).

It is important to understand that heritage is imagined as occurring in a somewhat extra-political or sub-political domain (Marschall, 2008; Weiss, 2007). In disagreement with Weiss’ (2007) conclusion that heritage has the potential to advantageously position one group over another, it also has the potential to impact issues around citizenship and human rights.

Drawing on the works of Boswell (2011), Marschall (2008), and Ndletyana and Webb (2016), one can see that heritage itself is politicised and plays an important political role in the contemporary multi-cultural state (Boswell, 2011). It acquires value through a process of memorialisation and management and is able to confer recognition to marginalised groups through its use as a powerful political tool that has the potential to empower and disempower communities in less explicit partisan terms (Boswell, 2011). Drawing on the latter, it is noticed that heritage has the potential to displace identity politics from potentially effective political realms (Weiss, 2007:419). It can be used to appropriate social capital from certain individuals while acknowledging others – this movement of power occurs in murkier and less classifiable social worlds at the expense of others (Weiss, 2007:419). As such Boswell, (2013:8), states “the memorialisation of an illustrious past, [forms] part of our continuous construction of identity. Everyone [speaks] about their connection to a pioneering ancestor and to a certain and politically untroubled past” (Boswell, 2013:8).

Leading on from Smith (2006), the retrospective value of heritage is confirmed. Heritage, much like spirituality, is said to be the personal property of the individual. It is often dependent on the individual to interact with or disregard heritages. Smith (2006) acknowledges that heritage is easily susceptible to nationalist propaganda. Statesmen seek to incorporate heritage into the broader nation-building narrative; since it produces nostalgic longings for an idealised past, shifts attention from ongoing
inequality and suffering and provides a tangible, commodifiable version of history and symbolic forms.

1.10 Interrogations of monumentalism and representation

On 9 March 2015\(^{17}\), a student at the University of Cape Town, South Africa, staged what appeared to be a personal\(^{18}\) political protest against the lack of racial and institutional transformation at the University of Cape Town (Ndletyana & Webb, 2016). The student protested on the university campus, next to the statue of Cecil John Rhodes\(^{19}\). Through an embodied protest and the soiling of the Cecil John Rhodes statue with human excrement, the student displayed and actively expressed the symbolic domination and reclamation of the ‘black self’. This action sparked a nationwide debate on the perceived meaning and oppressive nature of Victorian era and apartheid statues and monuments that are still positioned in public spaces in contemporary South Africa.

When studying the #RhodesMustFall movement, which called for the removal of a statue of an imperialist figure on the University of Cape Town campus, we can see that it was predominantly, if not only, South African students (whom are citizens) that were initially questioning the presence of the monument on the campus. This was a general trend seen in most campaigns that called for the defacement of Victorian era statues, monuments and memorials. As such, we can see that foreign nationals\(^{20}\) were sidelined from the conversation by some local students because they supposedly do not have a say in the matter based on nationality and as such their inability to claim South Africa’s colonial and oppressive heritage as their own (Ndlovu & Gatsheni, 2010), as they are considered not to have inherited South Africa’s struggle narrative and heritage.

\(^{17}\) This discussion is offered in my thesis because it was this incident that spark a national wide conversation about ambivalent heritages. It was also this incident that influenced the Economic Freedom Fighters campaign to deface heritages across the country - this will be discussed later on in this thesis.

\(^{18}\) This personal protest soon gained momentum and within hour’s large numbers of students, staff members and the Students Representative Council rallied behind the cause.

\(^{19}\) A European imperialist and later Governor of the Cape Colony was responsible for the exploitation and death of tens of thousands of “black” people in Africa (http://www.sahistory.org.za/people/cecil-john-rhodes) (Accessed 11/06/2016).

\(^{20}\) In addition to this, foreign students were scared to participate in such protests because they were afraid that they would lose their study visa if they were arrested, which in turn would result in their deportation from South Africa.
The #RhodesMustFall incident generated wide interest among the public and in some cases, like in Port Elizabeth, certain Victorian era monuments, such as the statue of Queen Victoria\(^{21}\) and the Horse Memorial, were vandalised. These statues are some of the many Victorian era statues that continue to occupy public spaces. In the case of Queen Victoria’s statue, it occupies the front entrance of the public library, which is located a few meters away from the Council Chambers of the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality\(^{22}\).

It is through their attempt to create alternative spaces of belonging in the post-colony\(^{23}\) that students at the University of Cape Town called upon the university management to remove the statue\(^{24}\) (Hess, 2015:1). However, due to their initial resistance, the students, metaphorically, took matters in to their own hands and vandalised the statue in their endeavour to decolonise the university’s public spaces. In this “post-colonial moment”, students were not only being antagonistic towards settler heritages in South Africa, but they were also calling for the development of a new way of thinking about heritage (Ndletyana & Webb, 2016:1). However, they were not aware that ‘colonial’ and ‘traditional’ heritages are not mutually exclusive. They are interlinked and need to be understood in relation to each other.

The students like my research participants wanted their ‘post-colonial moment’ interpreted within a framework that takes on a rigorous historicisation approach to heritage management. Such an approach establishes links between the past and the present and incorporates both the political and [partial] economic revolutions of South Africa (refer to Nora (1988), and not “simply revisit[s] and revis[es] historical domains of neglect [within] the much discussed paradox of recognition – [which] simply points out that misrecognition, or recognition is undertaken in the wrong way” (Weiss, 2007:417).

\(^{21}\) The statue of Queen Victoria was erected and unveiled in 1903 in honour of the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in 1897.

\(^{22}\) Port Elizabeth Municipality was renamed Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality to honour former South African President Nelson Mandela.

\(^{23}\) In this thesis, the post-colony refers to a space where everyone feels welcome and is accommodated without feeling any sense of discomfort.

The current difficulty of heritage management in post-colonial Africa and South Africa is that current conceptualisations of heritage focus on Greco-Romanian notions of heritage, such as the erection of monuments and memorials in an effort to re-inscribe the country’s landscape (Manetsi, 2011; Marschall, 2013). Twenty-two years into South Africa’s democracy, communities are questioning the country’s heritage landscapes, as well as social and economic inequality. They are questioning notions of heritage that have been used and are still being used as a point of departure. These appear divorced from the context of the country and rooted in ideas of heritage as an abstract concept rather than experienced; under which set principles emerged as part of the wholesale changes of modernity (Said, 1999; Winter, 2014:557). However, as already noted, heritage is more than that – it is malleable and is part of lived experience. It not only manifests in the form of the practice of codifying memory and erecting and preserving monuments (Nora, 1988; Harvey, 2001). However, the monumentalist approach to heritage was aided by the expansion of European imperialism in the 18th and 19th century (Nora, 1988).

As the colonies and settlements (i.e. South Africa, New Zealand and Australia) developed and expanded, the practice of monumentalism, became a common practice among colonial governments and became (sub-) consciously embedded in post-colonial commemoration practices. Marschall (2012), concurring with Nora (1988), remarks that the erection of monuments, especially in South Africa, is something that was introduced by colonialism through its cartographic practices. This practice was rooted in the ‘European’ traditions of memory which was influenced by early Greco-Roman memory practice (which spread rapidly throughout Europe during the Europe Renaissance) and ultimately found its way to the New World, including South Africa through colonial conquest (Mare, 2002). The use of statues, memorials and other solid commemoration monuments on pedestals was deeply embedded into early and contemporary European culture. They were of the opinion that such material objects, if

---

25 This questioning, as will be discussed later on in this thesis can take on a violent form like the 2008 xenophobia attacks (see http://www.sahistory.org.za/article/xenophobic-violence-democratic-south-africa) (Accessed 16/11/2016).

26 As in this thesis, the main argument of which is that there are different kinds of heritages that need to be considered and developed. Heritage takes on a different meaning for different people and it services different needs in different communities. As such, it would be ignorant to speak of heritage as a homogenous concept, which it is not.
engraved with meaning and memory, could be used in preserving or prolonging memories of conquest or societal achievement and in transmitting morals and values to future generations (Meskell, 2012). However, this often sidelined intangible oral heritages (Goody, 2004).

1.11 Shifting/Africanising heritage

In this section of the thesis, I will be offering a discussion of how the field of heritage studies has developed. I will also be offering a discussion of how heritage studies can be understood within a localised context.

The field of heritage studies developed and diversified its interests at the expense of others, because dominant ideas of memory practice and the exclusion of minority groups were a practice that found itself at the centre of the academy and in writings pertaining to heritage. This is evident in various readings of heritage and history, which continue to constantly privilege dominant understandings and practices of civilisation (Corsane, 2004; Eze, 2014). Winter (2014:559) reasons that, through the constant privileging of tangible heritage and civilisation, the constant benchmarking of these post-colonial nations against European “history of landmark monuments, cultural shifts, turns towards a collective awakening, or period of ‘darkness’ – is problematic”. He further states that, “If our conceptualisation of heritage is to be grounded in – and responsive to – some form of empirical reality, then field [of heritage studies] needs to account for its relationship to today’s regional and global transformations”.

As it currently stands, Europe and North America represent the centres of global scholarship. Countries on these continents position themselves as the metropole of research, with the hegemony of the English language heavily shaping knowledge dissemination (Winter, 2014:559-560; Eze, 2014). It is because of such hegemonic control that non-Western scholars located on the periphery are increasingly calling for new positions that stress the pluralisation knowledge production and new orientations theoretical innovation to better represent diverse pasts and possible futures (Winter, 2014:560). There is currently a profound call to de-centre Europe and the West by questioning the origins of knowledge about humanity and human cultural practices and values.
Over the past decade, there has been a shift in thinking about and representing of knowledge. Scholars such as Tuhiwani-Smith (2012) question the etic interrogation and study of ‘indigenous’ knowledge. Some have proposed that the shifts indicate increasing Afrocentricity or worse cultural chauvinism/conservatism.

According to Asante (1999), However, Afrocentricity is defined as a “paradigm based on the idea that African people should re-assert a sense of agency in order to achieve sanity” (Asante, 1999:1). This paradigm challenges dominant “post-enlightenment belief of the universalism of knowledge claims. Much of the theory generated in the metropole particularly that of the analytic tradition, has advanced without giving adequate reflections to its historic and cultural specifics” (Winter, 2014:560). David Livingstone grapples with this issue when considering the history of science, an arena of knowledge production that considers itself a-spatial and of holding universal validity (Livingstone, cited in Winter, 2014:560). Livingstone problematises the academies’ inability to acknowledge the role of context in the development of theory, constructing knowledge from a Eurocentric point of view, bypassing the privileges and inequalities that the academies encourage.

Mbeki (1998) proposed the African Renaissance a school of thought to respond to Western academy’s hegemonic and overhaul knowledge. 27 The paradigm interrogates and critiques knowledge about Africa, advancing African perspectives of the world (Asante, 1999; Mazuri, 2005).

As I will show in this thesis, the project of “recovery” seems sensible when considering the socio-political histories of colonisation and migration in different African countries as well as the extension of capitalism and its effects on other economic systems. However, the mission to recover Africa-ness assumes that there is a singular, exclusive, definite and genuine Africa character which acts as a repository of resources to guide the present and future African and from whom criteria can be drawn

---

27 I am aware that the construction of Africa and Africans as marginal and on a ‘periphery’ is also a construction. As such, using the same terms could be seen as confirming the position of Africans on the periphery. However, that is not my intention; my intention is to argue beyond this frame of understanding. As mentioned in this chapter, the academy has a limited vocabulary and, as such, non-Western scholars such as me are constantly forced to argue within the same limiting academy, even when we are trying to move beyond its dichotomous nature.
(Makhuba, 2013:10-11). While the goal of achieving a unified African identity\(^{28}\) and continent is desirable, the idea that an African identity can be achieved is problematic, given that there is no singular African identity or, put differently, African identities are diverse and dynamic (Makhuba, 2013:34).

Upon revisiting Mbeki’s notion of African Renaissance, Makhuba (2013) remarks that the philosophy suggests “a re-construction of African-ness that differs from the dormant, unchanging and homogenous concept of African-ness” (2013:39). One might add that it offers an idealised romantic or nostalgic view of the African past. For many South Africans (and quite possibly also Africans) the narrative of African Renaissance represents hope, rebirth and optimism. It is centred on the reconfiguration, celebration and development of African cultures, identities, languages, literatures and heritages. It represents moving beyond our traumatic past as a country; however, for many people this has still not materialised and still remains only a distant dream.

As such, one should be wary of Mbeki’s sentiments and seek to challenge the current and prevalent ideas of heritage and management that rest on “the acquisition of global cultures by Western powers [and indulge the] idea that only the West has a historical awareness of both its own cultural past and that of others” (Winter, 2014:561). In the following section, a build-up to the discussion of belonging, identity and theory in the post-colony is offered. This is because in this thesis, I propose that we need to consider alternative ways of thinking of heritage and therefore this discussion of the post-colony is useful because it helps from our understanding of knowledge and its current framing.

1.12 The post-colony, belonging and identity

Over the past few years, there has been increased effort by marginalised black South Africans to expel the ‘foreign’\(^{29}\) from the country’s urban spaces. A popular argument has been one centred on the notion of relative deprivation, that is, the foreigners are

---

\(^{28}\) This based on the notion that most people mostly refer to themselves as African first before they state their nationality. This was found when conducting fieldwork and participants were asked where they came from – they would first laugh and then say African, before their country of origin.

\(^{29}\) As mentioned earlier in this thesis, a ‘foreigner’ was conceptualised to not only refer to migrants from outside of South Africa, but also to include colonial memorials, monuments and heritages that are seen as foreign by Black South Africans in newly claimed urban spaces in post-apartheid post-colonial South Africa.
taking away resources that could potentially be enjoyed by locals. Along with the xenophobic responses, especially towards black African migrants and immigrants, one perceives an increased effort to localise the country’s urban landscapes. Nyamnjoh (2006; 2012) and Neocosmos (2008) argue that the negative responses to African migrants echo apartheid constructions of racial difference in the hierarchy, the notion that some blacks are ‘less’ worthy than others. Over the past two years (2015 – 2016), there has been an increased attempt on the side of marginalised black people to transform urban centres and make them more reflective of local people.\(^{30}\) Based on this, I suggest that South Africa is in the process of experiencing a post-colonial moment, a moment during which the country looks like it might pursue localisation as a means of achieving the restitution of identity and belonging. Thus, the questions of identity and belonging are not only cultural or psychological, they are also spatial and geographical, as South Africa has urbanised rapidly and the rural areas (as part of the labour migrancy practice) has been ‘depleted’.

In the wake of South Africa’s rapid and violent transformation into a new social, political and economic order, much was reformed through negotiations with various stakeholders, but some issues were left unresolved. As a result of this, we are witnessing an increasing number of violent service delivery protests, an increased number of attacks on foreigners and the forceful rejection of the culturally tolerant rainbow nation narrative, which the country has constantly drawn on in order to foster an ‘illusive’ imaginary of social cohesion. These issues are not only a result of the developments over the past 22 years of democracy, they are also a combination of issues going back to the colonial period.

Since the advent of democracy in South Africa 22 years ago, the term ‘post-colonial’ has been used to refer to South Africa’s complex, multi-layered and multiplayer transformative playing field. The latter is a complex fabric woven out of colonial, apartheid, indigenous and endogenous, to create a dynamic and ever evolving society. In anthropology, the term post-colonial is increasingly being deployed to

\(^{30}\) This draws on an article written by the Minster of Arts and Culture, Mr Nathi Mthethwa (MP), in which he reflects on the destruction of colonial statues, monuments and memorials – *Colonial symbols have no place in transformation* [http://www.iol.co.za/sundayindependent/colonial-symbols-have-no-place-in-transformation-1843799](http://www.iol.co.za/sundayindependent/colonial-symbols-have-no-place-in-transformation-1843799) (Accessed 17/11/2016).
assess the dynamic interactions of individuals with memories, objects and systems in contemporary society (Comaroff, 2004). The term 'post-colonial' is used to mark the passing of the colonial but the continuation of its legacy in the present (Loomba, Kaul, Bunzl, Burton & Esty, 2005). As such, post-colonialism not only refers to “a temporal marker that signals a shift in mentalities and metaphysical questioning, but also to a decolonizing movement enabled by new material conditions and to a theoretical and philosophical methodology” (Mendieta, 2005:1). Decolonisation in this sense does not refer to replacing one physical marker with another in the heritage landscape, but is about interrogating the power relations that exist within a particular society.

Writing on the post-colony, Mbembe (1992) suggests that multiple spaces exist within the post-colony – it is not made up of a single coherent ‘public space’, nor is it centred on any single organising principle. “It is rather plurality of ‘spheres’ and arenas, each having its own separate logic yet nonetheless liable to be entangled with other logics when operating in certain specific contexts … the postcolonial subject mobilizes not just a single identity but several fluid identities” (Mbembe, 1992:5). It is within these spaces that individuals contest for space and to be the dominant identity, the politics of identity, belonging and representation become evident (Werber & Ranger, 1992:2) and in which I situated the study, considering how various individuals attempt to create meaning and reason through their lived experiences.

In this thesis, I adopt Mbembe’s definition of the post-colony because it speaks to my research; I also support Rukundwa and Aarde (2007:1173). Drawing on Ashcroft, Griffith and Tiffi (1989) I concur that post-colonialism emerged from the inability of European theory to deal effectively with the challenges and the varied cultural provenances of postcolonial writing. I also support a view of postcolonial studies as the public establishment and valorisation of practices that favour local people with the hopes of empowering them and fosters a discourse that creates inequality (Loomba et al., 2005) in order to achieve equality in the post-colony. “One the one hand, postcolonialism signals the alleged end of colonialism and the beginning of a historical period. One the other hand, at the centre of postcolonialism is the exploration of … the postcolonial present, namely the enduring legacy of colonialism” (Mendieta, 2005:1).
Post-colonialism, although only coming into popular use in South Africa two decades ago after the end of apartheid, has been in use widely for much longer than that in academic circles outside South Africa. Edward Said originally laid much of the foundation of the theory in his ground-breaking text, Orientalism (Bhabha, 1992:456). Said’s notion of orientalism brought to light Western imperialism and racism (Kennedy, 2003:12) and challenged the way in which knowledge is embedded within systems of power. It sought to expose the “West’s effort to impose itself on the people and cultures who come under is hegemonic sway” (Kennedy, 2003:12).

Post-colonial theory “can [also] be said to be a phenomenology of the social world in that it analyses in tandem the mutually conditioning effects of the objective and subjective and vice versa.” (Mendieta, 2005:2). It examines the multiple ways in which individuals are able to live and experience their subjectivities and the manner in which such subjectivities subjugated or insurrected, and transformed the social world (Mendieta, 2005:3). It considers how “different narratives, imaginaries and imagines of the colonial powers are used to justify colonisation through the perpetuation of images of the colonized as inferior” (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1173). In this thesis, I add to the literature on post-colony because, it is a “critical epistemology and historical ontology that studies the sources and effects of modes of representation and the ways in which social being is historically conditioned” (Mendieta, 2005:3). It is cognisant of the fact that colonisation was never simply a unilateral process that used violence to produce victims – ‘the other’, but was much rather a multifarious process that was mutually implicating and inter-subjective (Boswell, 2016:1). It is within this complex structure of colonisation that we see that “colonization is part of a boarder, discursive reality and Black people all over the world have responded to it creatively, systematically and resiliently” (Boswell, 2016:1).

As such, the postcolonial critique of domination is a critique of imposing a global economic system of structural inequality (Mendieta, 2005:3) and of the effects of colonisation around the social histories, cultural differences and political discrimination that are practiced and normalised by colonial and imperial machineries (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1173) and power structures of the present (Rukundwa & Aarde,

---

31 Which itself was a form of colonisation.
By offering a framing concept for heritage and its management that stands outside this structuring and politically implicating force of colonisation, I attempt to show that other forms of heritage management are possible and are perhaps already in place.

Therefore, postcolonial theory is both a historical and an epistemological category (Chew, 2010:1) that “maintains that since no cultural or personal identities exist outside representation, and all representation is mediated by the history of its production, imposition, or rejection, all identities are thus … hybrid” (Mendieta, 2005:4) or creolised. As such, it seeks to deconstruct the notion of ‘otherness’. Looking at complexities that exist regarding the notion of otherness (which infers a state of doubleness), both with regard to identity and difference (Comaroff, 2004), it seeks to allow previously marginalised individuals and communities to reclaim their sovereignty by means of carving out spaces within which they can negotiate freedom, equity and dignity (Rukundwa & Aarde 2007, 1174), by threatening privileges and power (Young, 2003:7), by rejecting and challenging the superiority of hegemonic colonial cultures, and by administering equality and justice for people on the periphery (Comaroff, 2004). The theory is “built around the concept of resistance, of resistance as subversion, or opposition, or mimicry – but with the haunting problem that resistance always inscribes the resisted into the texture of resisting: it is a two-edged sword” (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1174). The theory seeks to revise and revisit historical and contemporary narratives in order to demonstrate that “resistance was a struggle for agency in the representation process, that is, for the power among different colonized people to reinvent themselves as the subjects if their own stories and histories” (Chew, 2010:2). It is based on the latter that postcolonial theory challenges the oppression and coercive domination that operate in the contemporary world (Young, 2001:11).

The underlying philosophy of this theory is not based on the historical (Cooppan, 2005, in Loomba et al., 2005), but it is rather about questioning the suppressive positions that individuals find themselves in as a result of the implicit or explicit consequences of the past (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1183).

Post-colonialism emerges from hybrid anti-colonial philosophies (Bhabha, 1994:112-116; Young, 2001:69; Young 2003: 69-90). It does not reproduce defunct native
culture, nor does it bring a totally new culture, but it produces a dislocated culture, a mixture of worlds – a fragmented and hybrid theoretical language: within a conflictual cultural interaction (Young, 2001:69; Loomba, 1998:15; Rukundwa & Aarde 2007, 1187). In postcolonial theory, the identities and cultures studied are inevitably a hybridised phenomenon (Ashcroft et al., 1989:195). This hybridity infers that there is a dialectal relationship between conjoined Western cultural systems and an indigenous ontology, which interact with each other to re-create local identities (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1187).

These new identities are created in the confines of unequal power relations, where some individuals benefit from the subjugation of others; however, this does not mean that colonisation was simply a one-way process that was received without any resistance. It was “deeply pernicious, has always been responded to by those who encounter it. Such encounters have produced complex, multiply situated and politically dynamic environments” (Boswell, 2016:1). Boswell further remarks that post-colonialism and conversation surrounding it seek to highlight the hidden transcripts of social life (2016:1). Drawing on Scott (1990), Boswell (2016:1) further states that “those who experienced Western colonization produce hidden transcripts to counter hegemonic impositions. Those hidden transcripts are evident in alter-narratives, indigenous/autochthonous epistemologies, the prioritization of other sensory realities and discourses of identity”.

Drawing on the above, this thesis coheres with postcolonial and deconstructive approaches to heritage management. Given the complexity and the multiplicity of this body of theoretical approaches, I have chosen (in the next chapter) to locate his framework of the ubuhlanti in this paradigm to unpack and explore the data. Of specific interest were issues of representation in contemporary South Africa and the role of heritage management in that process of representation.

1.13 Heritage management policies and practices

In contemporary South Africa, heritage management is embedded in the aforementioned dynamic and postcolonial space. It has historically involved a process of identifying and conserving mostly tangible heritage for public consumption. Agencies such as the South African Heritage Agency (SAHRA) are tasked by
government to do this. As a signatory to UNESCO’s World Heritage Programme South Africa, the SAHRA tends to rely on dominant notions of tangible heritage preservation and has made an effort to identify, nominate and inscribe universally valued heritages on a World Heritage List (WHL). Consequent to inscription, such inscribed heritages may be attached to or embedded in a World Heritage Site (WHS). However, according to Ndletyana and Webb (2016), South Africa’s heritage policies have not really considered intangible cultural heritage. The policies are inspired by older and defunct definitions of heritage. For instance, if one peruses the National Heritage Resources Act (NAHRA, 1999), it seems to focus on the preservation of tangible heritages, especially buildings and monuments. Unfortunately, this has denied communities (especially black Africans that are economically marginalised) the possibility of having their cultural practices recognised as ‘heritage’. Other forms of diversity such as generation, ethnicity, class and experience further complicate the picture of heritage and its management, as, within the broad category of black African there is incredible social, cultural and political diversity and these influence heritage practices and values.

In South Africa, most cultures such as the amaZulu and isiXhosa-speaking communities rely heavily on intangible heritage (for example orality, as expressed in song and story-telling) as a means of transmitting heritage and memory (Marschall, 2013). As a result, they are often excluded from dominant expressions of heritage conservation (Corsane, 2004). Over the past few years, increasing frustration with the general lack of social and economic transformation, as well as the poor representation of local cultures in public spaces, has encouraged increased numbers of people in South African cities to vandalise Victorian era monuments, memorials and buildings in an attempt to gain recognition and question public power dynamics. These violent engagements with visible cultural monuments have forced a national discussion on the role of representation and cultural identity in heritage and its management.

Early theorisation of heritage followed a mostly scientific approach to heritage studies. It concerned itself with the various methods and methodology employed in the process of retrieving and preserving heritage objects. This is a problematic approach considering the theory does not adequately address the broader social, economic and
political context within which culture is experienced and managed (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 1995; Waterton & Watson, 2013).

Winter (2014:563) states that social science usually prefers context-free, general social theories of heritage which tend to focus on the ability of heritage to attract people to sites or how to better manage the operation of heritage sites, rather than on the ontological or political aspects of heritage and its management (Zazu, 2013; Ashworth et al., 2007).

Given the dynamic nature of heritage, it is important to question defunct ideas of heritage because heritage no longer exclusively operates at a material, operational and commercial level, but it must also address the broader social and political context within which it is located. Heritage cannot be removed from the daily lives of people. It is part of their everyday lives, like the Malagasy who consider their ancestors part of their heritage and are believed to influence their daily lives continuously (Boswell, 2011; Graber, 1995). It is only by recognising this and by attending to the socio-political condition of heritage production that we can start making distinctions between the local and global heritages (Harvey, 2001) and their social function.

Therefore, postcolonial theory speaks to a wide constituency32 and their struggle to deconstruct the binaries that exist in society and their reclamation of power, and acknowledges that the subaltern does not transform the space within which it exists; but continues to perpetuate the same colonial discourse and practises in a different manner (Chadha, 2006).

Over the past 22 years, South Africa and other countries in the Southern African Development Countries (SADC) region have experiences of British colonisation. These countries have attempted to reconfigure symbolic heritages as a resource to achieve a particular nationhood. These narratives are presented as legitimate post-independence accounts of the past (Zuzu, 2013). As such, these heritages become

---

32 Such as the indigenous in North America, Australia as well as a wide range of issues such as sexual orientations and biological sexual variations and marginalised black people in South African and minorities.
representative of certain communities and at a macro-level heritages are considered to be representative of the nation.

According to Weiss (2007:419):

> Keeping this reality in mind, then, it is important to figure [out] how the very framing of heritage within the dynamics of recognition comes to force a very specific set of possibilities for mediation of both identity claims and the imagining of these sites and their primary significance.

1.14 Critique of postcolonial theory

Despite its dynamic and fluid nature, postcolonial theory does have its flaws. Postcolonial theorists have been criticised for their propensity to “abstract the other” and remove them from their context while constructing and portraying the West as a monolithic entity. This is in the place of acknowledging and appreciating the microphysics of colonial power that are the “uncertainties, inconsistencies, modifications and contradictions that afflict Western efforts to impose its will on other people” (Kennedy, 2003:16).

The theory sometimes treats issues of class, ethnicity, gender and race as issues that should be studied on their own, instead of acknowledging that they intersect, firstly, with each other and, secondly, with colonial discourse (Kennedy, 2003:17). Most importantly, the theory suffers from selective amnesia, which often erases the agency of the subaltern and their struggle against colonisation in their various ways such as performance (Stoller, 1995).

In summary, “Postcolonial theory is built from the colonial experiences of those who engaged in liberation struggles” (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1189; Prakash, 1994:1475). It “bears witness to constant cultural forces for representation. It allows people emerging from socio-political and economic domination to reclaim their negotiating space for equality”. It does not declare war or revise the colonial past, but it does challenge the consequences of the past that are exploitative in the present (Rukundwa & Aarde, 2007:1190). Drawing on this, I wish to employ this theory in his
studies in order to understand how marginalised black people interpret and interact with foreign heritages and foreign individuals.

1.15 Enter the *ubuhlanti*
Drawing both postcolonial theory and heritage theory, the concept of the *ubuhlanti* is put forward as a unit of analysis. A framework through which we can conceptualise and understand locally grounded notions and understanding of heritage. As it is being expressed on Govan Mbeki Avenue. As it currently stands, this approach to conceptualising of heritage is not being utilised.

In conclusion, whether we want to replace the concept of heritage with something else or try to expand the political and academic possibilities that the concept of heritage carries, we will need to ask ourselves what exactly are the implicit and unstated assumptions that come into play when we take up the language of heritage in contemporary South Africa (Weiss, 2007:423). South Africa is a country whose nation-building mandate centres on rectifying the fragile collectivity of a society that has for so long existed in division (Weiss, 2007:415). It is through employing the concept of the *ubuhlanti* that I attempt to understand how marginalised black people engage with and understand urban heritage in relation to their own personal narratives. This would enable them to engage with and question urban narratives, while inscribing it with their own intangible heritages and stories about issues such as the frontier wars, resistance and post-colonial identities that not only view heritage in relation to heritages that see “relevance in history only insofar as it relates explicitly to the cultural-heroes of the ANC anti-apartheid struggle, or though communal identity claims” (Weiss, 2007:424).
CHAPTER TWO
RESEARCH METHODS, CHALLENGES AND EXPERIENCES

2.1 Introduction
This chapter will present and discuss the notion of ubuhlanti (also referred to as a Kraal) which will serve as the conceptual framework of this study. Furthermore, this chapter will be discussing my hypothesis, research methods and research experiences, as well as my personal experience of fieldwork.

While researching literature on heritage studies, it became clear that the majority of the methods employed in the analysis of data rely on Western scholarship (studies mostly focusing on Continental Europe and North America) as a point of departure (Winter, 2014). Scholars in so-called “developing” countries are led by the West and rely on these methods to conceptualise heritage, even when the data do not match their contexts. Locally embedded heritage frameworks are rare.

In an attempt to contribute to the development of more locally embedded heritage frameworks in the field of Heritage Studies, this study will use and simultaneously develop the concept of ubuhlanti, a locally embedded framework that attempts to enrich the debate surrounding locally embeddedheritages and their role in the academy.

2.2 Building on to postcolonial theory and heritage theory - ubuhlanti (kraal) and umzi (homestead)
This thesis employs postcolonial perspective to understand heritage in South Africa, while simultaneously drawing on the isiXhosa-speaking communities and employing the concept of ubuhlanti or kraal33 as a metaphor and framework for analysing the research findings. ubuhlanti is a useful metaphor, which is not only used to commemorate the ancestors, but also represents the complex relationship and interactions that isiXhosa-speaking people have with their ancestors. However, before discussing the concept of ubuhlanti in detail, the study will offer a discussion on umzi

---

33 The concept of ‘kraal’ is not unique to Xhosa culture. It is a concept that can be found throughout different Nguni and Bantu cultures across Southern Africa. However, for purposes of this thesis and given that the research area is located in the predominantly Xhosa-speaking Eastern Cape Province, focus has been placed on the Xhosa ubuhlanti and how it is used by isiXhosa-speaking societies.
(or the homestead) and why the notion of ubuhlanti (or kraal) was chosen for the study over umzi.

2.2.1 Understanding the concept of umzi – Homestead

It is possible to understand how South Africa can use its heritage to heal its “wounds not through punishment but through a process that focused on confession and openness” (Carver, 2008:34) by attempting to understand the isiXhosa-speaking people and considering the significant role that they play in post-apartheid South Africa. While the concept proposed in this thesis draws on the notion of the ubuhlanti, the intention is not to side-line any other social or cultural group, nor is it to perpetuate any tribalistic views. Historically, such views were used by the apartheid government to advocate for the establishment of separate ethnic homelands based on the idea that there was a basic unit of black identity (the tribe), as reflected in language, custom, tradition and geography (Cowell, 1992:140). This study understands that isiXhosa-speaking people are diverse, their cultures are dynamic and there are other groups in and around the Eastern Cape Province. However, given the regional location of the research, it was fitting to use an artefact that is common across the rural landscape in the Eastern Cape; it draws on a concept associated with the isiXhosa-speaking population of the Eastern Cape and feeds into the cultural richness thereof as well as the Nelson Mandela Bay Region.

The isiXhosa-speaking people are principally located in the eastern portion of the Eastern Cape in South Africa (Carver, 2008:38) and are part of a border social group known as the Southern Nguni. The Xhosa people, as they are broadly referred to since they share a common language and are culturally similar, consist of various societies such as the Mpondo, Bornvana, Bhaca, Thembu, Mpondomise, Xesibe, Mfengu and the Xhosa. The latter may be further subdivided into the Gcaleka and Ngqika (Costello, 1990:1).

For the purposes of this thesis, Xhosa or isiXhosa will principally be used as a “linguistic term rather than an ethnic term, but there is a correlation between the customs and traditions of these linguistically linked peoples that allow one to recognise the Xhosa as a distinct … people” (Carver, 2008:34). It must be emphasised that for
purposes of this chapter and thesis, the term isiXhosa will be used to refer to the linguistic term rather than the ethnic term.

Despite the differences that occur between the various isiXhosa-speaking societies, their environments and migration histories (Costello, 1990:5), the various cultural groups share similar cultural practices with the most common being the idea of building umzi, which will be discussed next.

By employing the concept of ubuhlanti this thesis attempts to suggest an alternative way of conceptualising heritage studies. The deployment of traditional concepts used by isiXhosa-speaking communities does not attempt to essentialise nor does it seek to ossify these dynamic concepts. However, it does attempt to break beyond the traditional use of ubuhlanti or umzi, while simultaneously demonstrating that isiXhosa-speaking people are diverse and constantly adapting along with their customs, traditions and language. The possible danger in focusing on one linguistically similar group is the possibility of feeding into draconian and stereotypical apartheid notions which argued that certain cultural groups needed to be grouped together and live together in order to develop separately and experience ‘betterment’. This study strives to show that different cultural and linguistic groups are diverse and their understanding can be applied to other situations in order to unpack and understand them.

Drawing on the idea that “Artefacts express identity by communicating through visual images of symbolic forms and shapes” (Nxumalo, 2008:1), this thesis uses the idea of the ubuhlanti in an attempt to decipher the various ways in which people interact with and interpret Victorian era statues in Port Elizabeth. In order to understand how people create exclusionary narratives and readings of heritage, the concept of ubuhlanti over the broader notion of umzi is used. Ubuhlanti is rigid and selective of the people who can be associated with it and umzi is broad and inclusive of practices in nature.

umzi refers to a large grouping of family sub-units in a particular area that comes together to form a collective social, political and economic unit while their status is often differentiated in terms of wealth and unit size (Rapport, 1969:11 cited in Nxumalo, 2008:9). Among the isiXhosa-speaking people, society is structured on family units, largely hierarchical and male dominated. The latter is reflected in all
aspects of traditional isiXhosa-speaking society including the organisation of traditional homesteads, the structure of chiefdoms, marriage customs, reverence and interaction with ancestors (Carver, 2008:39). However, this is changing with time as customs and traditional practices evolve.

“The homestead and its constellation of households form the centre of isiXhosa-speaking people’s community. [Historically] households would usually be located on a ridge to provide both drainage and defense” (Carver, 2008:40). These households consisted of dwellings made up of the head of the household34, his wife or wives and their children. Traditionally, the “dwellings of a household would be a circular frame of poles and saplings, bound in a beehive shape and thatched with grass … [these have however evolved] present structures are just often likely to be cinderblock homes, but these often retain the conical roof the historic home” (Carver, 2008:40). This is similar to how isiZulu-speaking people in KwaZulu-Natal also organised their homesteads. According to Biermann (1977), “a Zulu homestead was a pastoral way of life centred on the cattle ubuhlanti – that is the man’s domain – with the domed houses of the wives and their children surrounding it.” It also served as an example of “a culture using a circular shape as its dominant centre to create a nucleus that defines their architecture” (Nxumalo, 2008:9).

Among the isiXhosa-speaking societies, houses would constantly be grouped in the form of a semicircle facing a large bush-wood byre for cattle with a smaller byre for goats in order to form a homestead. A maize storage pit would be located under the floor of the cattle byre. The area between the doorway of the main house and the gateway of the cattle byre was known as the courtyard (inkundla). This would be where non-ceremonial and religious social gatherings would typically occur. However, at the Great Palace (residence) of a chief or paramount chief, this space would be where court cases are heard and meetings convened (Carver, 2008:40).

---

34 Given the patriarchal nature of isiXhosa-speaking societies, the majority of the household heads are male and headships were often passed down from the father to the eldest son if the household head had one wife. In the event that the household head had more than one wife, headships were passed down to the youngest son of the senior wife, and the eldest sons were expected to go and establish their own homesteads in order to grow the family’s influence in the region.
Each homestead was economically self-sufficient. A homestead consisted of a man, his sons, their wives and offspring. In the event that the head of the household was wealthy, because he owned cattle and had access to vast amounts of land, he would then also have client families in the homestead. These client families would provide personal services (*ukubusa*) to the household head, generally as headers of his livestock (Carver, 2008:40) in exchange for living in his *umzi* and being under his protection.

Every household in a particular area belonged to an *umzi*. The head of an *umzi* was the person who had the greatest wealth among the households. Although land was cultivated, power, wealth and social status among homesteads were determined by cattle ownership (Carver, 2008:40).

Because of this, most household heads wanted to grow their influence in their region and gain favour with their respective chief or paramount chiefs. The *umzi* in a particular area did not exist in isolation, but “fell under the authority of the local chief in whose territory they were located” (Carver, 2008:41). Household heads constantly expressed a desire to expand the size of their *umzi*, which in turn resulted in increased influence and seniority in the chief’s council. In order to achieve the latter, household heads would welcome new people who moved from other areas or who are fleeing one region due to a shortage of food or the inability of their household head and chief to protect them from raids. In addition to this, household heads would poach households from other *umzis* in order to expand the size of their own *umzi* (Carver, 2008:40).

Given that the purpose of an *umzi* was to function as a solid social, economic and political unit, which supported everyone that was absorbed into the unit, *Umzis* were set up in such a way that they constantly expanded and accommodated other people. Unlike the *ubuhlanti*, the role of the *umzi* is to accommodate all people, given its potential to expand and accommodate those who wish to join the homestead. This worked in favour of the head of the *umzi* because he desired to grow their size, which meant that they grew their military, economic and political power.

This thesis then, seeks to understand the selective inclusion and dominant exclusion of people from certain areas and spaces in Port Elizabeth. It is based on the need to
unpack the notion of exclusion rather than inclusion in the city that the notion of *ubuhlanti* was chosen over the concept of *umzi*.

### 2.2.2 Ubuhlanti - Kraal

The *ubuhlanti* is difficult to conceptualise, as it is a neo-conservative concept while simultaneously serving as a liberating concept, because it suggests an alternative way of thinking about heritage. Until now, it has been that heritage and its definition have been decided at global level from organisations such as UNESCO and then filtered down to different member states and their respective bodies.

The *ubuhlanti* is clan specific and is physically located close to the family homestead. It contains material elements from the natural surroundings of the family’s homestead as isiXhosa-speaking people have a close relationship with the environment. It is a space used for a wide range of social, cultural and religious ceremonies, performed for the immediate family. Given its centrality in the *umzi*, the *ubuhlanti* is the heart of the homestead where all ritual activity happens. It is open for members of the immediate family to use and benefit from, but moving out of the inner circle of the *ubuhlanti* varying degrees of belonging and hominess can be experienced. The further from the centre of the *ubuhlanti* where the ancestors reside, the more distant and excluded one would be from the ancestors and family\(^{35}\). In addition, the *ubuhlanti* also articulates death, dying and commemoration or remembrance of death in a particular manner, in a way that is significant to the family and is more celebratory than sorrowful.

To the isiXhosa-speaking people, the *ubuhlanti* is a symbolic and sacred space. It serves a dual function, as a public space and a sacred private space. It has the ability to provide food (i.e. cattle that reside inside the *ubuhlanti*) and good fortune from the ancestors. It is believed to be a space in the homestead (*umzi*) within which the ancestors reside. Therefore, it is a space that is respected and well maintained. An overarching structure encompassing customs and traditions that form a way of life for

---

\(^{35}\)On the outskirts of the main family’s *ubuhlanti* and household, live the relatives of the main family including uncles, aunts and distant cousins. Travelling further away from the family household, people that have no relation to the main family live. These individuals come to symbolise the ‘other’ that are excluded from benefiting from the family and the protection of the ancestors. This group would include foreign nationals and those who are not kin.
certain groups of people; hence the perceptions that “people who live in rural areas are solidly ‘culturally rooted’” (Rudwick, 2006:61).

Among the isiXhosa-speaking individuals, ancestors and elders are highly respected and considered to be present in the life of an individual to act as guides and conferrers of good luck and fortune (Hayward-Kalis, 2013). It is a common belief that if an individual asks for a blessing from the ancestors, depending on the appraisal of the ancestors, they may not receive it. As such, there is an interconnected relationship with the ancestors in that they act as guardian angels, walking side by side with the individual. However, should an individual neglect the ancestors (i.e. not brew beer for them), their ancestors will cast a cloud of misfortune over them.

After the passing of loved ones, the ubuhlanti has the ability to honour their memory and serve as a beacon of remembrance. As such, this study will look at the ubuhlanti, to frame my research findings and provide an alternative to dominant understandings of heritage preservation that currently exists in South African heritage studies (Makhuba, 2013:27).

This study proposes the employment of a locally embedded heritage model centred on the idea of the ubuhlanti located within a postcolonial framework, seeks to shift hegemonic frameworks of heritage. I propose that the ubuhlanti offers a useful and locally grounded frame for understanding heritage, as the ubuhlanti is already critical for an understanding of identity and belonging in the Eastern Cape.

By employing frameworks and concept that is grounded, locally relevant and oriented towards the social context of Port Elizabeth. This thesis hopes to also show, that local conceptualisations of cultural heritage exist, are being applied and have repercussions for dominant strategies for heritage.

The concept of the ubuhlanti hopes to bring a transformative approach to heritage, and seeks to problematise Eurocentric conceptualisations and discourse of heritage. The notion of the ubuhlanti offers a locally symbolic level of representation, which shows that heritage is and can be theorised differently. This approach moves away from dominant understandings of preserving heritage for purposes of display
towards a view of heritage that is deeply personal, sacred and a dynamic conceptualisation of the self. In addition, this study attempts to conceptualise the ubuhlanti as not only a concept associated with rural areas, places usually not economically non-ideal spaces, that represent the remnants of “authentic African-ness… rural lifestyle, rather than an urban one” (Makhuba, 2013:9).

Using the concept of the ubuhlanti in the urban context, I further illustrate continuity between the urban and rural. I also hope that this idea might contribute to the development of an analytical concept and unit in heritage studies. Therefore, the ubuhlanti is a framework centred on local concepts of belonging, identity and community among isiXhosa speaking societies. Furthermore, a structure representative of ancestral cultural practices could be used, as it is a unique space that offers empowerment of the formerly oppressed majority.

The ubuhlanti garners a new meaning and a different purpose as compared to when it is built in rural and semi-rural spaces. In the present context, the ubuhlanti is not housed as an object rather it functions as a social space… (Makhuba, 2013:24)

However, it has the ability to be read both as a physical place and a symbolic space that is both exclusive and inclusive, as will be discussed later on in this chapter. The concept of the ubuhlanti is applied to the historical city centre of Port Elizabeth. In an attempt to unpack and understand the heritage concept and how it is applied in the city that as a tangible monument to the 1820 British settler project in the region.

Nearly 300 years later the city remains a resource from upon which only those of settler descent are able to draw. It provides for a select group of privileged people, an “older generation, [not] those communities that are the guardians of ‘traditions’” (Makhuba, 2013:31), while simultaneously opposing those who have recently laid claim to the space and its social benefits. This evokes and fuels exclusionary politics of non-recognition and self-enrichment. Furthermore, when one looks at the city centre and, particularly, Govan Mbeki Avenue, one can conceptualise this space as the heart of the city. It has a wide range of Victorian era settler or colonial symbols and when the new democratic government came into power, they tried to transform it and make it more accommodative to everyone, but it was not just black South Africans that were
moving there, there were also ‘outsiders’\textsuperscript{36} who were seen as contributing to the urban decay. As such, the *ubuhlanti* serves a dual purpose on the one hand it is a traditional concept that is part of an individual’s heritage and honours the ancestors and, on the other hand, it is figuratively a city centre that seeks to keep people from coming in.

When analysing the exterior of the central business district of Port Elizabeth, one notices that the space is surrounded by Victorian era buildings, statues and monuments\textsuperscript{37} and it is on these monuments and memorials that this research focuses. These manifestations of the 1820 settler heritage, are used by people (especially white visitors) to show a positive view of colonial history. The space at the centre of the buildings that surrounds the city centre functions like *ubuhlanti*, which is able to enclose a particular space, view of life, social system and ways of making memories. The Victorian era buildings that surround Govan Mbeki Avenue serve a similar function, only allowing particular people within it to claim and construct heritages from different contexts (Makhuba, 2013:25). While being guarded by the privileged older generation, the physical space allows them to construct their own meanings of the space and reproductions of heritage without being questioned.

After 22 years of democracy and the repealing of the Group Areas Act, Port Elizabeth’s city centre has evolved into a semi-hybrid space which is supposedly inclusive and does not subscribe to the colonial and apartheid concepts of essential and authentic identities. The city, much like the *ubuhlanti*, gives certain people access to certain resources and is used to achieve particular cultural boundaries. It is an inclusive, yet exclusionary space in the same way the *ubuhlanti* is used to exclude certain groups of people, because it is limited to particular family members. These same principles apply to the city’s space which is encapsulated by the Victorian era heritage and only permits certain people to benefit from it. Even though the inner space of the *ubuhlanti* is open to accommodate different kinds of people, the outer layer keeps other people out (because of its structure) and dictates the conditions of their inclusion.

\textsuperscript{36} Outsiders (Foreign nationals) because they are firstly seen as not possessing the same social and cultural capital and they are predominately not isiXhosa-speaking.

\textsuperscript{32} While there has been an increased effort to rename some of the street names (i.e. Main Street to Govan Mbeki Avenue) most of the settler buildings have been preserved and some even refurbished as part of the Donkin Reserve Project.
This space at the centre of the city can be seen as the *ubuhlanti* where multifarious, dynamic and urban spaces that allow for new understandings of heritage are beginning to emerge (Makhuba, 2013:36). By employing the concept of the *ubuhlanti*, isiXhosa speaking people in the city are able to respond to the colonial and newly renovated spaces. These spaces are perceived as differently valuable. Just as the inner space of the *ubuhlanti* provides for the family, contains livestock and offers protection from the ancestors. The same principles apply to the city as it provides for people’s wellbeing, there is a central space where a certain few can access economic, social and political opportunities in order to advance. There is also visible police protection for them.

A view of the city (and foreigners place in it) as already inscribed resonates with Mbembe’s (2004:376) critique, that the city is not a *tabula rasa* (a clean slate) on which the “new could be inscribed without reference to a past” (Mbembe, 2007:25). As diverse and innovative realms, cities are, there are ‘many’ guardians in the city. The visible are police officers tasked to implement South Africa’s Laws. These individuals however, are not merely officers. They too are isiXhosa speaking individuals and subscribe to the concept of the *ubuhlanti*.

These individuals appeal to like the ancestors, to maintain peace in the *ubuhlanti*, and if the ancestors are not appeased through regular ceremorial payments, and rituals they have the power to inflict misery and punishment on individuals in this space. By ‘carrying’ the concept of and enactment of the *ubuhlanti* in the urban spaces, the guardians determine access and claims to urban spaces. Access is granted along lines of nationality, language and political affiliation. As in the *ubuhlanti*, socio-linguistic categories have become primary signifiers of group identity and present unclear demarcations, and vague and ambiguous principles that are open to manipulation.

Access to the *ubuhlanti* is primarily granted via blood relations. In the case of Port Elizabeth, access to the colonial city is granted along lines of nationality, migrants and language in the case of non-isiXhosa speakers. Thus it appears that both South Africans and foreign nationals who find themselves in this space without permission (from the NMDA or isiXhosa speaking locals) are more likely to be subjected to punishment through the use of violence, isolation or deportation.
In the rural context, the *ubuhlanti* plays a dual role. It doubles up as a social space in which there are other social activities/rituals designed to encourage respect for the elders and the ancestors (Makhuba, 2013:31). This does not mean that access is simply granted to anyone – it is still granted by favour, based on the acceptance into the space by the ancestors make in the city centre, those decisions are given to the police and politicians as they are the guardians of the city in the postcolonial state. In my thesis, I found that the inner space of the *ubuhlanti* is central. However, this space is not fixed. As noted before it is a transitional dynamic space that takes on different meanings and functions at different times (Cresswell, 1992:8).

In Port Elizabeth, the outer skeleton of the city is considered ‘colonial’ heritage, but the space that exists within it has multiple meanings attached to it. These meanings are co-constructed based on the relationships that local isiXhosa-speaking people have with the landscape.

### 2.3 Research setting

Reflecting on her research among Senegalese migrants in Port Elizabeth, Barbali (2009) remarks that “urban spaces are not mundane, but characterised by a cacophony of sounds, voices, structures, spaces, smells and sights that wave a complex fabric of daily life that make ‘doing’ anthropology in urban spaces an exhilarating experience” (Barbali, 2009:57). Barbali’s (2009) description deeply captures the essence of the field site and fieldwork experience used in this study. Drawing on the field notes and secondary data on Port Elizabeth’s historical development and keeping in mind the concept of the *ubuhlanti* at work in the city, this section positions and contextualises the field site (Govan Mbeki Avenue) within the broader narrative of Port Elizabeth (and Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan).

On 13 July 2015, after being in the field for almost four weeks, I came to the realisation that the research topic had shifted slightly from research on South African’s interpretation and conceptualisation of ‘African’ immigrant heritages to broader colonial heritages in Port Elizabeth Central. This encouraged a new view of Govan Mbeki Avenue through a different lens specifically, how foreign nationals is received
and perceived in Port Elizabeth. In this thesis, the focus remains specifically on African heritages, with some important/integral references to colonial, European heritages.

The confines of the colonial buildings that made up Govan Mbeki Avenue is a diverse space. This space is filled with cultural, national and ethnic diversity; it is a mixture of everything. It is filled with people from different countries interacting with each other and people of different backgrounds walking side by side.

Most of the buildings that made up Govan Mbeki Avenue are Victorian Style Colonial Buildings, some of which have been revamped and repainted, while others have simply been left unattended. These buildings are right next to newer buildings, such as buildings that could have been built in the 1950s-1960s. Most of these buildings are well kept, some are occupied by shops, offices and some converted into residential buildings.

![Figure 2: Picture of buildings on Govan Mbeki Avenue (Image by author)](image)

This combination of colonial and apartheid style buildings make up the space that contained the diverse identities of Govan Mbeki Avenue.

The streets surrounding Govan Mbeki Avenue are diverse and have rich inscriptions of meaning embedded in them. An old, isiXhosa-speaking woman is usually dressed in multiple layers of clothes that keep her warm from the cold winter breeze. However,
all these layers of clothing make it extremely difficult for her to move comfortably as she walks past different traders seated under their brightly coloured T-shaped trading booths. These booths brighten up an area that was formerly considered to be decaying space. One trader (Cindy) in particular, sold brightly coloured and beaded clothes that would catch the attention of everyone walking past her stall.

Dressed in a bright, lime green polar fleece top, Cindy sets up her table attracting customers with her vibrant dresses and skirts. They are all different, one dress in particular is made out of a dark blue cloth with white circular patterns on it, red pockets and lined with red, green and yellow trimmings at the bottom.

However, the vendors are not the only thing that makes the space what it is. The walkways are constantly filled with white, black, coloured and Indian people looking through shop windows and interacting with each other. Contributing to this mixture of people are a wide range of migrants who also occupy the space. There are groups of tall, dark and muscular Nigerian men, Pakistani cellphone traders, Somalian clothing stores and Zimbabwean traders who sell different products ranging from vegetables from Zimbabwe to rat poison. Unlike others who occupy spaces in the street and close to stores, the Zimbabwean traders mostly occupy areas in and around the subway.

Govan Mbeki Avenue is an interesting area as it has people driving around in expensive cars (i.e. Mercedes Benzes) and homeless people who drift from one side of the street to the other as the day progresses.

On any given day one would be able to hear loud South African music blasting from one of the shops. The music would range from 80s R&B music, house music and South African gospel music all playing at the same time.

On the surface, everything appears to be well on Govan Mbeki Avenue and everyone seems to coexist, it appears to be a culturally diverse space. However, upon closer observation, one realises that the space is segregated and certain people are subjected to physical and verbal violence on a daily basis, without repercussions.
One such occasion was 12 July 2015. A frail old man, holding a rather long and thick stick in his hand, was threatening to hit a younger man. The spectators were staring silently and watching the event unfold. It escalated quickly and within the blink of an eye the younger man pulled out a knife and choked the old man from behind. The younger man then proceeded to cut the old man on his forehead. The crowd gasped and only then shouted for the young man to leave the old man alone.

The space is violent in the sense that people are subjected to verbal assaults, some blatant some subtle derogatory terms such as *makwerekwere*[^38], *moffie*[^39] and “these Zimbabweans”. This behaviour has become so normal that some people no longer take offense to them.

At the beginning of the research, participants mentioned that there were no xenophobic attacks in Port Elizabeth during the March to April 2015 xenophobic violence across the country. However, after a month, the xenophobic attitudes present amongst people in Port Elizabeth became clear.

On 13 July 2015 in a clothing store, one of the employees said to the cashier in a joking manner that he would like to come and open a clothing account. She responded by saying that she would need to see his identification document. The man responded that he did not have it and she asked him if he was a “*makwerekwere*” and, if so, what he was doing there. They both laughed and carried on with their respective tasks.

Although this is not a violent attack and there were no injuries, it is still offensive. It is this type of emotional violence that certain people are subjected to on Govan Mbeki Avenue. There is a level of xenophobia and it is important to understand why and how such a diverse area has people who appear to be at peace with each other but are not.

Based on this experience, I decided to explore how migrants and locals experience the foreign. The above abstract demonstrates that Govan Mbeki Avenue is a diverse space with multiple intersecting issues around the representation of black South

[^38]: Derogatory name used to refer to individuals that are foreigners. The name normally denotes that “sound” that foreigners make when they speak their own home languages.

[^39]: Derogatory name used to refer to homosexual males. This term often has stereotypes attached to it that view homosexual men as flamboyant and sexually deviant.
African heritages, xenophobia and homophobia. Using the notion of the *ubuhlanti* and concepts such as inclusion and exclusion, this study attempts to unpack them in various ways.

### 2.4 Choosing the research topic

Under both colonisation and apartheid, black people were shut out of urban centres and economic hubs. It was only recently that these spaces were opened for them. This research studies the dynamics of urban spaces in post-segregationist Port Elizabeth. It seeks to understand how black South Africans experience and construct urban heritages. Furthermore, it seeks to understand how people conceptualise the foreign in urban landscapes. In brief, I was intrigued by the continuation not only of colonial symbols in post-apartheid South Africa, but also the persistence of European frameworks for heritage and its application in an African context.

### 2.5 Research methods

Broadly, social theories\(^{40}\) provide analytical frameworks or paradigms to assist social scientists in examining different social phenomena. In contemporary society, social theories are used in an attempt to understand and explain societal behaviours while also attempting to predict or analyse changes that are occurring within a particular society. However, not all social processes and changes are studied or ranked with the same degree of importance. This depends on the context in which I find myself. In some cases, social life, development and social institutions are emphasised with themes such as gender, sexual orientation and gender performance being highlighted (Elliot, 2008).

Social theories function as the lenses through which social scientists deconstruct, describe and understand individual, societal changes and the realities within which they construct their understanding of the world (Walsh, 2010). These theories assist social scientists in constructing theoretical paradigms within which they attempt to understand societal realities. However, it must be noted that “social theorists are part of the work they investigate and their passion and fears are often very similar to those

---

\(^{40}\) Social theory can be conceived of as an all-encompassing concept that relates to the academy’s understanding of human development, personality, socialisation and organisational structures (Harrington, 2005).
of the people they study and [write] about” (Moore, 2007:4). By intellectualising the problems and issues, they face or observe in society, social scientists are able to create a space for researchers to engage intellectually with their research conundrums and their subjects on an academically credible and objective level.

To a large extent, one could argue that social theory is consumed by the idea of domination and how this concept plays itself out within different social institutions (kinship, economic, political and religion). The social world is a complex and multifaceted domain through which social reality is experienced. Schneider (1996:2) reflecting on social theory, defines it as “an integrated set of concepts, formed in propositions, that explain particular conditions or events in the world around us”. He further claims that theorisation is a multi-faceted process that: identifies and investigates societal problems, theorises the social problem and evaluates the theory against other social theories and attempts to examine its applicability to different societies (Schneider, 1996).

Concurring with Schneider (1996), Moore (2007) states that the core requirement of social theory is to acknowledge that there is a connection between individual experiences and the broader societal experience. Schneider (1996, 1997) stresses the importance of developing, articulating and publicising an array of theories that are related to their individual performance of their “lived reality”. However, in order to understand our research informants’ lived reality, one needs to conduct fieldwork in order to develop theory, as theory cannot be developed or generated in isolation.

Mackenzie and Knipe (2006) describe research as the systematic investigation of a research area, whereby data is collected, analysed and interpreted in a way that seeks to understand, interpret and predict social phenomena. Using qualitative research methods (Shank, 2002; Ospina, 2004) to describe and analyse individual and collective actions, beliefs, thoughts and perceptions in context-specific settings, this study gained an idiographic (Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) understanding of how the foreigners and locals interact with each other on Govan Mbeki Avenue.

Given that, the research is a descriptive study of a small sample’s experiences of urban spaces in post-apartheid South Africa, qualitative methods were better
equipped to offer an emic insight (Ponterotto, 2005) into the social and cultural contexts within which the research participants fabricated meanings, relationships and experiences (Guba & Lincoln, 1998).

2.6 Research paradigm
Drawing on aspects of grounded theory, this research is located within a constructivism-interpretivism paradigm. The constructivism-interpretivism paradigm is often understood as an alternative to positivism, which is a form of philosophical realism, adhering closely to the hypothetico-deductive method (Ponteratto, 2005:128). Unlike constructivism-interpretivism, positivism is of the opinion that there is a singular object and external reality (Ponteratto, 2005). On the other hand, constructivism-interpretivism assumes that there are multiple and equally valid realities that are constructed by different individuals (Ponteratto, 2005).

The constructivism-interpretivism paradigm is ideal for this study given that people hold different understandings and have varying experiences of urban heritage based on their age, sexuality, race and nationality. Through the employment of the ubuhlanti, it would be possible to study and understand all of the above notions. As such, the paradigm holds “that reality is constructed in the mind of the individual, rather than being an external singular entity” (Hansen, 2004 cited in Ponteratto, 2005:129).

As Guba and Lincoln (1998) state, a large portion of social phenomena is centred on the construction of meaning by individuals and groups experiencing the phenomena as “knowledge of the social… world resides in meaning-making mechanisms of the social, mental and linguistic world that the individuals inhabit”. This means that knowledge and knowledge construction cannot happen in isolation, but rather as a result of different experiences of reality.

2.7 Sample and access to the space
As Landau (2010:1) phrases it: “a sample is a subset of your population which you select to be participants in your study”. The research made use of the non-discriminative, snowball sampling method which later became more purposive to ensure that groups of people that are not included in the initial sampling period were identified and interviewed to ensure that there is a fair representation (Bernard, 2006).
One participant was initially identified who had an understanding of the city and the different areas that migrants frequented. The research participant was Grace\textsuperscript{41} who also participated in a previous study I conducted in 2014. She had extensive knowledge of the proposed field site and had an extensive network that she could utilise (Bernard, 2006). I reconnected with her at the start of the study and she was able to connect with others\textsuperscript{42}.

The aim of the project was not to be representative, but instead to hear and present individual experiences of urban heritage and xenophobia in Port Elizabeth. Five people were randomly selected out of persons that Grace suggested and others were found in areas surrounding Govan Mbeki Avenue. The study hoped to work with a diverse group of people, but because the research participants were found through Grace and Tendayi,\textsuperscript{43} five women were selected as the core research group. Furthermore, 20 other people were interviewed in order to gain a more diverse view of the field site. The sample size was purposefully kept small in order to better hear and present individual stories and experiences in the area. Individuals who are South African and non-nationals were selected to compare the reception of nationalist rhetoric and discourse around historical and contemporary imaginings of heritage, foreigners and xenophobia on Govan Mbeki Avenue.

2.8 Research participants
Increasingly, anthropologists have become more self-aware in the field, acknowledging the ways in which the participants and I interact with and impact on each other. There is a dynamic interplay between the two, which must constantly be taken into account, especially when I describe their research participants. As such, it is important to note that most of the descriptions and categories used to describe the research participants in this study flow from a wide range of subjective and objective interactions. The descriptions draw on how they introduced themselves or self-identified in public, they are also shaped by how I interpreted the wide range of social interactions that was presented during fieldwork. As Aull-Davies (1999:5) remarks, as

\textsuperscript{41} Pseudonym

\textsuperscript{42} Grace was used as a primary research participant because she knew everyone in the space. The researcher had also worked with her in an earlier project. However, working only with her limited the interaction that the researcher had with certain people, because of her personal views and relationships.

\textsuperscript{43} Pseudonym
researchers we must be cognisant of and “fully acknowledge and utilize subjective experience as an intrinsic part of research”. Hence, the use of a reflective and reflexive approach in this study.

Grace is a 44-year-old Shona-speaking woman who self-identifies as Zimbabwean. During the fieldwork, Grace played many roles: she was a mother to her children, advocate for the local hawkers, friend to the various traders around her, often making jokes, sharing meals and teasing during the many hours that I spent with her on a daily basis. Grace moved to South Africa in 2011 from the small town called Kwekwe in central Zimbabwe following the economic decline and increasing political instability in Zimbabwe after the 2008 elections. She decided to leave the country, moved to Tshwane (Pretoria), South Africa’s capital city, by herself and lived alone for over a year selling sweets, maize and other vegetables on the street. Then she moved to Johannesburg where she lived with her sister. Two years later, she decided to move to Port Elizabeth because she had heard that there were better economic opportunities and a market for the products that she sold (vegetables from outside of Zimbabwe and skin lightening creams). Within months of moving to Port Elizabeth, she decided that it was time for her to bring her children to South Africa as well. She first brought over her eldest daughter, who now helps her with her business; later she brought her youngest daughter and husband. When Grace first arrived in South Africa, she used her passport to come in and never left. The same is true for the rest of her family except for her youngest daughter who does not have any travel documents. However, she attends one of the local township schools because they accepted her without any documents. Over the past eight years, Grace has been applying for asylum status for her and her children, but it has not been granted, instead she has to renew her visa every three months in the hope that she would get the documents and would be able to stay in the country legally. Grace acted as the main research participant and it was through her that I was able to navigate the area, at a price. Every day during fieldwork, I had to assist with selling her products and running her errands.

Teresa is a 36-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean woman. During the fieldwork period and interactions with Teresa, it was clear that she was an individual suffering from stress and slight depression. She was often worried about where and how she was going to generate her next income, but, like most migrants, she could not access
the necessary assistance to deal with her depression and had to rely on the company of others to keep her mind occupied and distract her from her harsh reality. Teresa moved to South Africa from Botswana three years ago. She had first entered Botswana illegally and worked there for two years before deciding that it was time to leave because the government started to clamp down on illegal immigrants. She had been deported once from Botswana to Zimbabwe and she moved back. Teresa would often recall how she would travel through the different inter-border game parks at night in order to enter Botswana with a group of men who smuggled migrants in to the country. However, she also recalls how scared she was because many people were robbed and raped by a group of bandits who hid in the parks in order to mug the migrants. When she finally decided to leave Botswana for South Africa, Teresa crossed the Limpopo River, which acts as a natural borderer between South Africa and Zimbabwe. She often joked about how easy it was to get into South Africa because she only had to bribe the officials and soldiers if she was caught entering the country without any proper documentation. After arriving in South Africa in 2012, Teresa moved to Port Shepstone in Kwa-Zulu Natal where she worked as a domestic worker for an elderly couple, but when the wife died, she quit her job because the man often made sexual advances and she did not feel safe. Stranded, she moved to Port Elizabeth over a year ago heavily pregnant with her youngest son. She had made contact with one of Grace’s sisters in Johannesburg who told her that Grace lived in Port Elizabeth. When she arrived in Port Elizabeth, she stayed with Grace who treated her like a sister because they lived on the same street in Zimbabwe. For one year and four months, she lived with Grace. Towards the end of the fieldwork period in 2015, Teresa went back to Zimbabwe to visit her other four children, as her eldest is 19 and pregnant. However, she never returned and it was discovered that she got a job in Zimbabwe as a security guard.

Cindy is a 40-year-old isiXhosa-speaking woman. She was often worried about her children and how she was going to make ends meet and support her eldest child whom she left in Johannesburg with her husband when she initiated the divorce process at the beginning of 2015. She often took on dual roles, that of trying to be a friend and parent to me because I was the same age as her son. At the start of the fieldwork process, she had recently moved to Port Elizabeth from Soweto where she had lived for the past 20 years. At that time, she lived with her mother and baby. She left her
eldest son in Johannesburg with her husband because he was studying sound engineering. She works as a trader on Govan Mbeki Avenue selling traditional Xhosa clothes and accessories.

Nomfundo is a 32-year-old isiXhosa-speaking woman from New Brighton. She was semi-literate as she dropped out of school in grade 8. She sold vegetables on Govan Mbeki Avenue, often helping Grace with storing her stock for when the security guards or police chase them away. She was the sole breadwinner in her family, supporting her one-year-old son and her husband, and putting her sister through university.

Scelo is a 40-year-old isiXhosa-speaking male who lived alone, unmarried and struggled to maintain a relationship with any woman. He was struggling to deal with his crippling gambling addiction. On most days, Scelo could be seen chatting up various women as they walked along Govan Mbeki Avenue and then he would be seen making his way to the local sports betting hall close to where the traders were positioned. Scelo was responsible for making sure that Govan Mbeki Avenue was kept clean by the cleaners and that the migrants were not trading in the subway. The security guards reported to him and he was the one that often called the guard to come and remove the migrant traders. He believed that the migrants were responsible for making the street and areas surrounding it dirty and as such, he wanted to remove them. He would often fight with the migrants, telling them to apply for permits to trade in the space, despite knowing that they did not have documents and therefore could not do that. When he was not fighting with the migrants, he was often seen around the street flirting with women or entering the local Marshalls Sports Betting Store in order to go gamble. Scelo was sometimes rude to the migrants and homeless people. On one occasion, he told a beggar to stop begging on Govan Mbeki Avenue and then he slapped the beggar. Spectators responded by gathering around him and beating him up.

Beauty is a 33-year-old isiNdebele-speaking, Zimbabwean woman and a research participant found in a coffee shop in Donkin Reserve. Beauty, who worked in the kitchen in the coffee shop alongside Noma, was responsible for preparing the food in the shop. Beauty had moved from Zimbabwe to South Africa in 2009 in search of better economic opportunities and political stability. She had moved directly from
Bulawayo to Port Elizabeth because she had family already living in Port Elizabeth who helped her get a job when she arrived. She has a son, aged 11, who moved with her, unlike most of the female research participants who had left their children in the care of their grandparents or relatives when they moved to South Africa. Beauty was of the opinion that South Africa was a nice country, but she did not like isiXhosa-speaking people in Port Elizabeth. She thought that they were rude and often unwilling to make compromises. As a result, she thought that they were xenophobic and decided to send her child to a former model C school. She mentioned that despite the fees being high and having to make major sacrifices in order to afford it, she would much rather suffer financially than have her child go to a school in the township where all the lessons were in isiXhosa and where the students and teachers isolated migrant children. She remarked that isiXhosa-speaking children, like their parents, often called her child "makwerekwere" and because of this she did not mix with the isiXhosa speaking people and she also did not want her child to mix with them either. In addition to this, despite speaking fluent isiXhosa, she mentioned that she never spoke the language to local isiXhosa speaking people; she only spoke English to them because she wanted to frustrate them. She only learnt the language so that she could hear them when they gossiped about her.

Noma is a 30-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean woman. Noma, like Beauty, worked in the coffee shop in Donkin Reserve. The researcher discovered her when a barista asked why the researcher kept going to the coffee shop to write notes (field notes). Once the barista was informed of the nature of the research, she took it upon herself to introduce him to Noma, who in turn introduced him to Beauty. Noma had moved from Harare, Zimbabwe, in 2011. Noma was open, friendly and less reserved than Beauty. She would invite the researcher to sit with her and Beauty in the kitchen every day while at the coffee shop. Noma had a six-year-old son who she planned to send to the same school as Beauty's son in 2017. She cited the same reasons as Beauty for wanting to send her son to the model C school, and not to a more affordable school in the township.

Antoinette is a 50 year-old woman with a stylish dress sense. She had one daughter and a grandson who lived with her in Galvendale. Antoinette worked at the printing shop a few meters away from the coffee shop. It was from here that the researcher
would be informed about the protests in the township. With her circular glasses and curly, silver-grey hair, sitting behind the counter of the shop, she would always talk about her friend who was in a relationship with a Nigerian man. She would mention how her friend would constantly be talking to the Nigerian man, but she did not trust him because, in her opinion, all Nigerians were conmen and were responsible for every scam in South Africa. Despite being a very nice woman, she held contradictory views of migrants. She often said that she liked Somalis because they ran shops in her township and they helped the community by selling cheap products to locals and giving the old people items on credit when they did not have food. However, she held that she did not like Nigerians at all despite having only interacted with two or three of them in her lifetime.

Andrew is a 40-year-old male, Antoinette’s boss and the owner of the printing shop. Andrew is a former journalist who used to work for the Herald newspaper. He quit his job to start his own business. During the 2008 xenophobic attacks, Andrew was responsible for covering all the news around the attacks in Port Elizabeth. He was also the person who covered all news surrounding the closing of the Home Affairs Refugee Reception Office in Port Elizabeth.

Makalavo is a 35-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean woman who traded across from Grace in the subway. Makalavo had three children, but two of them stayed with their father and his family in Zimbabwe while she was in South Africa with her youngest son who is eight years old. In July 2015, after being in the field for over five weeks, Makalavo went to Zimbabwe for a week-long visit and to stock more Zimbabwean products (i.e. peanuts and Mazoe juice), but she did not return to South Africa until June 2016. She said that she had experienced some issues while coming back and felt that her other children needed her as well.

Makakhudzi is a 40-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean woman who traded in the subway. She often traded next to Makalavo and across from Trisha. She had two children, both of whom lived with her. Once she had settled in South Africa, she went to collect them from Zimbabwe one by one. Makakhudzi was always sceptical of speaking to the researcher when the other traders were around. When she was, alone she would often speak about her children. She arrived earlier than the other traders in
order to make more sales before the others arrived, as some of the traders sold the same items. From the way Makakhudzi interacted with Grace, one could tell that she really did not like Grace, but she was civil because they were both trading in the same space.

Trisha is a 40-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean woman who is Grace’s cousin. Trisha was from the same town, Kwekwe, in central Zimbabwe and she often displayed a sense of hostility towards Grace. Trisha was also a street vendor like Grace and traded a few meters away from her, but she often competed with her and told the other traders that she was much better than Grace. At one stage during the fieldwork process, Trisha was telling some of the traders that Grace’s husband was going to leave her because she was overweight and ugly. However, Grace dismissed this by saying that she was just jealous that her business was not doing as well as Grace’s.

Loyiso is a 25-year-old isiXhosa-speaking male, student leader and activist who lived in New Brighton. The researcher first met Loyiso in 2013 when he was on the Students Representative Council of the University of Cape Town, in the years that followed they kept in contact. In 2015, he was part of the group of students that advocated for the removal of the statue of Cecil John Rhodes from the University of Cape Town’s landscape. He is a stern ANC supporter and would always advocate for the ruling party.

Tanya is a 45-year-old English-speaking woman who worked at the university. Tanya supported the call to transform the country’s heritage landscape, but she also maintained that colonial heritage should not be destroyed. She suggested that in order to achieve the latter, other indigenous statues and memorials needed to be erected in order to be more representative of local people. In addition to this, when asked about her own heritage as a white person, she often remarked that she thought that her own heritage was not as rich and complex as that of isiXhosa- and isiZulu-speaking people.

Zodwa is a 25-year-old student at the University from Gauteng, but studying in Port Elizabeth. She was in the process of completing her honours degree in Economics. Zodwa is already in possession of a Bachelor of Commerce and a Bachelor of Laws,
but she just wanted to prepare herself for the working world. She often remarked that she did not believe that colonial heritages should be destroyed, but stated that they should not be maintained and protected by the government. Instead, she believes that the money that is being used to preserve colonial heritages should be used to fund the country’s underfunded universities.

Sandile is a 23-year-old isiXhosa-speaking male who has lived in the Eastern Cape his entire life. Sandile has a Bachelor of Arts and Bachelor of Arts Honours degree from the university. He worked for the university as a project coordinator. He was of the opinion that colonial heritages should be removed from Port Elizabeth’s landscapes, as he believed that the decision to remove them would be a step in the right direction. He argued that it would serve as an indication that the people of the city and country were serious about transformation and that they wanted to transform the country in order to make it more representative of the black majority.

Khwezi is a 30-year-old isiXhosa-speaking male. He is an unemployed isiXhosa-speaking man from New Brighton. Despite constantly indicating that he was unemployed, he wore brand name and designer clothing from Uzzi and Nike. He constantly expressed his dislike for migrants. Reflecting on a xenophobic attack he witnessed in the township, he stated that he supported such actions. He supported xenophobic attacks, especially those against Nigerians. He stated that Nigerians abused local isiXhosa-speaking women and often impregnated them and left them with the children without support. He was also in the process of pressuring the ward councillor to investigate how Somalian traders were getting RDP houses (government social housing), while locals like him were still waiting for their houses and they were South African citizens.

Sam is a 27-year-old isiXhosa-speaking male who lived in New Brighton and was friends with Khwezi. Unlike Khwezi, Sam was less hostile towards migrants. He believed that migrants were part of and helping to build the community. He often cited the story of a Congolese pastor in Motherwell (another township) who started a centre that helped young people in the community get training in order to access employment opportunities.
Nelson is a 32-year-old Shona-speaking Zimbabwean male who moved to Port Elizabeth in 2014. He was one of the main traders responsible for selling counterfeit DVDs on Govan Mbeki Avenue. He hated trying to make a living without resorting to crime in the city, but he was constantly harassed and intimidated by police officers, who extorted money from him and the other traders. He argued that if a white person were doing the same things he did, they would not be arrested, but because he is black and a foreigner, he was a target. He also felt that it was the South African government’s fault, because they were targeting foreigners and they wanted to get rid of them by making it difficult for to get legal documents, as well as arresting and deporting foreigners. In addition, he feared that he would be deported one day and never see his isiXhosa-speaking girlfriend and their one-year-old son again. He said that he wanted to stay in Port Elizabeth so that he could support his son and not leave him, as he left his other children and wife in Zimbabwe when he moved here.

Khanyisa is a 25-year-old isiXhosa-speaking female. Was originally from Port Elizabeth and has lived there for most of her life, in the suburb of Mount Croix. During the fieldwork period, Khanyi would assist with navigating the township – as she spoke the language and knew the area well.

Thabo is a 23-year-old seTswana-speaking male. He was a research student who was doing his master’s degree. He was interacting with everyone in a confined space, while also studying and dealing with his own issues, like most of the research participants.

2.9 Research methods
2.9.1 Participant observation
Anthropology fieldwork is the foundational research tool and is often accompanied by a number of research methods that are used to collect data (Barbali, 2009; D’Alisera, 2004). Participant observation in anthropological research is the core research method in data collection. Therefore, it was used extensively as the primary method of data collection during the fieldwork for this study. This method “facilitate[d] the collection of data [based] on social interactions (Burgess, 1984:79) allowing the anthropologist a chance to compare what people say with what people do” (Barbali, 2009:70).
Participant observation meant observing and participating in the lives of the research participants where allowed and deemed appropriate. This process allowed the researcher to spend time with the research participants, giving him the opportunity to be immersed in their lives and understand their interactions with other individuals in urban spaces.

2.9.2 Interviews and data analysis
The researcher held unstructured interviews with the research participants. These interviews were in the form of “conversations with purpose and a form of discourse shaped and organised by asking and answering questions” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994:80). The use of unstructured interviews enabled the researcher to gather information through with the participants as they went about their day. It allowed for a deeper understanding of how the participants positioned themselves within their broader space.

The data collection period spanned over four months (end of June to mid-August 2015 and January 2016 to March 2016). The data collected was organised and analysed using themes emerging from the field notes. Thematic analysis, analysis of field notes and discourse analysis were important in the interpretation of the data. It was taken into consideration that reality in a qualitative method is a social construct (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). The study further made use of interpretive technique, which pieced together and analysed the collected data using the researcher's impressions of the respondents and their environment (Guba & Lincoln, 2005).

2.9.3 Ontology and epistemology
“Ontology concerns itself with the nature of reality and being” (Ponterotto, 2005:130). In the case of this study, the research is rooted in a constructivist-interpretivist paradigm (Ponterotto, 2005). This means that it works on the belief that there are multiple, constructed realities instead of a single, true reality, as positivism would argue (Ponterotto, 2005). The research is primarily oriented towards heritage, which, like spirituality, is multifaceted, shared, malleable and socially constructed by the individual. Reality is “subjective and influenced by the context of the situation, namely individuals experience and perceptions, the social environment, and interaction between individual and researcher” (Ponterotto, 2005:130). In essence, what is being
presented in the research findings is merely one of the many realities that exist amongst individuals in these spaces based on their social background, economic and political awareness and education. This notion feeds into epistemology, which is mostly centred around a “transactional and subjectivist stance that maintains that reality is socially constructed and, therefore, the dynamic interaction between researcher and participants is central” (Ponterotto, 2005:131).

2.9.4 Reflection: Challenges and solutions

This section will address the aspects of the research that were problematic and the approaches used to address them. There were a few ethical issues related to heritage studies that were flagged during the fieldwork. The first ethical consideration was the manner in which the research findings were to be presented. From one point of view, it might appear to support some people and could be legitimising a certain version of the past. This could be used to legitimise an individual’s claim to social and cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986).

Bloor and Wood (2006:64) define ethics as “guidelines or sets of principles for good professional practice, which serve to advise and steer research as they conduct their work”. In the social sciences, ethics is concerned with the “morality, integrity and the distinction between right and wrong” (Bloor & Wood, 2006:64).

As an anthropologist, my primary concern while conducting research was to not cause any harm to the research participants. As an anthropologist in training, the researcher was bound by Anthropology Southern Africa’s code of conduct. The researcher engaged with sensitive topics around the research participants’ lives while conducting fieldwork (Bloor & Wood, 2006). “Conducting ethical research [was] sometimes not a simple matter of applying prescribed rules that provide solutions” (Bloor & Wood, 2006:65). Research codes of conduct serve as inflexible rules; these guidelines are intended to provide advice to researchers and encourage ethical behaviour (Bloor & Wood, 2006:65). A number of problems arose during the fieldwork that were not covered in any code of conduct.

To ensure that the research was balanced, reflexivity was used to understand the underlying factors in the researcher’s personal history and circumstances that could
influence the way he worked. Reflexivity is the process of questioning everything seen in the field, as well as questioning the researcher; it is a process of deconstructing oneself as much as it is a process of deconstructing the other. According to Ross (2004), reflexivity represents a concern with a researcher’s images and representations in ethnography. It is based on unsettling, constructed nature of meaning and whether one can truly get beyond social representations to research the true reality. This process requires reflection in terms of deep introspective thought. Reflexivity is a vital process and allows a researcher to see their own biases and acknowledge them.

2.10 Reflection
The subject of ethical research and reflexivity is one that cannot be avoided by any researcher, whether experienced or beginner. When researchers enter the field they have preconceived ideas of what the field site is going to look like and what results it might yield. Voss, Zimpher and Nott (1982:43) remark “fieldwork is fieldwork exactly because parameters can never be predefined, experimental scripts cannot be pre-written”. Research students always have a preconceived idea that researchers go into the field, conduct their research and then leave. However, fieldwork is a complex and emotionally taxing process and issues relating to ethics and power relations need to always be considered.

Laimputting and Ezzy (2005) stress that qualitative research should be reflexive, therefore, the researcher needed to be both reflective and reflexive on his position as a researcher. It became clear that fieldwork is a process of self-discovery, adventure and letting go of societal categories and labels in order to connect with other people. Reflecting on the fieldwork process on 21 July 2015, the researcher noted the following:

“I am starting to learn that fieldwork is more about self-discovery and finding myself rather than discovering and studying the other. The fieldwork process is more about me discovering myself. It’s about working through all the issues that I have and it’s about developing a level of trust with my research participants too.

Over the past five weeks I have come to learn that people are able to care for someone without expecting anything in return. For the first time, I am
comfortable being around people. I don’t second guess myself and I am learning to trust in myself.

Fieldwork has taught me that I have been my own worst enemy. I have been the one who has put up all these multiple barriers and facades to keep people out, but it really doesn’t matter. I have spent the past few weeks working through issues that I have suppressed for a number of years. Today it finally hit me as to why I have been unable to let anyone into my life, because I shut [down when people get too close to me]. The last time I trusted someone with my life they took advantage of me and my body.

So, I spent the day working thought these emotions but, also coming to the conclusion that not everyone is like that. Not everyone is going to hurt me, and that there are people who actually care about me. I have come to realise that over the past few weeks.

I have started developing relationships with my research participants and they have started show me how good it feels and how it’s like to open yourself to other people. I mean Tendayi[^44] cares for Tanaka[^45] and she has been able to forgive ever, despite the fact that she is the reason her marriage is on the rocks.”

### 2.11 Ethics

At first we see the anthropologists looking at the Balinese, and the Balinese looking back at them; then a change occurs as the Balinese alter their attitudes towards the anthropologists, who in turn being to see the Balinese differently (Nazaruk, 2011:78)

As Zavisca (2012) puts it, “the anthropologist as witness is accountable for what she sees and for what she fails to see, how he acts and how he fails to act, in critical situations” (2012:128). This means that researchers must prevent themselves from creating their own perceptions of the people they are studying, influenced by their own social conditioning which influences the way they perceive things. When Malinowski’s (1963) journals were published, they disclosed the hidden nature of the anthropologist, they revealed his racist slurs, his sexist remarks about his sexual desires and relations with his research participants (Nazaruk, 2011).

[^44]: Pseudonym.
[^45]: Pseudonym.
Malinowski’s actions where only one of the few incidents that sparked the debate about researchers behaviour in the field and the need to regulate them and to protect research participants by using ethical research guidelines (Singer & Levine, 2003). Most ethical guidelines that have been adopted are rigid and fail to recognise that the field is a dynamic space and that principles, such as no harm or exploitation of research participants form the basis of ethical research, but they do not account for all the ethical mishaps that occur in the field (Foucault, 1982). These guidelines are not effective because an individual’s ethics are influenced by their morality. An individual’s moral and social background influences their ethical decisions and how they would interpret ethical guidelines (Lincoln & Holmes, 2011). As much as one can argue that ethical guidelines are objective, there are in fact subjective guidelines.

Ethical practices in the field are not linked to documents, but rather they are linked to a person’s morality (Foucault, 1982) and the only way to address ethical issues that occur in the field would be through a researcher’s reflectivity. As such, the researcher had to be honest and treat the research participants with respect and not subject them to any harm. This is evidenced by the researcher’s ambivalence and perhaps generous approach to what was effectively a sexually aggressive participant in his research.

In order to ensure that no harm comes to the research participants, they were assured that their identities would remain unknown before any interviews were conducted. This was ensured through the use of pseudonyms. Research participants were also told that they could withdraw from the study when they felt uncomfortable. Furthermore, they would not be paid for their participation in the research project. Permission to carry out the study was sought and granted by the Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, Faculty of Arts Ethics Committee.46

46 While institutional clearance to do this research was obtained the onus was still on the researcher to ensure that ethical practice was maintained even in a difficult fieldwork environment. As such the researcher was bound by the Anthropology Southern Africa Association’s ethical guidelines and that of Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.
CHAPTER THREE
GOVAN MBEKI – VUYSILE MINI SQUARE – HERITAGE AND POSTCOLONIAL SPACE

3.1 Introduction
The study of heritage does not involve a direct engagement with the study of the past. Instead, the contents, interpretations and representations of the heritage resource are selected according to the demands of the present and, in turn, bequeathed it an imagined future (Ashworth et al., 2007).

With the South African government placing an increased emphasis on urbanisation and industrialisation, large numbers of South Africans are moving to urban areas in search of better social and economic opportunities. With every move, these individuals bring along their own cultural practices and heritage, which enrich the heritage landscape and contribute to the creation of a culturally diverse population in urban areas. They also contribute to the development of new types of challenges to social cohesion and nation building.

Urban heritage, “represents the social, cultural and economic asset and resource reflecting the dynamic historical layering of values that have been developed, interpreted and transmitted by successive generations” in urban areas (HABITAT III, 2015:4). They comprise “urban elements, architectural elements (monuments, memorials and buildings) and intangible elements” (HABITAT III, 2015: 4), which are selectively chosen and preserved based on their historical and political importance. Urban heritages are political in nature, because they are erected and conserved based on particular memoires and narratives that further and legitimate particular kinds of political narratives.

“Cities continue to be strongholds of heritage rooted in colonial precepts and values” (Gandhi and Freestone, 2008:1). These values inform how urban heritages and urban spaces continue to function as exclusionary spaces in the post-colony. In Port Elizabeth, while the city might have a democratically elected local government, the city and its heritages continue to reflect the early years of 1820 settlement – its imaginaries, depictions and philosophies. Hence, when studying viewpoints of
heritage in Port Elizabeth, it is important to consider that issues relating to local heritages within urban spaces constantly need to be unpacked against “the backdrop of colonization and the impact these have on indigenous people, their culture and history” (Gandhi & Freestone, 2008:1).

While considering the preservation and recognition of Aboriginal heritages in colonial settler cities in Australia, Ghandi and Freestone (2008) concluded that for Australia’s heritage landscape to become more diverse and representative of all its citizens the country needs to “move beyond its colonial legacy, associating only with European heritage, to become more inclusive of Urban Aboriginal space” (2008). They state that Australian settler city spaces, as they currently stand, are still reflective of heritages that are “underpinned by concepts of cultural and racial superiority, and… laid the foundations for a chiefly domination-based strategy” (Ghandi & Freestone, 2008:1).

Graeme Davison (cited in Ghandi & Freestone, 2008) remarks that the effect of British imperialism is often widely visible in post-colonial cities because first and second generation settlers sought “to create a tangible communal past” through the “deliberate creation of obelisks, statues and monuments… commemorating… deeds of explorers, governors and military heroes”. Ghandi and Freestone (2008) state that “early settlers sought to mark the landscape with memorials as …they regarded Australia as a country without any trace of a “tangible past” … unlike European countries, the land did not bear, the known and familiar signs of a “thousand years of human endeavours, with modified landscapes of buildings, factories, parks, fields and canals” (2008:1).

The same sentiments could be shared with Port Elizabeth, which was also a British settlement. As such, when the 1820 settlers arrived, they did not see any tangible monuments, memorials or buildings. Thus, they started constructing their own monuments and memorials as a sign of their development of the land and celebrating their own victories over locals (Ndletyana & Webb, 2016). Through their erection of monuments and memorials, the settlers were not only altering the landscape, but they were also recreating a new imagery of home. This creation of the familiar was based on the monuments, memorials and heritages that were being erected at the time in
Europe. In this chapter, I will be examining some of these Victorian era heritage sites in Port Elizabeth and how they fit into the post-colony.

3.2 Market Square – Vuyisile Mini Square

Market Square and its surrounding heritage sites such as Town Hall, the statue of Queen Victoria and the library are some of Port Elizabeth’s notable landmarks. The square, which is situated in the city centre, can figuratively be conceptualised of as the heart of the city given its prime location. The square is of significant importance to the city given all the historically significant events that have occurred on it, and decisions that have been made on the heritage site.

“Market Square is a stone paved space with gardens and benches surrounding it. It is one of the few spaces around Govan Mbeki Avenue that individuals could use during the day to take their tea break, wait for friends, and admire the different buildings located around it or anything else that could be performed within the space. It is located right in front of the Nelson Mandela Bay Council Chambers building, which is one of the oldest buildings in the Nelson Mandela Bay Metro, but it is also the political and administrative seat of the metropolitan.”

Market Square is surrounded by a number of Victorian era settler buildings, monuments and memorials that are preserved by past and present government legislation\(^\text{47}\) and actions. The square as old as the city itself has its origins rooted in the city’s early settlement years, when the ship-landing beach was located a few meters away from the square. Due to its prime location close to the harbour, the square became a central location for merchants to trade and receive merchandise. As time went by and the town started to grow, the square went on to become a central space for local farmers to congregate at selling their produce and stock. As the township of Port Elizabeth started to grow in population and infrastructure, everything became centralised around the square and it started to function as a showcase for the city’s Victorian-era architecture.

\(^\text{47}\) National Heritage Resources Act (No. 25 of 1999), National Monuments Act (No. 28 of 1969) and Natural and Historical Monuments, Relics and Antiques Act (No. 4 of 1934).
The square’s most striking and almost superimposing monument is City Hall. Characterised by large, arched windows and an entrance with large columns, the heritage monument, a classic example of neo-classic Victorian architecture was built on Market Square given the importance of the space as a town square. The building is a grand, old monument to the city’s 1820-settler heritage and emits timeless elegance as it stands watch over the bustling Govan Mbeki Avenue.

Unveiled in 1862, construction of the double-storey town hall commenced in 1858 and was completed four years later. Twenty-one years after completion of the building, it was decided to add a clock tower on top of the building to form part of the structure.

which added an even more dramatic effect to the already overbearing structure. In November 1974, Market Square and City Hall were recognised as national monuments by the National Monuments Council\(^50\), due to their close connection to the establishment of Port Elizabeth as a town. In 1977, three years after the sites were recognised as heritage sites, City Hall was destroyed by a fire that consumed most of the building and reduced it to only a memory of its original self. However, given its importance and significance to the settler descendants of the city and the apartheid government’s nation-building narrative, the building was rebuilt in the exact same manner. The new building served a dual purpose in that it was a memorial in honour to its former self on the one hand and its architectural beauty and historical importance to the Market Square heritage precinct on the other hand.

In 2010 (the year that South Africa hosted the FIFA Soccer World Cup), Market Square was renamed by the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Council to Vuyisile Mini Square\(^51\), in honour of Vuyisile Mini. Mini was a trade unionist and one of the first anti-apartheid activists to be hanged by the apartheid government. The square was also renamed to honour twenty-three black workers who were killed by police in 1920. These individuals were murdered for protesting against the illegal detention of Samuel Makama Martin Masabalala\(^52\), their trade union leader who had been detained by the police for advocating for better working conditions and wages for workers in the industrial and commercial sectors in the city. Remarkling on the renaming of the square, the then Deputy Executive Mayor of the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan, Councillor Nancy Sihlwayi said: “Renaming our heritage sites is about the memory of the struggle. It will also be an education tool for future generations, who can learn from the extraordinary example of people such as Vuyisile Mini”.\(^53\) It is based on the latter statement that the role of heritage in post-colonial post-apartheid South Africa, but more specifically on North Govan Mbeki Avenue, in Port Elizabeth will be discussed.

---


Sharing the same sentiments as Councillor Nancy Sihlwayi, Carter (cited in Wittenberg, 2000) remarks that the space is “transformed symbolically into a place, that is, a space with a history” (2000:7). Carter further says that the renaming of monuments and memorials is “an act of violence through which virtually every space in the world is explored, chartered and finally brought under control” (cited in Wittenberg, 2000:2). In Port Elizabeth’s urban spaces, ambivalent heritages are being renamed, removed from public spaces or defaced because black locals are not familiar with them. These actions are an attempt to render them familiar to the local population which was excluded from urban spaces.

However, the naming and renaming of places are not unique to Port Elizabeth and South Africa, it is prevalent in the formation of nationalism, social cohesion and the transition into new political administrations (Azaryahu, 1997:480). This process is complex and multifaceted. One could even argue that it is a twofold procedure in which the old is erased and the new is chosen and introduced. An example of this would be the renaming of the University of Port Elizabeth (a formerly all-white university) to Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (a new, diverse and multi-racial university). Both these acts are highly symbolic and powerful acts. According to Meiring (2008), one can understand both acts of renaming Market Square and the University of Port Elizabeth as an act of creating and maintaining ideological power among those who have recently acquired political power.

The act of renaming monuments and memorials has the power to become an unequivocal political declaration of a change in political power as it serves to legitimise the political elite’s power (Azaryahu, 1997:481-482; Azaryahu, 1996:318). However, in some cases, this act is temporary and its political effects are short-lived. This can be seen in the case of Vuyisile Mini Square – most people in Port Elizabeth do not know about this name and history. They suffer from a particular type of “amnesia”, one that causes people in the city to still call the heritage site Market Square, instead of Vuyisile Mini Square.

In this chapter, the manner in which the use of Market–Vuyisile Mini Square has changed over the past few years will be considered. The chapter will include a discussion of how marginalised individuals have found alternative ways of engaging
with and questioning heritage sites around the square. The relationship people have with the above monuments and memorials in present day society and the meanings they attach to them will be examined.

One morning I decided to leave the backpackers where he was staying in order to commence with the fieldwork for the day, which he decided to start in Market Square.

I walked past the school gates and all of the children that were standing outside of it, facing the harbour and I slowly made my way down the road, admiring the sun rising over the ocean. I stopped to take a photo for my Instagram account. However, the joy that I felt came to an end when I arrived at what appeared to be hundreds of thousands of stairs I would have to climb down in order to make my way down to Govan Mbeki Avenue from Prospect Hill. As I walked down these stairs, I started to hear noises, it sounded like more children playing at the bottom of the stairs, but I was uncertain of this. However, this was confirmed when I finally made it to the bottom of the stairs, out of breath. I attempted to catch my breath in the cold winter air while watching the children I heard earlier playing in a group, chasing each other around Market Square, while the older kids sat around on the benches on the square talking to each other.

Market Square is a stone-paved space with gardens and benches surrounding it. This is one of the few spaces around Govan Mbeki Avenue that individuals can use during the day to take a break, wait for friends and admire the different colonial buildings located around it or anything else that could be performed within the space. It was located right in front of the Nelson Mandela Bay Council Chambers building, which is one of the oldest buildings in the Nelson Mandela Bay Metro and houses the political and central administrative seat of the metropolitan.

The aesthetics of the Council Chambers Building are quite interesting because the building is still the same, regardless of how much it might have been transformed inside and the people might be different. The building still bears the city’s colonial coat of arms and it is still intact, facing everyone that looks at the building and legitimating itself and the authority that is used to command.
What stood out about Market Square on this particular day was the fact that as much as one was in post-colonial post-apartheid South Africa, one could not help but get the feeling that one had been transported back in time, looking at all of the Victorian era architecture, monuments and memorials that were located in the heart of Port Elizabeth. It was like being back in a colony within a post-colony. The monuments and memorial impose on the space and constantly transform the space and take on different meanings over time. Like the ubuhlanti, the heritage site takes on different meanings at different times. It morphs from being a space of memory and remembrance into a playful and celebratory space and, finally, into a reminder of South Africa’s troubled past. The latter will be unpacked using the next two pieces of field note extracts, as these demonstrate the two contradictions that exist in the spaces in and around Vuyisile Square.

African migrants are moved out of Govan Mbeki Avenue, because they are considered to be agents of urban decay. They are considered to the individuals who bring ‘dirt’ into Govan Mbeki Avenue and they are the ones that are blamed for chasing tourists away from visiting the heritage sites in the area. The security guards, acting on behalf of the municipality, do not want any migrants on Govan Mbeki Avenue. The migrants have to be removed as they are regarded as not contributing anything to the space and they are not allowed to claim the formerly exclusionary space. However, South African citizens are allowed in formerly exclusionary colonial spaces on Govan Mbeki Avenue, they are allowed to challenge these spaces and the police or security guards are rarely called to remove them. This raises questions around the double standards that exist within Govan Mbeki Avenue and questions of representation, because black South Africans are encouraged to claim formerly exclusionary spaces, but, at the same time, black African migrants are removed from such spaces.

3.3 Govan Mbeki Avenue: Heritage site or migrant Site?

As I walked down Govan Mbeki Avenue, the streets were relatively empty; there were small islands of people walking on the paved pedestrian sides of the road. The walkway, paved in red brick, was very clean; it was like there were no people at all. Normally, there were papers floating or lying around on the side of the road. The migrants that traded in the subway a few meters away from heritages sites
such as the statue of Queen Victoria and Market Square were usually blamed for all the dirt on the street.

I was in a really good mood while walking down to the subway, humming and dancing by myself as I walked towards Grace. I had not bumped into Scelo this morning and I hoped it would stay that way. Walking down the street, I wiped the sweat off my face, it was not hot today, but the humidity made it unbearable to be in the space.

With cold water in the hand, I proceeded to power walk towards Grace. I bumped into Nelson, dressed in a black shirt and brown pants, standing with a group of black Zimbabwean men selling counterfeit DVD movies. I walked up to the group and greeted them, but only Nelson responded. I continued walking towards Grace and the first person I encountered was Nomfundo who was dressed in a white shirt and white apron with red trimmings on the edges. Nomfundo, sitting behind her table, stacked full of fruits which she sold. She was busy packing grapes into different packets. I then spotted Grace who seated not far from Nomfundo.

At the entrance of the subway where grace normally traded, was a skinny black man dressed in dark blue security guard uniform and a bulletproof vest. The man had a large black dog with a chain around its neck and they stood at the entrance, not allowing the migrants to trade on the subway. The guard looked awkwardly placed in that space. It was as if he did not know what to do with himself. In fact, he looked like a badly superimposed addition to the space.

Grace was wearing a dark blue shirt; she was seated on one of the large, cement-like poles that were in front of the markets. These large cement structures appeared to be placed around the pavement to keep cars from coming onto the pedestrian walkways. I walked up to Grace who was talking to Trisha who had her braids tied in one bun at the back of her head. Dressed in a light brown shirt and dark brown skirt, she placed her hands on her hips while she spoke to Grace. The two women looked like they were in a very serious conversation. I could not make out what the conversation was about, because it was in Shona. I loitered around them awkwardly while they had their conversation. The traders were all waiting
around here, because they were waiting for the security guards to leave so that they can go trade into the space. As they spoke, I walked to the subway to look at how everything was.

I walked towards the exit close to where we normally traded and sat on a wall about 0.5 meters tall. The wall, which was painted white, was now starting to turn brown because it was dirty. I sat on the wall about 2 meters away from the security guards. One was dressed in a dark blue uniform with sunglasses and had guard dog with him; the other one was dressed in grey school trousers, a white short-sleeve shirt and navy blue pullover and had ‘dom peel’ with him.

Both these guards sat on the wall watching as people walked past them. The black dog kept barking at the people as they walked past and the guard kept pulling it back. It then unexpectedly tried to bite the other guard sitting a few centimetres away. Luckily, the guard jumped over the wall quickly to the other side. The other guard pulled the dog back and laughed.

The other guard jumped back over the wall and moved away from the dog. The guard then said to him that he should not be scared and it won’t bite him. As time went by, groups of people with their shopping made their way down the subway while some were making their way from the subway from the taxi rank. Most of these people were unaware of the dog and just walked down from the subway talking to their friends until the dog barked or tried to jump at them. Then they would scream and run to the far side of the subway away from the dog.

Some people were too scared to walk past the dog and opted to walk on the side of ‘Laboria’, which meant they had to cross the highway to get to the taxi rank. Some braved this and would often run down the subway like headless chickens. The security guards laughed at the people’s expressions as they found their fear amusing. As the dog became more restless and wanted to chase after more pedestrians the security guard shouted “foey” and pull on the dog as a way of asserting control/authority over it, but the dog would often ignore him. This made me question his ability to handle the guard dog.
While sitting here, the only thing that I could hear was the barking of the dog and the hooting of cars in the middle of the road as they tried to exit on Govan Mbeki Avenue. Looking at how scared the people looked when they saw the dog, it made me think about how irrational people act when blinded by fear or rage. Remarking on this, Grace stated the following:

Grace: People will kill the dog seriously, they leave the dog’s water there in the bucket when they walk around, and someone will put rat poison in the water.

When I returned, Grace was done with Theresa. I then greeted Trisha and she returned my greeting today. Normally she would not acknowledge me, but over the past few days, I had been running some errands on her behalf via Grace like buying airtime and KFC for her and this encouraged her to engage with me more. Trisha then walked away into the subway.

Thabo: Grace, are you okay? I was looking for you yesterday and I did not see you.

Grace: I was so bored yesterday, I called the people here and asked if the dogs were here. They said yes, so I just slept. I slept the whole day.

Thabo: That’s nice, so now you are all rested.

Grace: Yes, but today I needed to wake up and come here because I need money to go to Pretoria on Saturday.

Grace needed money, because she needed to go to the Home Affairs in Pretoria to check on her asylum application, which she has been waiting for, for almost six years now. This was the reason why she could not apply for a trading booth on Govan Mbeki Avenue, because she was told that she needed papers to qualify for the space. This was the reason why the migrants were continuously being moved from the subway – they were told they made the space dirty and then tourists did not want to come visit the heritage sites around the area. They were also told they did not have the proper documentation to trade on Govan Mbeki Avenue and then they were moved. Ironically, South Africans, like Nomfundo, traded in the same area and were never moved.
I then took a walk, looking around the area. As I walked out of Shoprite, I turned left and walked on the side of the Hungry Lion restaurant instead of crossing the street. As I was about to pass the restaurant, I bumped into Scelo (the head field officer in charge of policing the traders on Govan Mbeki Avenue and making sure that certain spaces were kept clean and clear). Dressed in a striped yellow and brown formal, collared shirt, brown long pants and a cap, Scelo was standing with two other middle-aged black men with their arms folded. One of the men was dressed in a white formal, collared shirt, while the other man was dressed in a T-shirt and blue jeans with sneakers. All three men seemed like they were in the middle of an important conversation. They stood squarely in the middle of the pathway, firmly entrenched in their spot. They took up half the walkway and did not seem to be bothered by this at all. They were unperturbed by people’s attempts to get round them.

I walked slowly towards Scelo, hesitant to interrupt their conversation, but at the same time I had the urge to greet him. I eventually decided to greet him. I walked up to him and said hello. Scelo turned around placed his one hand on my shoulder and extended his other hand to shake my hand upon which I extended my hand and shook his hand. He looked happy to see me – actually, he looked like he had a grin on his face.

Thabo: How are you Scelo?
Scelo: I am good and you?
Thabo: I am great thank you.
Scelo: Did your people tell you what happened? (Referring to Grace and the other traders)
Thabo: What did you do to my people now? You know I need them, who am I going to talk to now?
Scelo: Well, this morning I chased them away. I used two big dogs to chase them away.
Thabo: Where are they now?
Scelo: I don’t know; you must go find them. They are somewhere, look for them. They are not at the subway. There are two big dogs there now. I told them that I was coming for them.
One of the men that Scelo was talking to earlier said something and he turned back to them. I bid him farewell and I walked back to Grace. A few minutes after I arrived, Scelo made his way towards us. He confidently walked through the street looking from one side to the other. He approached us and spoke to Grace.

Scelo: What do you want here?  
Grace: I am sitting here Scelo.  
Scelo: (Looks at Nomfundo) Why are you allowing her to sell here? These people are now not allowed to sell here.  
Grace: I am not selling here Scelo. Where am I supposed to sit now?  
Scelo: I told you. Where are those dogs to remove you?

Scelo then laughed and walked away, pretending to go look for the security guards who have now left. Grace then stood up and walked to one of the large municipal structures that were erected for informal traders the street. Here, behind another trader who sells handbags, Grace positioned her grey trolley filled with all her stock.

Grace: Where are these people now? (The other traders)  
Thabo: I do not know, but I also saw Makainino earlier outside Clicks  
Grace: What was she doing? Was she selling outside there?  
Thabo: No, she was sitting drinking juice  
Grace: Well they must come now – we must sell before the security comes back.

Then Trisha arrived and she and Grace spoke in Shona about something. Grace then pushed her trolley out. I tried to get into Trisha’s good books so I offered to help her carry her stock to the subway. Grace pushed the trolley out and I followed her with my backpack, bucket and Trisha’s bag filled with her stock.

I walked down the subway while Grace navigated the pavements so she could move with ease. As she walked, she was joined by Trisha who walked next to her. I walked ahead by myself and arrived at the trading spot before them. The other Zimbabwean traders who sold DVDs had already arrived, as well as a man Grace calls ‘coloured’. He was the coloured guy who sold fruit in the subway. Grace called him by this name because she did not want to know his name.
Migrants are constantly moved out of the area, because the Nelson Mandela Bay Development Agency attempts to implement its Urban Renewal Strategy and migrants trading on the streets are not a nice sight for tourists visiting the city. Acting through the development agency and Scelo the movement of migrants in and around the heritage precinct is limited and censored.

3.4 Vuyisile Mini Square: Heritage preservation or poverty alleviation?
In the case of Port Elizabeth, heritage is not a priority that is recognised by all people. People in Port Elizabeth are more concerned with their daily survival and well-being than with the preservation of tangible heritages, they are waiting for the government to deliver on the promises it made at the advent of democracy – the promise of a better life for all.

When engaging with heritage sites such as Vuyisile Mini Square, City Hall, the Statue of Queen Victoria and the Horse Memorial, black locals do not engage these heritage sites as items that continually contribute to their contemporary understanding of the world or inform their imagined future the way heritage is supposed to. However, they view these heritage sites as being representative of their traumatic past. Thus, when locals protest in front of heritage sites such as City Hall, which is both a heritage site and government building, the protestors view the Victorian era heritages as epitomising the social ills in their lives. They do not view the current government that occupies the building as a villa, but they direct their anger and frustration towards the heritage sites.

When protests erupt around Govan Mbeki North, individuals often engage heritage sites by displaying their disregard of the heritage spaces in various ways, that is, by careless littering (particularly Vuyisile Mini Square) and banging on the doors of the city hall without caring if they damage them, hence the deployment of security guards to protect the heritage precinct. It is through these actions that people show their disregard for the heritage sites. They are symbolically claiming their power from these spaces by singing freedom songs on this space or by vandalising the heritage as will be discussed below.
Arriving in the field this morning, I was greeted by a large group of coloured men and women sitting on the benches of market square. They were all dressed in casual clothes and, although there was a mixture of those who were dressed smartly, the dominant group were dressed in old-looking clothes. For a minute I even thought that some of them were homeless, based on the way they were dressed, but also because some of them were sitting down eating, rushing through the food like they had not eaten in days. These groups of people were all gathered in one space, drawing my attention, but also arousing my interest and leading me to question what they were doing there.

I wanted to know why they were all there and why there were so many of them, because every time there was a large group of people in front of Market Square, something big usually happens. After a while, they all bent down and picked up picket sign that were hidden on the floor next to the one car that was parked next to them. They had converted old brown boxes into signs to use for their protest. After picking up their signs, the group moved to the centre of Market Square and started to shout and laugh.

After a few minutes, more of them started walked towards the centre of Market Square, close to the entrance of the municipal council chambers. Within minutes they all started singing and shouting “Amandla”, which translates in to “power” (this was one of the sayings that was used to indicate that power belong to the people; the full saying being “Amandal Awethu” – the power is ours).

The main group of people continued to sing outside the building as more people started arriving and the group kept growing bigger and bigger and with every wave of people that arrived the singing got louder and louder, drawing the attention of everyone who was around the area and attracting more spectators.

This was followed by the arrival of a larger group of people. When they arrived, the group stopped singing and everyone started to talk among themselves. The two groups joined and huddled up together and started talking amongst themselves.
The group of protestors only consisted of coloured men and women. They were of different ages, from young people to old people and some adults were accompanied by children. It is worth noting that within the first few minutes after the arrival of this group of protestors, the doors to the municipal building were closed and locked and no one was allowed to go in. People would knock on the doors and the windows, but none were allowed to go in; they were directed elsewhere and they would then go around the building, I suppose to a more “secure” entrance. The same thing happened last week when the municipal workers were protesting outside the building.

This group consisted of almost 100 people who stood in the middle of Market Square and formed a circle. More people joined and the circle grew bigger. They started to sing a song in Afrikaans. They sang a song which went along the lines of “Mama hie sê die ANC, Mama hie sê die ANC, hie sê die ANC, die ANC, die ANC, eyo eyo yo, yho yho. Mama hie sê die ANC, hie sê die ANC, die ANC…”

This song was changed to “My father was a garden boy, my … my mother was a kitchen girl. My father… My father was a garden boy, that’s why I am an ANC, I am an ANC, I am an ANC, I am an ANC, I am an ANC, thattttt’s…. why I’m an ANC, I am an ANC”. They kept singing this song over and over again, with some dancing to the tune they had created. At one stage during this song, they looked like they were having more fun dancing than they were actually protesting. This song was a remix of Gospel Artist Rebecca Malope’s song My Mother, which was a big hit in 2010 and continues to be a big hit among her fans and this group of protestors.

These are the original lyrics to the song:

My mother was a kitchen girl
My father was a garden boy
That’s why
Ngibong’ Ujesu ngalomanlana
angiphe wona
noma bekunzima.”
Rebecca Malope (2010)
But, with an even older struggle song version of the song being:

“My mother was a kitchen girl
My father was a garden boy
That’s why I’m a communist”

This went on for a very long time and the protestors stood outside the city hall building in the winter sun, holding their placards up in the air and singing. Different groups of people walked past them, look at them in amazement and continue to walk. Very few actually asked them what was going on. These people wanted the attention of the municipality and no one in the city hall building gave them that attention, all they did was simply shut the door on them.

The protestors then started to move in a circular pattern around Market Square, waving their signs and hoping to get the attention of the senior municipal officials that occupied the building. They were singing and dancing to “Mama hie sê die ANC, Mama hie sê die ANC, hie sê die ANC, die ANC, die ANC, eyo eyo yo, yho yho. Mama hie sê die ANC, hie sê die ANC, die ANC…”

At this point, two people who appeared to be government officials parked their car in front of where I was seated. They looked at the protest and started laughing. They walked away to the municipal building across the street when they were stopped by one of the men who was part of the protest. He told them that they were protesting against the MBDA and that the MBDA was being used as a tool against the ANC-led local government. The man told them they would not leave Market Square until the problem was solved and that they were prepared to barricade the roads and ensure that no one could enter or exit the area.

The protestors continued with their demonstration and soon they started toyi-toyiing in front of the building. They all stood in a large circle, chanting and whistling as one person after the other went to the middle of the circle and do the toyi-toyi move, which involved lifting one leg up in the air, while jumping on the other and then alternating between legs. They then started shouting Amandla, viva ANC,
viva, viva ANCYL, viva. It is worth noting that they were chanting and supporting the same governing party that they were protesting against, as was the case with the striking municipal workers.

After this occurrence, a man in his late 40s, maybe early 50s, entered the circle and stood in the middle of the group. He led the group and encouraged them to shout “down with MBDA, down” and the crowd would and this would echo thought the square. They repeated this saying multiple times until he shouted that they would not leave until the MBDA was out of their area. As he continued to shout this, more people arrived and joined the protest.

The man made a speech in which he said that they supported development, but they were not supporting this kind of development, which gave the jobs to the gangsters. He said that because the gangsters had jobs, they could buy more bullets and weapons and this led to an increase in the crime rate and an increased fear among the community members. He said they demanded that this end today. Based on the newspaper articles that I have seen since I arrived in Port Elizabeth, I can safely say that gangsters seems to be a major issue in the Northern areas of the city.

The crowd then suddenly started to shout “voetsek DA, voetsek”. “Hamba. DA, Hamba”. The DA (Democratic Alliance) is the official opposition to the ANC (African National Congress) in the area and at national level. After a while of pretesting and standing in the sun, a heavily pregnant women approached the protestors and starting speaking to them as a middle-aged coloured man took pictures of them. I assume that these were journalists because there was a newspaper house located a few buildings down from Market Square. When the crowd saw the woman and the man, they became more energised and sang louder and louder. The man then took photographs of the protestors, but some people hid their faces with the signs they had in their hands. This was justified considering that they were protesting against gangsters and they wanted them to be fired from their jobs, therefore, they wanted to hide out of fear of victimisation or even fear of being killed.
3.5 Unpacking the dynamics of Vuyisile Mini – Market Square

Vuyisile Mini – Market Square was a national heritage site that was proclaimed in 1974. It was part of Port Elizabeth’s 1820 settler heritage. However, in the years that followed after South Africa became a democracy, the heritage site was demoted from a national heritage site to a provincial heritage site, falling under the protection of the cash-strapped Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage Resources Agency.

Under the previous government, Vuyisile Mini Square was a space the above protestors would not have been able to occupy, let alone protest on. It is surprising how a space can change and be used for different purposes at different times. Heritage spaces are sometimes significant to national identity, social cohesion and can emphasise a shared past. However, they are subject to contestation and are fought over by different groups, so that they emphasise their self-importance and the exclusion of others.

In South Africa, particularly Port Elizabeth, the renaming of heritage sites, buildings and towns is of profound importance and we need to examine the meanings attached to them carefully. Heritages can be used as political tools to achieve change or as a tool to further self-serving interests. As noted in the field note description earlier on, migrants were not allowed to trade in and around heritage sites on Govan Mbeki Avenue, but South Africans were allowed to do so. There is a new level of engaging with heritages; one that does not pay due attention to heritage sites, but that uses the destruction and non-engagement with heritage sites in and around the Market Square as a means of getting the government (local, provincial and national) to listen to their demands and one that seeks to exclude migrants from particular spaces.

South Africa finds itself in a peculiar time, experiencing a post-colonial moment. Those who were marginalised during apartheid were led to believe that their lives would change in the democratic dispensation, but that has not been the case. Although there are millions of people whose lives have been improved slightly and who have benefited from the advent of democracy, there are still those who have not benefited at all. In this study, reference is mostly made to individuals who feel they have not benefited or who still feel they are being sidelined, despite their constant demonstration of loyalty to the governing African National Congress.
In a separate, but related incident on Vuyisile Mini Square:

I sat there, quietly drinking my coffee, looking at everyone and asking myself why they were there. Why were all these workers dressed in blue uniforms sitting there and who were they waiting for. I looked around and soon caught the eye of two elderly black men who were seated on a bench diagonal to mine were looking at me. I think they were trying to figure out what I was doing there, because I was the only person sitting in that area that was dressed in a black hoodie and everyone else was wearing their blue uniforms.

After moments of trying to figure out who I was going to approach and how I was going to approach them, I decided to approach two coloured women that were standing on the opposite side of the road. In all honesty, my confidence to approach people had taken quite a knock the day before when the traders refused to engage with me and, when they did engage with me, they would only speak to me in isiXhosa and not want to talk about anything besides the sweets or fruit I was buying from them. I conjured up the courage to walk to them and as soon I got to them I realised they were in the middle of a serious conversation. I figured that they would be angry with me for disturbing them. Next to them was an old coloured man who was standing by himself. I approached him and asked him what was going on. He slowly looked at me and said that it was a meeting. I asked me what meeting and who called it. He looked at me and then looked away. I took this a sign that he was not interested in talking to me. With this new knowledge, I walked back to my original bench and thought about how I was going to approach someone else who could expand on this.

I sat there for approximately 20 minutes, thinking about how I was going to approach someone else. I soon came to realise that no anthropologist ever became an anthropologist without being humiliated or embarrassed. I told myself that Geertz was also mocked when he was doing his fieldwork in Bali and that led to him writing a great ethnography. With this thought in mind, I decided to move to a bench that was closer to where all the other workers were seated and I observed two older women. After watching these women for some time I decided that I was going to sit down next to them.
I walked to the bench where the one woman was seated and sat down next to her; she looked at me and then looked away. I sat there silently for a few minutes and then I politely said hello and she greeted me back and looked away. I sat in silence for a few minutes and then looked at her again and asked her what was going on.

MaMokwena: (She looked at me) “We are on strike because we want more money.”

She then looked away and proceeded to have a conversation with the woman that was sitting next to her.

Thabo: (I leaned over) “Can I ask, who called the meeting and what is the increase rate that you are asking for?”

MaMokwena: (She turned to look at me and silently thought for a minute or so before answering me) “The union told us that we should come there. I don’t know what the proposed amount of money that they are asking for.”

She then looked away from me again. I quickly introduced myself to her and told her that I was doing research. I told her that I had been observing Market Square for a few days now and I was surprised this morning when I arrived and the square was filled with workers. She looked at me in silence for a long time.”

MaMoekwena: “The workers want an increase because we do not earn enough money. Look me, for example, I earn R1 100 per month. This not enough to support me and my family.”

MaMoekwena: “My name is MaMoekwena and I am from the Transkei. I first came to Port Elizabeth in 1980 to come and look for a job.”

MaMoekwena: “Why is your name Thabo, but you cannot speak isiXhosa?”

Thabo: “Well, that is because I am Sotho and my name is Sotho.”

MaMoekwena: “Thabo, why are you speaking English instead of seTswana/SeSotho?”
Thabo: “It is because most of the people that I have met in the city speak isiXhosa and not many of them speak Setswana.”

At this moment she laughed and said to me Bua ge (translating into “talk then”). I smiled at her and started telling her about my name and that it means happiness in Sesotho. She looked at me and said, well ina ke mokwena (meaning “I am a crocodile”). This meant she was Tswana/Sotho and that she could speak the language. This was also used to indicate her totem, which was the crocodile. We both laughed at this point. I found it interesting that this woman grew up in the former Transkei, but she was Tswana/Sotho.

Within minutes of conversing the shop stewards emerged from the Council Building and called all the workers towards the stairs of the building. Soon the workers, like an army of blue ants, assembled in front on the stairs. Within minutes they broke into song starting out very low, gaining momentum as the song progressed. With the shop stewards leading the song from the front of the building facing the workers, everyone started to dance – swaying from one side to the other and clapping hands, while someone in the crowd blew a whistle. This lasted for almost 10 minutes. Then they all started to chant “Amandla, Awethu” followed by “power to the ANC, power” and then one final chant of “Amandla”. Then the crowd went silent.

The crowd was addressed by the different shop stewards. The workers stood in front of the Council Building, shielding their eyes from the harsh winter sun and wind. They all stood there silently while being addressed. I joined them and stood at the back, silently listening to what was being said, trying not to be noticed or called out by anyone for my presence at this meeting. I stood behind a tall man, so that no one in front could see me. However, standing at the back was a problem because I could not hear what was being said because of all the cars and trucks that were driving past the building. I soon found myself in the middle of the crowd, chanting Amandla with the workers and showing solidarity so I would not stand out.

What stood out the most about this meeting was that the shop stewards were shouting out power to the ANC, but they were protesting against the ANC-led
municipality. The amount of political language that was being used by the group of representatives seemed to suggest that the workers should not be angry at the moment that their bonus was no longer going to be paid and that it was okay to earn R1 100.

The meeting was political in nature and only certain people were allowed to talk. The language that was being used throughout the meeting was isiXhosa, with the exception of when she spoke English for almost three minutes; this despite the fact that there were coloured men and women who could not understand isiXhosa.

In the post-colony, people lay claim to spaces through various practices such as protests and by occupying spaces like Vuyisile Mine Square as both a space and a heritage site. People can dominate certain heritage sites symbolically and physically. Through demonstrating on the heritage site and by constantly showing disregard for the heritage site when protesting, people are attempting to claim some kind of power that asserts their self-worth. The manner in which they engage with Victorian era heritages is an attempt to dismantle an oppressive system that is epitomised by colonial and apartheid heritages. People are not only claiming the space by means of protests, they are also employing other ways such as engaging the space, converting the heritage sites into spaces other than what they were originally intended for – a place of safety for homeless people. This will be elaborated on later on in the chapter.

When studying heritage in Port Elizabeth, one needs to be cognisant of the fact that we are dealing with the symbolical and physical reclamation of the city. The city doubles up as both a space and heritage. It is a heritage whose power can be drawn on for both political and economic gain, but it is also an economic space from which black people were excluded as explained in chapter two. Thus, when they are reclaiming the city’s heritage landscape through various means such as defacing statues, protests and disregard for Victorian era heritages and memories through

---

54 This would be through the ability of one class or group to convince themselves and others that the existing social hierarchy is justified or needs to be questioned through actions of favoring or sidelining other forms of knowledge, artistic expression or heritage over another.
various embodied and external performances, they are claiming the heritage space to draw on its symbolic, economic and political power through a form of performance.

In Schneider’s (1997) theory on performance, he stresses the importance of considering performance as a multifocal concept that is continuously regenerated, transmitted and received depending on the goals it hopes to achieve and the social context within which it functions. In this context, people protest because they are trying to reclaim the space, they are engaging monuments and heritages. By defacing Victorian era heritages during protest, people are venting their anger with the past and their dissatisfaction with the present government’s slow service delivery. They do the latter through different performances of their anger, hence the importance of performance theory to understand how people publicly question heritage narratives.

Performance theory functions as an all-encompassing approach to performance that is infused with popular culture, folklore and social diversity. It is based on the construction and performance of the self and other, considering that the individual’s performance of the self is interpreted and received by society as a performance by the “other”. Schneider (1997) considers performance to be inclusive of more than just theatre. It includes a wide range of other social structures such as the individual’s everyday life, rituals and art. Turner (1977) considers the imaginary to be an important factor in the ability of an individual to construct a salient identity that is self-expressive and different from the normative that was possible and could be real within the context of performance. In this case, the identity the protestors take on is one that is positioned in opposition to the hegemonic structures. They view themselves as being mentally free from hegemonic structures and ideologies, and seek to challenge the latter at every opportunity that they have.

Drawing on Turner (1977), Schechner (1988) regards performance as inclusive of: play, games, sport, theatre and rituals. Schechner (1998) argues that the five activities share the four qualities of performance, which are: (1) a special ordering of time, (2) a special value attached to objects, (3) non-productivity in terms of goods and (4) rules.
Schechner (2002) argues that public and, to a large extent, private societal behaviours can be plotted on a continuum that ranges from theatrical performances on the one end to private individualist ritual performances on the one end (Schechner, 2002). My understanding of this is that individuals are continuously performing, but their level of staged performance varies depending on their level of social surveillance or if they are trying to prove a point, as in the case of Port Elizabeth where people are continuously trying to prove a point. When they are continuously under surveillance or ‘panopticism’ in public, as coined by Foucault (1975), their level of expression is toned down or is completely curtailed. However, when they are performing private rituals such as ancestor worship in the ubuhlanti or protests, they are more expressive and their social identity is more expressive and liberal. Therefore, individual engagements in societal “real life” are often indistinguishable from theatrical role play because of their constant experience of panopticism (Foucault, 1975), monitoring their performance of self and experience when engaging with heritage.

Foucault’s (1975), Turner’s (1977) and Schechner’s (1988) work on performativity indicates their rejection of the dominant post-modernistic paradigm of the time, which placed an emphasis on group identities and experiences at the expense of individual sovereignty. Post-modern scholars understood the performance of individual identity and gender as something that was socially constructed (mostly by the elite), informed social, political and economic institutions and therefore needed to be experienced by everyone and be reflective of the social rather than the individual unit. This is why people attribute different meanings to heritage.

Institutional practices are considered to be the dominant shapers of social life and theoretically they are considered to inform the individual’s daily and social performances (Schechner, 2002). In turn, these social behaviours become stylised into social representations and they are ultimately turned into traditional customs that are perpetuated by the social, political and economic elite, because they help maintain their dominance over the masses. These predetermined social roles and performances result in the general population enacting public facades which they end up believing, because they become engrained in their perceptions of self-identity. However, through their work on performance, Foucault (1975), Turner (1977), Schechner (1988), Moore (2007) and Henderson (2014) directly and indirectly rebel
against the dominant social identities and attempt to break the cyclical perpetuation of oppressive societal practices in order to bring about change.

Therefore, we are dealing with the use of heritage as a way of conceptualising inclusion and exclusion in the post-apartheid state. Being in the post-apartheid state involves questioning everything that is in the present, lest it reinforces dominant (colonial) narratives. In the case of the post-colonial city, heritage management is about “Re-humanizing the city [so that it] becomes a strategic objective for the New Urban Agenda. Enhancing local culture and recognizing cultural diversity can be a powerful way to mitigate urban conflicts, foster tolerance, preserve the social fabric and promote pluralism” (HABITAT III, 2016: 4).

In my observations of Vuyisile Mini Square, I observed that people did not care about the formally designated heritage sites at all. While some individuals did not know it was a heritage site, some people simply did not care about knowing anything about the space at all and others used different protests to challenge the heritages in and around the square.

In performance, everyday ideas, objects (monuments and memorials) and performances (protests) are used to challenge dominant notions of power, but they are also used to construct and reflect the inner self. Schechner (1988; 2002) argues that perceived reality (individual identity and rituals) is on a continuum with perceived reality on the one side and performed reality (stages individual performances) on the other side. Therefore, the two understandings of performance should not be understood as binary opposites of each other, but that they should rather be understood in terms of their locations on a sliding scale, which allows the individuals to move between the two.

When looking at the narratives presented above, I would say that even within the ubuhlanti (city centre), people are still finding different ways to interpret the space. They are constantly finding alternative ways of thinking of the ubuhlanti, while trying to create a space for themselves. They are aware of the power dynamics that are present, but they do not let it stop them from re-interpreting meaning of the heritage site. I also argue that with people using the space for alternative things, other than its
original heritage use, those who were marginalised or continue to be marginalised have found an alternative way of using their symbolic power to challenge the structure that they find themselves in. They have also noticed that they can use heritage as a way to attract the government’s attention to their plights.

Marginalised individuals and communities use different kinds of staged and un-staged performances of self to question the hegemonic nature heritages and narratives. They use different acts such as protests to take away power from ambivalent heritages or they simply ignore the heritage sites because, by not engaging them, they do not feed into their narcissistic personalities.

In his book *Embodying colonial memories Spirit possession, power and the Hauka in West Africa*, Paul Stoller (1995) studied how the Hauka people in Niger mimic and mock both post-colonial and colonial Europeans through the use of spirit-possession public performances and rituals. It was also through spirit-possession rituals that Hauka spirit mediums would be possessed by the spirits of unsettled colonial officers who died in Africa during colonisation. However, these spirits are not aware that colonisation has ended. Reading into this one can argue that the Hauka mocked their colonisers because they wanted to reclaim their power, which they were deprived of during colonisation. It is based Stoller’s (1995) work that a comparison is drawn between the Hauka and people in Port Elizabeth. Stoller’s work can be understood as being inclusive of not only the notion of reclaiming symbolic power by the subaltern, but also as the reclaiming of heritage and urban spaces.

In conclusion, locals are using different ways to engage the foreign in urban spaces. The foreign ranges from colonial heritages they consider ambivalent to foreign migrants that are increasingly becoming visible in urban areas and thus pose a threat to the country’s attempt to localise urban landscapes.
CHAPTER FOUR

HOLDING HERITAGE HOSTAGE: THE DESTRUCTION OF HERITAGE IN PORT ELIZABETH

4.1 Introduction

This chapter considers how the destruction of particular heritage sites can be read as a symbolic act of claiming power from the side of marginalised communities. People’s destruction of ambivalent statues and monuments is an attack on the foreign. In the eyes of the communities who continue to be trapped in poverty due to the policies of dispossession of apartheid and colonisation, Victorian era heritages epitomise oppression, a lack of service delivery, an exploration of the subaltern and failed dreams and hopes of the rainbow nation.

Twenty-two years into South Africa’s democracy, the country is dealing with the legacy of apartheid’s forced removals and the social and economic exclusion of the black majority, together with increasing poverty, which continue to pose a challenge to the development of the Eastern Cape, broader Nelson Mandela Bay region and Port Elizabeth (Ronan, 2008). The city remains deeply divided on the grounds of race, nationality, income, use of space and influence of political decisions in the city.

Formally promulgated in 1948, despite having been unofficially in practice for a century under British colonialism, apartheid (translating into apartness or segregation) was a “system of social engineering that segregated people based on race” (Ronan, 2008:8). The system advocated for separate living spaces for the country’s socially constructed racial groups based on its pseudo-scientific beliefs (i.e. eugenics). Governments’ reasoning for apartheid was that different races and ethnic groups would develop, and live better if separated. The segregationist governments wanted to preserve different cultures and heritages. However, through their dispossession of the land and subjugation, the black majority was marginalised, while the white minority population controlled 86 per cent of the country’s land (Wilson & Ramphele, 1988).

Black people were forcefully removed from their land and relocated to newly created townships on the outskirts of cities or in so-called homelands and “independent” states (Transkei, Ciskei, Venda and Bophuthatswana) which were overcrowded, overgrazed
and deprived of socio-economic opportunities. The majority of black people were denied access to resources and systematically impoverished by the apartheid government’s policies (Wilson & Ramphele, 1988).

Black people in South Africa were rendered foreign in their own country – dispossessed of their land and rendered alien in their own space. They could not lay claim to land or identify with any of the landscapes in the cities or land outside of the overcrowded homelands. Years into the country’s democracy, interactions between the socially constructed races in the city are still based on a master-servant relationship, as noted by Ross (1997).

Currently, the effects of the apartheid policy and ideology are still firmly entrenched in Port Elizabeth. From 1948 to 1994, the National Party (the controlling government of the time) implemented a number of fascist and racist policies. Most of these centred on the exclusion and impoverishment of the black and coloured majority population. In 1950, the Population Registration Act was legislated and required that all South Africans be racially classified into one of three socially constructed categories: white (European), black (African) or coloured (of mixed decent). The coloured category included subgroups of Indians and Asians. Classification into categories was based on appearance, social acceptance and descent. White people were the apex of the hierarchy, with coloured people in the middle acting as a buffer between white and the black. Black people were at the bottom of this hierarchy and their primary role was considered to be servants.

The apartheid government enacted laws that institutionalised the racial discrimination of individuals based on their physical and ethnic appearance. Race, a socially constructed ideology during the expansion of imperialism, was reinterpreted by the apartheid government and the notion of racial difference materialised through the enactment of legislation. These racially tailored laws affected every aspect of social, political and economic life in the country. The government regulated every aspect and interaction between its so-called races – it prohibited marriages between non-whites (blacks and coloureds) and whites, it deprived black and coloured individuals of the opportunity to vote and reserved all high-paying and skilled labour for white people.
and only non-skilled and low-income jobs were reserved for the majority – this action helped keep them trapped in poverty.

In his lecture at the University of Fort Hare, Neville Alexander (2006) argued that race does not exist biologically. However, it is a lived reality for a number of black and coloured people who are still suffering from the legacy of apartheid and continue to be trapped in a vicious cycle of poverty that was designed to maintain their systematic marginalisation. Their deprivation was not only economic in nature, but it was also social in the sense that black people were denied access to an effective education system. They were denied the right to practice their cultural practices outside the homelands, because it was considered backwards and uncivilised by the state (colonial, union and apartheid).

4.2 Establishing a link between heritage and poverty

Looking at poverty from a purely economic lens, May (1998:1) defines poverty as the “inability to attain the minimum living standard, measured in terms of basic consumption needs or income required to satisfy them”. There is a wide variety of definitions of poverty; however, the definition of May (1998) above is closest to my understanding of poverty. However, May does not fully capture the interpretation of poverty. For purposes of this study in Port Elizabeth, I propose the following definition of poverty: Poverty is the inability to attain and sustain a living standard, measured in terms of basic consumption of needs, income and cultural capital.

It is important to expand on the definition, because a person has to be able to sustain their livelihood in order to be able to break out of the cycle of poverty; they need to have access to a continuous income to sustain themselves, their family and, in a number of cases, their extended family. However, in order to ensure the latter, one needs to have access to different opportunities and access to them is facilitated by social, cultural and political capital. The move to incorporate cultural capital into the above definition of poverty is important, because, if an individual does not possess cultural capital they can draw from (i.e. heritage), they will be unable to advance. It is through possessing cultural, economic and social capital that individuals are able to access resources.
The city represents resources that have been placed in the hands of a privileged few located within the colonial, apartheid city (*ubuhlanti*) (David Harvey, 2008). Marginalised groups are located on the periphery, kept out of the *ubuhlanti* (city) by ‘gates’ (class, race and education). Therefore, in order to access this space, heritage becomes as way of attaining cultural capital in order to access the resources needed to benefit from the new dispensation.

The marginalisation and impoverishment of communities located on the periphery are nothing new, nor is it unique to Port Elizabeth, the Eastern Cape or South Africa. It is a social phenomenon that can be found throughout Africa, Europe, Asia and the Americas. It is present and lingers in the background of most developing and developed countries. In South Africa, the previous government’s deliberate and systematical impoverishment of the majority of the population, through their exclusion from the economy and the political sphere (See Plaatje, 1916), but most importantly through their dispossession of land and heritage, has contributed to most of the social issues experienced by individuals in and around Port Elizabeth.

When studying heritage and the anger people exhort towards Victorian era heritages, one cannot help but notice the entrenched anger that marginalised groups express towards these monuments and memorials, as they regard these as a continuous reminder of their dispossession and extortion by previous governments.

As such, poverty is not a one-dimensional matter that can be reduced to statistics, numbers or historical events, but is a complex, multifaceted matter that has many faces (Buffel, 2007:170). For a prolonged period, black people were denied the right to lay claim on various heritage sites. The previous government erected monuments that honoured itself and its own heritage, while black people were denied the same right. This contributed to their tangible cultural impoverishment and invisibility in urban areas.

Marginalised groups of people in Port Elizabeth, continue to be trapped in a cycle of material poverty, which was systematically created and entrenched in the socio-economic and political institutions such as schools, healthcare and cultural institutions
by the apartheid government. These institutions were founded on the premises of people from opportunities, which granted them social and class mobility.

4.3 Heritage, poverty and migration

After 1994, South Africa opened itself up to the world and allowed foreigners\(^{55}\) into the country. Twenty-two years into South Africa’s democracy, the country is still in a phase of transition from an authoritarian society to a mature democracy. The country’s first changeover in 1994 was not a revolutionary one, but rather a negotiated one. When the apartheid regime transferred political power to the democratic government, the economic power remained in the hands of a few individual South Africans. This still constituted the minority of the population controlling the majority of the country’s wealth (Buffel, 2007).

As Foucault puts it:

> When colonized people attempt to liberate itself from its colonizers, this is indeed a practice of liberation in the strict sense, but we know very well, and moreover in this case, that this practise of liberation is not in itself sufficient to define the practices of freedom that will still be needed if these people, this society and these individuals are to be able to define admissible and acceptable forms of existence or political society (1982:2282).

Those who are marginalised try to break out of the margins, but fail. In Port Elizabeth, this still remains the case – those who were trapped impoverished under the previous government remain in the same position. Social issues such as gangsterism, unemployment and crime remain rife. However, marginalised people are finding creative ways to break out of this cycle of poverty. They are using heritage as a means to claim spaces they were systematically excluded from and as a way of empowering themselves.

\(^{55}\)Neocosmos speaks of the fact that after Apartheid, South Africa was obliged in a way to open its borders to foreigners from SADC countries who had assisted with political asylum/training for Umkhonto WeSizwe during Apartheid. But they were unhappy with the idea of foreigners, so they imposed a 'two-gate' system, where it appeared that they were open to foreigners, but the Alien Controls Act suggested otherwise.
On Thursday, 26 May 2016, the Budget Debate of the Department of Sport, Arts, Culture and Recreation in the Gauteng Provincial Legislature was held. The legislature building, one of the historic landmarks in the city of Johannesburg, houses the Provincial Parliament in the old city of Johannesburg town hall. The building, one of the city’s historic buildings, was refurbished and took on a new meaning in the democratic South Africa. Under the previous government, it was a space that black people were unable to access; however, due to democracy, black people now hold the political power in the country and populate the corridors of such political institutions.

I walked into the vexing gallery and looked for a place to sit. I was seated right in the front facing the provincial cabinet as they debated their various budget votes. I looked forward and watched all the different members of the provincial legislature debating the budget of the provincial education department, which had just been presented by the Member of the Executive Council (MEC) of Education. The debate went on for another hour, until it was time to move on to the Department of Sports, Arts, Culture and Recreation’s budget.

After the closing remarks by the MEC of Education, the Deputy Speaker – presiding over the day’s sitting – called the MEC of Sports, Arts, Culture and Recreation, Faith Mazibuko (MPL) to the podium to deliver her budget speech. The MEC, dressed in a bright pink and black dress, stood up and greeted everyone in the house. While delivering her speech, the MEC remarked that her department planned to use heritage as a way of fostering social cohesion in the province and was in the process of working on a liberation route to celebrate liberation heritage in the province. The speech made reference to celebrating liberation heroes in the province. However, no mention was made of colonial and apartheid monuments in the province. This was interesting, given that countless colonial heritages were vandalised over the past year, but there was no reference to this in her speech.

What stood out in the MEC’s address was that heritage and heritage resources were not taken seriously. It sounded like heritage had been included into the speech a few minutes before the MEC presented it. Due attention was not paid to the importance of heritage and how heritage was going to be used to empower
people, help them develop a sense of ownership of the country’s heritage landscape and foster social cohesion. What was confirmed by the MEC’s speech was that heritage was not considered as important as other social issues such as education and housing – it often takes a back seat to service delivery. The irony in this is that when communities have service delivery protests, the first thing to be vandalised or destroyed is heritage, because this is considered a way to attract the government’s attention.

The above extraction from the field notes is presented because Gauteng is one of the few provinces in South Africa that invests money in heritage services. It is one of the few provinces that have a functional provincial heritage resources agency, while the Eastern Cape, where the research site is located, does not have a functional heritage resources agency. In 2014, the Eastern Cape Provincial Heritage Resources Agency (ECPHRA) received a crippling annual budget of one million rand to carry out its functions, while its counterpart in neighbouring Kwa-Zulu Natal, received a budget of close to sixty million rand. This meant that the agency was unable to carry out its functions as a heritage protection body.

In in October 2016, the MEC for Sports, Recreation, Arts and Culture, Pemmy Majodina, informed the Eastern Cape Provincial Legislature that the agency had ceased being fully functional because of “the transitional funding arrangement for the ECPHRA in which the Department ceased to transfer the ECPHRA annual budget allocation, opting for creating an enabling environment for the ECPHRA to conduct all its procurement and payment processes from within the Department” (Majoida, 2016). This decision further crippled the operations of the heritage agency, limiting its ability to act as a body to initiate the heritage transformation process in the province.

The process of transforming the country’s heritage landscape is not only prioritised by certain government sectors, as mentioned by the MEC in her budget speech in the Gauteng Provincial Legislature, but it is also advocated for by ordinary citizens who
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want to transform the country’s landscapes in an attempt to make the country’s heritage more representative of the country’s diverse citizens. One such example was a discussion with Zodwa and Khanyisa:

**Thabo:** Do you think that the erection of liberation heritages (statues, monument and memorials) is necessary in order to make urban areas more reflective of the South African majority?

**Zodwa:** Yes. I think we have too many statues of white men who colonized our land and very little monuments of men and women who fought the struggle for our liberation. So definitely, I think I should equally be able to point to a statue of Steve Biko on some mountain and show my child what he looked like and why he was so important, we had to make a statue for him.

**Khanyisa:** I think it is necessary because it represents the impact of social change. I think it also carries the responsibility of reminding society in order to develop a collective community to continue.

The government’s attempts to reform urban spaces through the erection of contemporary counter-monuments that represent liberation heroes have often gone unrecognised by ordinary citizens who have opted for alternative ways. Those formerly marginalised are responding in a physical way by destroying monuments that they associate with their continuous poverty and society’s inequalities as a way of urban reform.

**Upon entering the parameters of the township, a massive sign reading “New Brighton” greets us, and the taxi turns left into the township. There is a car in front of us that keeps stopping and delaying the taxi. The driver of the car then sticks his head out and starts shouting at the taxi driver, another man seated in the passenger seat of the car does the same thing. The driver shouts back at them in isiXhosa. The car then stops and the taxi driver hoots at them. At this point, everyone in the taxi starts to murmer about this car and how it’s delaying them. After a few minutes, the car started to move, the taxi driver, and the man in the car**
start shouting something to each other and they laughed. The anxious atmosphere in the taxi then broke as everyone started to laugh. It became clear that they knew each other and were joking. For a moment there my heart was pacing, so were most of the other people’s, because we thought that the taxi driver and the man in the car were going to get out of the car and have a heated confrontation.

As the taxi continues to drive through the township one cannot help but notice how dusty the streets are; they look like they have not been maintained in years. In addition to this, the houses were small and cramped into one street. I then noticed a van parked outside one of the houses and a woman at the back of the van selling meat.

After the former incident, the taxi starts making its stops as people shout out their desired drop-off points to the drivers. Khanyisa shouts out the name of the place where we are going to and within seconds, the taxi comes to a standstill. I assume that this is our stop, but I am still uncertain, because this is my first time coming here. I grab my bag and start preparing myself to get off as the taxi stops. Khanyisa then says “Come, friend, let’s go this is our stop.” The man sitting next to us then opens the taxi door for us and he himself gets out so that we can get out from our seats.

We get out of the taxi and step onto the dusty pavement. I look around the area and notice how small the yards here are in comparison to the yards in the suburbs and everywhere around Port Elizabeth. The area seems impoverished; there are no trees growing around the area to provide shade to everyone on this extremely hot day. There was a flood of cars driving past this narrow main road making their way to wherever they were going, and a span of taxis hooting trying to attract passengers. We then cross the street, burning from the heat of the scorching sun, escaping from a fast-approaching taxi.

As we cross the street making our way down to Loyiso’s house, the first thing I notice is the rubbish that had been dumped on the side of the road. The open piece of land had been converted into an informal dumping site for everyone to dump
their rubbish and it looks like the municipality had not cleaned the area in a few days, or weeks.

At this stage, people in Port Elizabeth continue to deal with the historical legacies of apartheid and colonisation in an attempt to escape their state of poverty. People are also scared of what is going on in New Brighton, one of the areas where gangsterism is a problem and where there are such altercations as mentioned earlier, as sometimes these result in a shooting. Another frustration is that, when South African first became a democracy, the majority of the black population expected that things would be better for them; however, this has not happened. They continue to live sidelined because of a lack of service delivery (e.g. no collection of rubbish by the municipality) and they are frustrated because their material conditions are not improving as quickly as they had expected it to.

Thabo: Do you think it has been left to decay? If yes, why do you think this has been done?

Tanya: I think that everything in SA has been left to decay in the last 20 years. Street lights, roads, infrastructure and building regulations. If one reflects on the history of SA, this is understandable. The ANC government was not qualified to be in government and tended to think only of this generation, then they put in place a quick fix. Now that over 20 years have passed, I think that this will change and that people in government will be more willing to think of the future of the country and the future generations that need to carry on here. Quite frankly, I do not think that policies on heritage sites were put in place and it therefore led to the decay of existing ones and even new ones.

Marginalised communities continue to live in a state of relative deprivation; they have now reached a breaking point and are trying to claim their power through various ways, such as the expulsion of the foreign. The foreign are those who come from outside the country (migrants and immigrants), as well as tangible heritages that these communities cannot identify with; they are foreign in the sense that the people could not claim it or identify with it because they were excluded from urban spaces where Victorian era heritages are located. The foreign is becoming increasingly isolated and
‘othered’ as the country moves in the direction of localising the landscape. This is demonstrated in Zodwa’s response below when asked about the Horse Memorial and the Statue of Queen Victoria.

Zodwa: I haven’t been there, but if it’s a colonial heritage site, I assume the government got tired of cleaning up after white men even after death… also because their children still discriminate against us… lol!

Heritage serves multiple purposes in South Africa, especially in Port Elizabeth. Heritage is multifarious; it could be used to foster social cohesion and unity, while it could simultaneously be used to exclude and include people in particular spaces. Under the previous government, black people were deprived of their socio-cultural capital, as they were unable to practice their own cultural practices. This was done by means of multiple ways, one of which was their deprivation of land. Among isiXhosa-speaking societies, land is important, as people have a relationship with and attachment to land. They construct their family ubuhlanti on the land and use the ubuhlanti as a way to commemorate the ancestors and communicate with them. It is a symbolic space, constructed in a particular area of the umzi for a family. The ubuhlanti is attached to land and is an important aspect of people’s culture and well-being. Under the previous government, isiXhosa-speaking people were unable to construct ubuhlantis in their yards in urban areas due to the small size of their properties. These properties were only big enough to accommodate a matchbox house. The inability to connect with the ancestors deprived isiXhosa-speaking people of their social practices and of their well-being, because the ubuhlanti is a space where isiXhosa-speaking people go to communicate with their ancestors, get advice and release stress. This inability to connect with their ancestors is sprout from their dispossession of their land – the same land where their ancestors were buried.

Heritage has the ability to give an individual instant gratification, accompanied by a feeling of assurance when such individual needs it. Heritage also places people on a political high that is sometimes used by politicians to garner votes and support during election time. However, as soon as elections are over, they withdraw from the public and wait for the next election, hoping that someone will come deliver on their election promises. The argument being made is that heritage is a political aspect and it is
constantly used to assist individuals to cope with everything that is happening in their lives. It is used to further certain political ideas and notions. In terms of the defacement of the Victorian era heritage, what we are dealing with is a case of misdirected anger; an attempt to localise Port Elizabeth’s heritage landscape and make it more representative of marginalised communities. Yes, there are streets, towns and heritage sites that have been renamed, but these communities still feel that not enough has been done to address their socio-economic positions and as such, they are conflating heritage and service delivery together.

Thabo:  *Do you think that the destruction of colonial heritages such as statues of colonial heritages (i.e. the statues of Cecil John Rhodes and Queen Victoria in Port Elizabeth) is necessary in order to achieve transformation?*

Khanyisa: *The discussion around the destruction of colonial heritage statues brings up a critical reflection on the nature in which these figures are still embedded in our contextual realities. The example of #RhodesMustFall illustrates the untransformed nature of institutional spaces (UCT) and representation of the colonial figure in a constitutional democracy. This conversation became necessary when the defacement of these statues started, which also points out that these discussions are not being openly facilitated in a university context. This is problematic considering the universal projection of this institution as not only a space of producing and reproducing knowledge, but also as a public good too. This is also problematic because the colonial figure is representative of the kind of curriculum being canvassed and how it is unrepresentative/exclusionary despite regime change.*

However, views held by individuals such as Khanyisa are not taken into consideration by the government; instead, the government keeps promoting heritage sites (such as the liberation routes and route 67) or erecting monuments in their communities as a way of reconciling with past injustices.

Thabo: *Do you think that heritage plays an import role in people’s lives?*
Tanya: Not for me, as I do not have a culture, unfortunately, due to being from a completely mixed heritage, but for our IsiXhosa, IsiZulu and other cultures, I have observed that the traditions are extremely important. I worry about the future generation – in that they will not continue the heritage of their culture with their children. This would be sad, as I have seen the pride that people display in their heritages and it would be disastrous to future generations if they did not learn about their heritage. Heritage creates a sense of belonging, affinity and pride.

There are contradictory views regarding heritage management and there are underlying issues regarding the erection of the monuments and memorials in the post-colony. Marginalised groups feel that the government does not consult sufficiently when mounts are being erected and that the government does not pay attention to the conditions of the surrounding community. This can be seen in the case of the Walter Sisulu Square in Johannesburg and Red Location Museum in Port Elizabeth.

4.3.1 Walter Sisulu Square, Johannesburg

Built in 2005, the Walter Sisulu Square was erected as a monument by former President Thabo Mbeki to commemorate the anniversary of the Freedom Charter\(^58\), which informed the drafting of the country’s constitution (the most progressive in the world). The multi-million rand project was erected in Kliptown, one of the poorest regions in Soweto, Johannesburg. The monument commemorates the struggle against apartheid and the advent of democracy. It is located right in the face of a shantytown – “The roads are rutted and muddy. Communal latrines stand useless, their doors open and rubbish piled inside. Next to them on the uneven ground wobbles a portable toilet, its door padlocked against vandals. A sludgy stream trickles past, fouled by children unable to find the key in time”\(^59\) (The Economist, 2012).


In Kliptown, many community members do not have proper housing; they are living in shacks without proper sanitation. While some people struggle to survive, the monument directly faces the community – reminding them that they have been forgotten. According to figures released in 2015, the monument does not attract people to come view it\(^\text{60}\). People around the area hardly visit the monument, because they feel that it does not speak to their daily lives and lived experiences. The visitors’ site of the monument site has running water, electricity and flushing toilets, while the community a few meters away does not have electricity or running water, and continue to use long drops – a legacy of apartheid. To them the monument is not worth celebrating, because it reminds them of the past and contains facilities that are still foreign to them (i.e. flushing toilets).

### 4.3.2 Red Location Museum, Port Elizabeth

The next example, closer to the research site of Govan Mbeki Avenue, is the Red Location Museum\(^\text{61}\), the multi-million rand museum built in New Brighton, an under-resourced area in Port Elizabeth. The museum built as a reminder of the struggle against apartheid \(^\text{62}\) (The Herald, 2014) is fenced in, separating itself from the community around it, while they continue to live in an impoverished area. The road leading up to the museum is smoothly paved, unlike the streets in the community that are covered in litter, makeshift rubbish dumps and potholes. The monument was built in a manner that allows people to interact with local struggle heroes’ memories and internalise it\(^\text{63}\) (South African Broadcasting Corporation, 2016), but it fails to connect with and speak to the community’s lived experiences. The museum uses memory boxes containing memories written by apartheid activists to remind the community of their past. However, this internationally renowned museum was closed down by the community two years ago (in October 2013). The community closed down the museum because the municipality did not deliver on their promise to build RDP houses for them.

---


\(^{61}\) Although not specifically located on Govan Mbeki Avenue, the Red Location Museum still plays an important part in Port Elizabeth’s postcolonial heritage narrative.


The museum has been closed since then and all attempts to reopen it have been met with resistance from the community.

Based on the above, it seems that people see heritage as a tool they can use to leverage against the government. Communities use the destruction of heritage to attract the government’s attention, so that the government would listen to their demands and deliver on the promises it had made when South Africa became a democracy. However, the biggest problem with this approach is that many people forget that heritage management in the Eastern Cape, especially in Port Elizabeth, remains underfunded and their destruction of heritage is not necessarily the best way to attract the government’s attention. Likened to the central space of the *ubuhlanti*, heritage takes on different meanings at different times depending on the time and context the community finds itself in. Sometimes, it is used as a place of remembrance and on some days, it is held hostage in an attempt to force the government’s hand, which is not always successful.

4.4 Inclusion and exclusion
It is around the idea of belonging that people group themselves into different communities, which are a “source of collective identity, [which is] a powerful everyday notion by which people organise their lives, understand their localities and settlements and the quality of their social relationships” (Jenkins, 1996:195). It is around certain ideas that people create in and out groups. In Port Elizabeth, one can read the current in group as those who were previously marginalised by the previous government and the out group as the foreign, which is perceived as a threat to the localisation of the country’s landscapes. Access to in group is guarded and only those who are similar to the people in the in group will have access to it. Harvey (1998) states that access to certain parts of the city (societal resources) is often guarded and measures are put in place to exclude those who do not belong, in this case – the foreign. The next section of this chapter will discuss how heritage is used by locals to exclude certain people from particular heritage spaces.

*Thabo:* Do you think that heritages can become exclusionary?
*Tanya:* Definitely – whenever someone is not part of something, it immediately becomes exclusionary. Not understanding the languages, traditions and
ways of a heritage can be frustrating. I feel that our school system should concentrate more on this. It is difficult in South Africa, however, as there are so many different heritages. In Europe it is very simple – the Irish are the Irish and have one history and heritage – the Vikings have one heritage. In SA we tend to have over seven heritages. To give a simple example – the colonial heritage is completely different from the IsiXhosa heritage. Christmas, birthdays, funerals and weddings are all celebrated differently. Who wouldn’t feel excluded when you observe people celebrating in a totally different way to your own tradition or heritage?

Zodwa: Yes. That is how apartheid came about. That is where Afrikaner racism and discrimination came from. People believed that their way of doing things was way better than how other people did them. Their strong beliefs made it hard for them to see past their own and to include others. And that is how black culture was inferior to white culture, black cultural practices were regarded as uncivilized, etc… I think that it could be…

Public heritages and landscapes are often politicised and it is mostly the dominant group that lays claim to them. Notions of belonging are based on affiliation with the dominant group. They create a monopoly of the heritage landscape privileging in group communities at the top of the social hierarchy, followed by those associated with the in group that have a higher social standing in the community. It is those who were formerly privileged who seek to maintain control over the heritage landscape, because they succeeded in retaining social capital after transition into democracy. Due to their political standing during apartheid, they succeeded in immobilising marginalised people, preventing them from gaining access to the ubuhlanti (its social, economic and political capital) and subjecting them to further exploitation (Harvey, 2008; Foucault, 1982).

However, this situation is changing slowly as those who were marginalised previously are increasingly finding alternative ways to claim and deconstruct the hegemonic societal structures that exist and alter the heritage landscape as it currently stands. A discussion of two Victorian era heritage sites located on Govan Mbeki Avenue and Cape Road – one a monument and the other a memorial – will be discussed.
4.4.1 Statue of Queen Victoria

The statue of Queen Victoria was erected and unveiled on 30 September 1903 in celebration of the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee 64 (City of Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan, 2016). At that time, the Cape Colony (of which Port Elizabeth formed part) was considered a territory of the United Kingdom, and Queen Victoria was the longest reigning monarch in the history of the United Kingdom. As a gesture to the queen, the citizens of Port Elizabeth, mostly those of settler heritage, raised funds and commissioned E Roscoe Mullins, a renowned sculptor in London, to create a Sicilian marble statue of the queen. 65 The statue depicted Queen Victoria holding the Sovereign’s Orb and sceptre, indicating that she was the “one and only true ruler” of the United Kingdom and other realms over which she governed. The statue is located across from Vuyisile Mini Square.

She stands in front of the library, facing the sea; however, this is no longer the case because the statue was vandalised a few weeks ago. People vandalised the statue by throwing green paint all over it. So, as a way of protecting the statue from further damage it was covered with a silver-grey plastic that would prevent it from damage. By covering the statue, it prevented the statue from standing in public and speaking, or rather, being a demonstration of what was happening in the country at the moment, which was the mass vandalism of colonial monument and memorials that was occurring.

---

64 “Statue of Queen Victoria – City of Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan”

65 “Discover Port Elizabeth”
This action (covering the statue) denied the statue the opportunity to occupy the public space that it would normally occupy and it could no longer watch over Settler Clock, the harbour. It could no longer welcome ships that came in its direction or anyone that walked towards Market Square. It was covered with a grey plastic-like material tied down with thick ropes, with green splats of paint around it on the ground. She (Queen Victoria) stood there in isolation with no one looking at her. She was in some kind of solitary confinement and this in turn led to her becoming irrelevant, non-existent, standing there in silence, with no one even paying attention.
After sitting on the bench for some time after the old man had left, a young black woman walked past me with an elderly black woman. The young woman then turned to the elderly woman.

Young women: I think that this building is cool (referring to the city hall).

The elderly women commented and the young woman responded
Young women: The statue was fine when it was covered.
I assumed that the elderly black woman’s comment was about the statue of Queen Victoria being covered.

When conducting heritage studies, one is always bound to encounter heritages that have negative stereotypes attached to them (Chadha, 2006) for one group of people and a positive view for others. There are always diverse views to heritage, but we need to study heritage within its context. However, there are those, such as Sizwe, who holds that we cannot do this.

Sizwe: …single-handedly achieve transformation, nor is it a substantive move in order to do so. However, I believe the transformation process in South Africa is one that may require symbolic moves such as destroying or, at the very least, removing colonial heritages. This, in particular, is because of how deeply entrenched the remnants of colonialism and oppression are, and how vividly they are still manifest in every-day society. To remove the statues is merely a step towards transformation, but an important one.

Ambivalent heritages such as the statue of Queen Victoria occupy prominent spaces in the post-colony where they do not belong and they are not wanted. In South Africa, Victorian era and apartheid heritages occupy such spaces. Monuments such as Queen Victoria’s statue and the Horse Memorial occupy spaces where they serve as a reminder of the pain of individuals who were marginalised. According to Chadha (2006:348), these heritages are ambivalent in the sense that they occupy spaces of “conflicting emotions and indeterminate meaning”.

Drawing on research on a ‘colonial’ cemetery in India, Chadha (2006) studied Park Street Cemetery in Calcutta, India. This area serves as a cemetery and monument for
the colonial officers who died in the country. The monument is not maintained by the present government and has fallen into a state of disrepair. However, it has not been demolished to make way for housing projects in an already overcrowded city. The heritage site, left to crumble and disintegrate, is now inhabited by drug addicts and has become a site for criminals to hang out. As a result of this, the space has lost its previous meaning and is left to serve as a reminder of the past.

By not explicitly preserving the heritage site, the government indicates its desire not to be associated with the colonial heritage. On the other hand, by not demolishing it, the government acknowledges its importance. Despite the public space that the monument occupies people ignore it, but there are people who pay attention to it and question its presence and the power it commands in the city, because it still has not been moved or demolished.

4.4.2 Horse Memorial

The second heritage site, the Horse Memorial, stands on a green patch of grass situated on the corner of Russell Road and Cape Road, Central Port Elizabeth. Erected after the South African War (1899 – 1902) the memorial is dedicated to a countless number of horses that died from fatigue and starvation during the war. The statue depicts a man kneeling on one knee in front of a horse holding a bucket, feeding the horse as a reward of its bravery in battle. However, it also celebrates the triumph of the English over everyone else in the country.

The inscription on a large piece of rock on the memorial reads, “The greatness of a nation consists not so much in the number of its people or the extent of its territory as in the extent and justice of its compassion”. Because the memorial is dedicated to the horses (and other animals), a drinking basin forms part of the memorial. It was envisioned that it would provide drinking water for passing animals, given that the city relied on horses as a means of transport when the memorial was built; ironically, the water was never connected. This memorial has been standing in the same area for a century.
On 6 April 2015, a group of 30 men dressed in red shirts, pants and overalls jumped over the spiked fence of this memorial. They toppled the kneeling solider from the platform. The individuals who vandalised the memorial were part of the Economic Freedom Fighters (EFF), a political party that advocates for radical economic and social transformation. They maintain that the ANC-led government needs to remove all Victorian era monuments and memorials from the country’s landscape as part of the drive to localise the heritage landscape. The organisation maintains that by keeping Victorian, Edwardian and apartheid heritage and monuments, the ANC-led government continues to traumatising marginalised people who still experience the effects of apartheid, because they are constantly subjected to mental violence when they encounter the ‘colonial’ heritages on a daily basis. Therefore, in response and in order to break the chain of violence, they toppled monuments in an attempt to dominate symbolically over the heritages. One could argue that their actions could be read as a public performance and they were symbolically reclaiming their power in post-colonial South Africa – gaining some recognition in the new democratic dispensation.

However, not everyone viewed their actions in the same light. Responding to this action, the Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality’s Director of Communication, Roland Williams, remarked, “This is ridiculous and unacceptable and will not be tolerated under any circumstances. The perpetrators must and will face the

---

full force of the law. To that end we have been in contact with the SAPS to make sure that they are brought to book because we cannot allow hooliganism and anarchy to continue for cheap political mileage"68 (Roland Williams, 2015 cited in *The Herald*). On the other hand, Khanyisa, one of the research participants, held a different view of this matter.

**Thabo:** Do you think that we need to remove all colonial heritages from the South African landscape in order to indigenize it?

**Khanyisa:** I don’t think we have to remove all of them; we rather have to address the institutional memory we allocate to these figures. Much like violence, South Africa has not entirely addressed the reason why we continuously resort to extreme violence, erasure or ongoing protest action for real changes to be made. The state’s responses to serious structural challenges on socio-economic levels create even more resentment towards colonial heritage statues, particularly with regard to dispossession and issues around land reform.

In response to Williams’ remarks, the Deputy Chairperson of the EFF in the Nelson Mandela Bay Region, Bo Madwara, stated that, “The toppling of colonial statues is part of the EFF’s signal, which indicates rejection of the economic system that has been imposed on us by foreigner settlers”69 (Madwara, 2015 cited in *The Herald*). Madwara also stated “As the EFF, we will be doing the government a favour. In our next contact with a statue or monument, we are going to load it onto a bakkie and go unload it into the sea”70 (Madwara, 2015 cited in News24).

Prior to the vandalising of the memorial, it held meaning and value to some people. The statue was often ignored by the motorists driving past on a daily basis and by


students from the Port Elizabeth College, which is situated directly across the memorial. Many people regarded this memorial as an irrelevant relic from the distant past, which served as a place where homeless people lived and received food from volunteers in the evenings.

In Port Elizabeth, Victorian era memorials such as Vuyisile Mini Square and other heritage sites such as Fort Fredrick, serve as shelters for homeless people, not because of their historical value, but because the people are safer in these spaces due to the lighting and security the municipality provides for the heritage sites. The latter an action the EFF is against.

“The hundreds of thousands of rands wasted on the process aimed at putting back a colonial soldier in a public space, should rather be used for activities that could restore the dignity of the previously disadvantaged,” (Madwara, 2015 cited in Spies, 2015)

However, unlike Madwara (2015), Zodwa feels as follows:

_Thabo: Do you think that we need to remove all colonial heritages from the South African landscape in order to indigenize it?_

_Zodwa: No. We might not like how they brought about their heritage but there are some things that are helpful with everyday life. We cannot go back to living in caves and hunting meat to cook it with fire. I do think though that, as natives, we should not rely so much on it that we fail to realise that we can improve on it or that we can invent something better. I think it also does not mean that we have to stop fighting for transformation in different institutions and spaces because we are still discriminated against and that needs to change._

Part of the reason for people targeting heritage sites during protests is because they feel that heritage sites are valued more than poor people in Port Elizabeth. Homeless

---

71 A soup kitchen was also set up for homeless people by a group of volunteers every day from 7 pm.

people are only attracted to heritage sites because they feel that these sites have more security than them as citizens. This became evident in another event:

On Govan Mbeki Avenue North (where the heritage sites are), the streets are not as congested and overcrowded as on Govan Mbeki Avenue South, they are peaceful and calm, and there is no hooting or loud music playing on this side of the street. The pavements and walkways are meters wider and there are formal trading units on this side of town, unlike on the other side where people occupy the narrow floors of the pavements to sell their products.

The breeze on this side of the street is fresh and crisp with no lingering urine odour to nauseate people; there is a fair distribution of white, black, coloured and foreign nationals on this side of the street. There are benches on this side, which give people the opportunity to sit down and converse, unlike the other side where the people have to occupy whatever little space they can find to congregate with other people and have a discussion.

There is a homeless man that often occupies the benches of Market Square, getting dirty looks from or being chased away by the security guards in from City Hall. I noticed that, throughout the day on Govan Mbeki Avenue North, he would walk from one side of the street to the other, but never crossing over to Govan Mbeki South. He would politely ask for food from people walking past and when people said that they did not have money or they said no, he would politely thank them and move on to the next person. He caught my attention in the morning and I did not know how to approach him. In the afternoon, he was again present in the outer space near Market Square.

I approached him to ask asked him how he was experiencing the space, but before I could do that, he stood up and approached another white man. He asked the man if he had paper for him to roll a cigarette. Without hesitation, the man reached for his pockets and handed him the paper. Based on the outward appearance of the second man he seemed like he was poor – from the working class. His face looked aged and exposed to the elements and his clothes were old and faded. After receiving the paper, the homeless man invited him to sit down next to him.
The homeless man then started rolling the cigarette and the other man hovered around for a while without speaking to him. After a few minutes, he decided to leave and the homeless man was left alone to smoke his cigarette.

After observing all of this, I decided that I was finally going to have a conversation with the homeless man. I had not eaten at all so I decided that I would go to KFC and buy something for both of us to eat. When I returned from KFC, the homeless man was still seated in the same place. I walked towards him and asked if I could sit next to him, to which he agreed.

I sat down next to him, took the food out of my backpack and asked him if he would mind me joining him for a meal. He looked up at me, invited me to sit closer and asked me why I was doing this. To be honest; I wanted to speak him, but it also felt good to make someone’s day. I responded by telling him that I felt like doing it and then he smiled at me and asked me if it was God that spoke to me and told that he was hungry.

Homeless man: What is your name?
Thabo: Thabo and yours?
Homeless man: Anthony.

Anthony was a homeless man in Port Elizabeth. He was on a mission to make his second trip to Cape Town on foot. He was originally from Pretoria, South Africa’s capital located in Gauteng, about 1200 km away from where he currently is. He was making his way to Cape Town to collect a leather jacket, leather pants and an old bible that God told him he had to go and collect in Cape Town.

Anthony: while he was in Pretoria God spoke to me and told me to walk to Cape Town.
Thabo: Walk to Cape Town? That is like 1100 km away.
Anthony: I am used to it. The last time I travelled to Cape Town in took me 18 days, walking and hitchhiking.
Thabo: How long have you been in Port Elizabeth for?
Anthony: Close to one month because God told me to wait here for a bit.
Thabo:  Do you have any family?

Anthony: Yes, I have a sister that lives in Umtata and my mother. But I don’t talk to my mother because she married someone that my sister and I don’t like. My father passed a long time ago.

Anthony in his 40s briefly reflected on his career – he mentioned that he used to be a barber and that he used to own a shop in Pretoria but that did not work out. He then told me that he used to use his skills to make money by cutting people’s hair at the different petrol stations that he would come across as he travelled; however, that is no longer the case because he was robbed the last time that he was in Cape Town and now he cannot generate an income for himself.

I then asked him about how he was finding the space and he told me that it was fine; he told me that it was better than East London, but he did not want to elaborate on that.

Thabo:  So, where do you stay in Port Elizabeth?

Anthony: I used to sleep by the gardens by the fort (Fort Fredrick – another heritage site), there are a lot of homeless people there, but it’s cold now. So I have moved to the beach, I sleep in the Dunes by the beach where I can use fire to keep me warm. There is nowhere else for me to go.

The dirty looks that I received from people as they walked past us were very amusing. It was like people did not want us to talk to him.

Based on this interaction with Anthony, one could gather that homeless people in Port Elizabeth’s urban spaces were ostracised and treated like ‘the other’ – foreign. Individuals did not want to interact with homeless people and they very seldom assisted them. The municipality was ignoring the plight of the homeless people that lived around Vuyisile Mini Square and other heritage sites. There were no campaigns (from the municipality) to assist them. They were allowed to stay in other heritage sites such as Fort Fredrick because they were out of public sight and therefore out of mind. They did not distract the tourists, but they were moved away from the heritage sites during the day, like the immigrants who were told that they needed to stop trading in spaces close to heritage sites.
However, the same cannot be said for Victorian era heritages, because they are in plain sight when one drives in and out of the city or when ships enter the city via the harbour. If anything happens to the heritages, they are immediately protected or repaired by the municipality. This was clear when the Horse Memorial was toppled by the EFF. Within one day, the “police escorted municipal and private sector trucks [to collect and] hide the fallen colonial soldier, as part of the municipality’s commitment to restoring it back, after repairing it,” (Madwara, 2015). Within weeks after the incident, it was restored and a heritage specialist was hired by the municipality to clean the statue of Queen Victoria.

Granted, the municipality could not leave the heritage sites in a state of disrepair, because they are compelled by national legislation to safeguard it. In addition, the statue of Queen Victoria is a tourist attraction and by covering the monument, the city was losing tourists. However, the municipality’s choice to restore the heritage and not attend to pressing needs such as providing shelters for the homeless was met with disgruntlement from the locals, as they felt that the local government was choosing Victorian era heritages over them.

Twenty-two years into South Africa’s democracy, the country is faced with the need to start engaging with the different kinds of social structures that have emerged in the aftermath of apartheid. It is important to remember that societies do not simply come into existence on their own, but are produced and reproduced through the performance of certain ritualised practices of inclusion and exclusion.

South Africa is in the process of rapid transformation. Under apartheid, the notion of freedom and a future in which everyone is free to express themselves was central to keeping the liberation struggle going. People constructed an imagined future – a future in which everyone was well represented in every sphere of society, including heritage.

After South Africa became a democracy in 1994, a number of references were made to the country’s pre-settler past and the liberation struggle against apartheid. Narratives and memories from these periods were called upon and used in constructing and fostering a new national identity in post-apartheid South Africa.
This unity was fostered at the expense of those who were not part of this history. Those who were not part of the liberation struggle are now constructed as ‘the other’; a sense of amnesia that seeks to limit the country’s heritage to a selective period. Victorian era heritages and monuments are now seen as the foreign because they are not part of the post-colony’s narrative.

People are starting to vandalise and remove monuments from public spaces across the country in an attempt to localise the country’s heritage landscape. Those who were formerly marginalised and denied the right to the city are now beginning to claim the space for ubuhlanti. In the post-colony, marginalised people are beginning to lay claim to urban spaces that are located on land and spaces they were dispossessed of in 1913. However, the land and space they find themselves in now are different; it has been morphed into a foreign space, a ‘colony’ that has been altered to resemble the motherland.

Marginalised individuals who are entering urban spaces are encountering and questioning ‘colonial’ spaces. They are engaging with the credence of the colonial nature of space, acknowledging the unforgettable history of colonisation and settlement, and acknowledging that the space belongs to various people to begin with. While laying claim to this space, they are beginning to question the increasing visibility of ‘foreign’ heritages and other individuals perceived as foreign. In addition to this, people are increasingly vandalising heritages because they still occupy prominent public spaces that marginalise the people. They continue to pay homage to themselves. In a way, their existence is narcissistic, because they constantly want to be preserved, looked after and maintained. In as much as there have been discussions around the construction of counter-monuments and creating counter-narratives in Port Elizabeth (i.e. the statue of Nelson Mandela) little has materialised.

As such, marginalised people are finding it increasingly difficult to encounter ‘colonial’ monuments and memorials in the post-colony. They would much rather alter the heritage landscape in an attempt to localise it in order to make it representative of the majority of the population. It is also about the political and symbolic domination of the
former ‘colony’ and empowerment of the marginalised people. This idea will be discussed further in this thesis.

In conclusion, by defacing, painting or breaking down colonial monuments and memorials the people in Port Elizabeth are not committing criminal actions as stated by the country’s heritage legislation; they are merely attempting to localise the country’s heritage landscape so that it can be reflective of their heritage and their attempt to gain recognition and make the country’s heritage landscape more representative of everyone.
CHAPTER FIVE
THE MARKET AREA - TEMPORARY HERITAGE AND POLITICAL EXPRESSIONS (XENOPHOBIA AND VIOLENCE)

5.1 Introduction
In this chapter, concepts such as heritage, citizenship, belonging, inclusion and exclusion are discussed in relation to how immigrants on Govan Mbeki Avenue and surrounding areas construct their identity, while attempting to create a sense of belonging in the South Africa heritage landscape.

With South Africa becoming increasingly globalised and participating in the global economic market, there has been a significant increase in the number of migrants moving from the Southern African Development Community Region, East and West Africa, the Indian sub-continent and China to South Africa in search of opportunities, including education, healthcare, employment and political stability.

5.2 Contextualising New Brighton
One afternoon, Khanyisa and I went to New Brighton to conduct interviews. The aim of these interviews was to compare notes on how locals interacted with foreign nationals in the township compared to how they interact with them in the city centre. Loyiso had arranged interviews with the ward councillor and a Nigerian barber called Buddha. Buddha did not like foreign nationals and made this extremely clear. He is an alcoholic who collects scrap metal and sells it for alcohol money.

New Brighton, originally established in 1902, was the first ‘black’ residential area in Port Elizabeth. It was here that the first cell of Umkonto we Sizwe (spear of the nation), the armed wing of the ANC, was established. When entering the township of New Brighton, the first thing you see is a large power station in the middle of the township, which seemed to be one of the many abandoned or unused power stations in different areas around Port Elizabeth. A man was selling meat on the sidewalk and women selling cooked mealie meal seemed to be nothing strange. Police cars were driving recklessly on the narrow roads.
5.3 Unpacking Xenophobia in New Brighton – Conflicting interests and dynamics

This section of the chapter contains an interview transcript discussing a xenophobic incident that had occurred in the community a few months before. The transcript is then discussed in relation to literature on xenophobia and heritage.

Thabo: My first question is something that I picked up yesterday, but it’s also something that Loyiso mentioned is an incident that happened next door, would you mind please telling me about it? Like what happened exactly?

Khwezi: Umm … I didn’t actually see the beginning of the incident, but I remember coming from this side seeing people like making a lot of noise like (ohh ohhh uhhhh) and then like ahhh and like the foreigners were like in need of help. In fact, people were divided into two groups, there were those who wanted to help these guys, but there were those who were like no they must go away these guys. But, when I asked around what was happening some other guy told me that people from this house are kicking the foreigners out and then I was like “What is the noise about?” And they were like “We want the groceries” and I was like “What?”. They were like “We want the groceries” ou ya bona, and there were like other people wanting to hit them. I was like “No, what is happening?” and they were like “You don’t know anything, wena. Move, move, move on” and there was a like a lot of rakarase as lapa ekasi. Ahh, but I didn’t stay that long and then I moved away and then I remembered that they called a meeting. Ahh, you know, I don’t think it was a councillor, … members of the community called a meeting here at the gap (asks what a gap in English is). And they were discussing the matter. Now, the guys who own that shop were there and I think two of those guys who own the other shop were there also. Just discussing what happened and the other guys said that the other guys were not legally fit to be in South Africa. Only to find out that these guys were fit to be there and then there was a bit of jealousies between the two foreigners; they were not the same … I don’t know what they call these groups. O ya Bona, they are not at the same things, like the save ways some part of I don’t know what they call themselves, but these are not from the same group as them, see the save way people. What I thought
was that those guys were jealous because they were the only shop around, but now this one was here and then this incident happened and there was like, so the whole thing was like… The conclusion of that whole meeting was that where should those guys stay? Because they are helping the community, because most of the shops are very far so at least there is a shop around. You got old ladies around here with no kids at home so at least they can buy ahhh food nearby; and so the conclusion was like that and then the discussion was closed and then these guys moved from there.

Thabo: Okay, thanks cool. Like that helps, because it like contextualises our discussion a bit. My first question, uhm, my second question then is “Do you feel that you are part of the community or that you belong here?”

Khwezi: Ja, pretty much.

Thabo: Do you then feel that foreigner shop owners, so let’s say the people from save ways; do you feel that they feel that they also belong here? Are they made to feel part of the community?

Khwezi: Ahhh. Yes and no, because ahhh… those guys are very firm of religion you see. The Islamic religion is I don’t know it’s like you see they are a closed family so anyone who is not like them or everyone that is following other religions or ways of spirituality, to them is an outsider; no matter what you say or what you do to them. But, I think those guys they want to fit in, but not wholeheartedly. They (ahhh) … to them its business you know. To us, we are people of Ubuntu tina, we are like … ahh… we welcome everyone and we don’t care what race, colour, whatever you see. But, there are others who are like these guys; they are not like us, o ya bona. So I would not say that these guys feel they are part of the community. They actually don’t want to be part of the community in my eyes. O ya bona, they just want to carry on doing business in the community. If it was up to them they would not have personal contact with, o ya bona, people around. If business was done in like a machine, that would be very beneficial to them, but since they have to be inside the community to do this kind of business, they try to communicate. If you notice, they don’t stay long. You see the two guys that were selling here? They are no longer here anymore; there are other guys. These are not the same like the first
ones, there were the first ones and then they went away and then the second ones came, Onyoug, and they are no longer here and then these are other ones came. Which means that they are just like you see. They don’t want you to feel you are a part of the community. When they see that you are getting along with the community they change you, they change you. There must be some sort of committee that runs, like, in my mind, the whole shops. So, they are like … ahhh … it’s changing. I saw one in extension, o ya bona, and extension is way over there. He was selling here for a while. I think three months and then he moved away and now he is in, I think, extension and then I saw another one in Motherwell and then they are like moving, they are moving around. They don’t stay for long. That is why I say it’s not about, they don’t want to feel that they are part of the community they just want to run business. They want to see how the community runs so that they can control the business, they want to control the way of their business.

Thabo: Okay. So do you think, let’s say one of the migrants, a Somalian man, decides to marry a local women, do you think, how would people respond to that?

Khwezi: Ah, eyo, that would be very difficult in a way, because people are like then they are going to want to change the belief system of that particular girl, because he will then change her to his Islamic ways, whereas maybe that girl grew up in a traditional manner. We are indigenous people, moes tina, we do things in a traditional way, but that would be the, ahh a problem. Other than that, I don’t know you see, because the family, ahhh I don’t see it fit you see. Just because of that, there is going to be friction; just because of that. It’s either the girl is going to leave her family for the man or the man can like … ahh … compromise on the situation in that he can like attend like family things of the lady, but I don’t see that happening.

Thabo: Do you think that there is a xenophobic attitude towards foreigners in the community? Are there people who don’t want them, like people who just don’t want them to be here?

Khwezi: Ja, there are people who don’t want them to be here and they don’t hide it. They speak it out; they are like “I don’t want these guys here”. Some say they are taking our jobs, which I don’t get, because you know you have
got your hands and your brains. And some say like these guys are like they change our community in a way, like they change it, they change it around. You see, they change the mindset of our people; there are those who are like that in our community and there are those who are like you see. If you are nice to me I am nice to you, it doesn’t matter where you from or what you do. I am just plain. There are a lot of us who are like that, you see. We grew up in a similar way, in this community you can get in any house – it’s similar. There is uMama and uTata and you respect your elders. You, you, if you are a man, you have to be a rock of the family and if you are a women you have to make sure that the family is a one spirit, you know. In all of these houses it’s similar, maybe different in one way or another but similar, o ya bona. It’s our upbringing that makes me think that if you are nice to me then I am nice to you, you see.

Thabo: Do you then know of any immigrants or migrants that have children here in the location?

Khwezi: Ahh, ja, but they have like Nigerian children. Somalians are not in … ahh … they are not so much violent. But Nigerians they are like so eyo; those guys they are like you know. There are those who are violent and there are those who are selling. If you ask any one which foreigner is dangerous amongst those who are here, people will tell you the Nigerian guys are like dangerous.

Thabo: So there are Nigerian guys here?

Khwezi: Ja, there are Nigerian guys here, but you won’t know because they don’t spend that much time here. Some they like rent a flat here some rent houses some stay there, but they don’t stay they just sleep or check coast or whatever they do; I don’t know. But, most of their time they spend at central because there are a lot of them there. So, I think they feel like, I don’t know.

Thabo: So, these Nigerian men or women, do they have children here locally and do their children attend the local schools?

Khwezi: Ja, most of them, go to school here. They speak isiXhosa and they don’t know their Nigerian language, like they only see their father like once in three months. I know of one lady who has a son; she lives emdani. She has three children with this man, but her son does not know his father.
Like this guy, the Nigerian guy, she is so scared of him. Oh no you can’t talk about him, he brings the money. I am not going to ask him ... then I was like okay.

Thabo: So who raises the children?
Khwezi: Ahhh, but my mother is around. Every girl who is dating a Nigerian guy is like; if you ask they are scared; not so much in love. You see it's more of a fear thing that is going on.

Thabo: Do you think that, because they have that, do you think that if there was ever xenophobic attacks, do you think that is something that could fuel why people would want to kick immigrants out?
Khwezi: Ja, that would be the starting strategy, right. There it would be the one for the white man that would be the strategy.

Thabo: The migrants around here do they gain access or do they use local services like the clinic at the hospital or do they go somewhere else?
Khwezi: Ahh, they use, ja they use our clinic, because not all of them are dangerous like you know. Some of them are good people who want to uplift the community. They actually use our clinics and our hospitals and stuff. I see them around, there are good ones. I know of a couple who are married who lives in Motherwell. See, he is a Nigerian guy, but a good guy you see. He is involved very much in the community. He is trying to speak Xhosa and he says that South Africa is a better place to live. He is like a good person to be around; he does not do these bad things you know. I would say that it’s actually a personal thing; you can be a Xhosa like me, but very wrong for me. Do you get my point? It does not have to be where you stay, o ja bona, so it’s like that.

Thabo: You mentioned this Nigerian guy in Motherwell who is trying to uplift the community; how is he doing that?
Khwezi: He is a local pastor. I think he has something like a soup kitchen. He actually works here at the furniture shop. Ja, he loves children very much; he goes to school to encourage children to study and he does those sorts of things, you know. Ja, ja, he is a good guy.

Thabo: So you know my last and concluding question would then be with regard to xenophobia. Why do you think that people are xenophobic or why do
they have xenophobic mentality? Or, why do they develop a xenophobic mentality or a psychology of xenophobia?

Khwezi: I would say it’s a lack of knowledge, you see. Say in our community, we don’t even know our laws. You see most of us we don’t. I think it’s about time that we are educated you see, we can like call a meeting and educate the people about the laws of our country, the laws of the foreigners. You see, if people we educated in that sense that would eliminate xenophobia in that sense, they think like yuuhhh …. When you come here you want to take our jobs, you want to take our children and make them prostitutes. It’s the lack of knowledge around. If people were educated, you see, you don’t have to go to school, you just have to educate the black person and you would get rid of those ideas of that time. People in our local communities would have an open mind in our communities and I think xenophobic mentalities would be eliminated. That is what I think.

With the demise of apartheid in South Africa in 1994, the “advent of democracy … created new and as yet partially understood opportunities for migrants” (Vandeyar, 2011:448). With the increased flow of both internal (in relation to people who lived in rural areas and former independent homelands) and external migrants, there was constant interaction between diverse groups of people across the country. This meant that the country needed to foster a sense of belonging for all people. Different models as listed below were employed by the government in an attempt to foster social cohesion within the country (Vandeya, 2011).

1. Nation as common blood and belonging based on shared language and culture
2. Chosen citizenship that is constructed by the state rather than claimed
3. The African National Congress Model, which is rooted in the idea that the nation is anchored in an individual’s citizenship

However, one problem with the above models of citizenship is that they focus on creating belonging among individuals who already belong to South Africa and exclude individuals from outside South Africa. The biggest downfall of these models is the manner in which they view inclusion and citizenship; they do not take into
consideration where immigrants belong in South Africa’s broader rainbow nation scheme.

Instead, they continue to use and perpetuate apartheid South Africa’s conceptualisation of immigration, which considered an “immigrant [as someone that] had to assimilate in to the …population” (Crush, 2008 cited in Vandeyar, 2011). Although this was formally repealed in 1991 to ensure that African immigrants could also be considered as immigrants, the underlying notion of this was that individuals would have to either assimilate into the broader South African community or face rejection from their host society if they failed to assimilate.

With the amount of African immigrants (Harris, 2002) in South Africa increasing over the past two decades (1994 – 2014), there has been an increase in intolerance and animosity towards immigrants, which is often accompanied by a misconception which portrays foreigners as a threat to the social and economic stability of the country (Vandeyar, 2011).

Vandeyar (2011) argues that there are five possible reasons why South Africans develop a sense of animosity and xenophobic attitudes towards foreigners, as outlined in Khwezi’s interview transcript. She outlines the following explanations:

1. The Scapegoat thesis (Morris, 1998; Tshitereke, 1999): This thesis places xenophobia in the country’s social context, social transition and change. According to the scapegoat thesis, foreigners are easy targets to blame for the country’s social ills (i.e. crime, unemployment and spread of diseases) (Vandeyar, 2011).
2. The Relative Deprivation thesis (Tshitereke, 1999; Pillay, 2008). This thesis argues that the slow rates at which social and structural inequalities are being addressed in society force people to direct their frustration towards foreigners (Vandeyar, 2011).
3. The Isolation Theory (Morris, 1998): This thesis puts forward the notion that, due to apartheid South Africa’s prolonged period of isolation from the rest of Africa, citizens from beyond South Africa are seen as the unknown.
4. The Bio-cultural Theory (Harris, 2002): This thesis locates xenophobia at the level of visible difference, or otherness. This can be based on the way people look or dress (Vandeyar, 2011).

5. South African nationalism (Neocosmos, 2008) argues that the apartheid government ruralised and devalued black South Africans, while urbanising and valuing white people and aspirations to whiteness. When South Africa attained democracy in 1994, this binary shifted and South Africa(ns) were seen as urban and superior, while Africa was considered to be rural and underdeveloped, hence making them inferior.

Drawing on the above, one cannot but notice that, in South Africa, we are dealing with a combination of the above theses; hence the need for an anthropological viewpoint which seeks to provide a more nuanced perspective.

In South Africa, xenophobic actions of any kind have become “silent manifestations of broad and deeply entrenched hatred for black foreign nationals” (Vandeyar, 2011: 449 drawing on Dodson, 2010 and Matsinhe, 2011). As described in Khwezi’s interview answers, the dislike for immigrants has evolved into an avenue to violently express frustrations with the state’s inability to implement institutional and structural changes from apartheid and its relative depravation. In the same way, the destruction of heritage during service delivery protests has been used as a way of expressing frustration with the government. Xenophobic attitudes have expanded so much that they play out in public spaces, where children have been socialised into believing that African immigrants are the ‘other’ and that their collective social, political and economic isolation from public spaces is justified.

5.4   Green bushes – Xenophobic experiences at the market

_I walked into the house, into a large room without any furniture, just filled with large black plastic bags and white maize sacks piled up on top of each other. The dirty, stuffy and dusty room smelt like mould, despite the door being open. There were six white doors with huge brown dirt stains on them. All of them were locked with padlocks, except the one out of which the Xhosa woman came. The house was shared by a large group of people each with their own en-suite rooms, a shared_
living space and kitchen on each floor. In this case, what was supposed to be a living space was converted into a storeroom. After waiting in the foyer for a few minutes looking at the wormed out wooden floors, Ndana came up the stairs and invited me downstairs where Teresa and Grace lived with their families.

As I made my way down the worn out wooden stairs, Grace at the bottom of the staircase greeted me. She was seated on the couch facing the stairs, busy examining Khundai’s mouth, with Khundai bent over on her knees. Grace did not like public hospitals, because, in her opinion, “migrants were treated badly in hospitals” around Port Elizabeth. She was not the only research participants that held these sentiments. Noma and Beauty who had lived in Port Elizabeth for the past eight years, held the same views.

Thabo: Have you ever experienced any discrimination in the healthcare system here?

Both women swiftly responded by saying no. However, Noma then broke ranks and said: “The experience that you get depends on which hospital you go to and who you are! Different people have different experiences.”

Noma: I have a friend who was mistreated and shouted at by the nurses while she was busy giving birth to her baby. Then while she was still drugged and hallucinating from the medicine, she was forced to sign a document that was not explained to her. She was then discharged from the hospital and when she finally got home and sobered up, she gave the document to her husband to read. Her husband read the document and got angry. He asked her why she had signed it. Confused she asked him what the document was about and the husband told her that she could no longer have children because they tied her tubes.

They were informed that the reason behind this was that migrants were having too many children and that they were everywhere. In some hospitals, nurses and doctors mistreated migrants by tying their fallopian tubes after giving birth without their consent. It is based on such stories that Grace did not trust the public healthcare system, and opted to check her children’s health at home unless it was an emergency.
While Grace was examining Khundai, I looked around the unorganised room; everything was everywhere and there was some of Grace’s trading stock against the wall. The floors were dirty and the dishes had not been washed; but then again, this was a shared kitchen and the dishes could have belonged to anyone. As I walked towards one of the worn floral couches to sit down, Teresa walked out of one of the rooms, greeting everyone in the room and stuffed items into two large bags that were in front of the kitchen counter. I wanted to sit as far away from the kitchen as possible, as the last time I was there, there was a huge rat that ran into the kitchen. I looked at Grace and told her about the rat, but she said that they were fighting over the food. She responded with such ease, not worried or scared about the fact that a rat the size of my face had just run over the kitchen floor. She had no attachment to the house whatsoever and could not be bothered. But then, how was one expected to respond to living in such poor conditions. They could not rent any other apartment because to rent most houses in the city you needed an identity document and bank account and she did not have either of those because of her status as an immigrant, as she did not come into the country legally.

Grace: “Thabo, how are you?”
Thabo: “I am good thank you, how are you?”

We watched television for a good few minutes, not conversing at all. Teresa then stood up from the couch and went back to the bedroom, coming out with more clothes, which she continued to pack into the big bag behind the broken couch. After a few minutes of going back and forth between the lounge and the rooms, she finally came to sit down and started texting on her phone. Grace then got a call and spoke to the person on the other side in Shona. She said something to Teresa in Shona and then told me, “Thabo, help Teresa with that bag”. Teresa and I stood up from the couches, each grabbing one side of the bag, and started to drag the bag across the lounge and up the stairs.

Thabo: “What is in the bag?”
Teresa: “Clothes that we are going to sell.”
Thabo: “Why?”
Teresa: “We sell the clothes because we don’t need them, but we need the money.”
Thabo: “Who do you sell them to?”
Teresa: “We sell it to the people in Greenbushes because they are far from town and clothing shops. They buy them because we sell our clothes cheap, like R10 and R20.”

Thabo: “Okay.”

Teresa then went back in to the house, leaving me standing by the gate, while Khundai played with two children in the street. As they played one child said something in Shona to Khundai, and just as they laughed, Teresa came out of the house and Khundai tells Teresa what the other child said. Teresa got angry and started shouting at the children.

Thabo: “What’s wrong?”

Teresa: “It’s fine. They were swearing at you.”

Teresa is a strict person who did things according to a certain procedure and people were not allowed to cross any of her boundaries. After shouting at the kids, Teresa came to sit next to me as we looked down over the city, the abandoned colonial buildings and the clear blue ocean. The cold winter wind blew up the hill leaving us shivering as we waited for the taxi to arrive. As we started into the horizon, a white BMW arrived. Teresa turned to me and told me that this was the taxi that we were waiting for. We were going to travel with one of Grace’s friends.

The old white BMW pulled up in front of the house and Grace started making her way out of the house, up the wooden stairs towards the car. I looked at the car and it seemed like there would be no space for me to go with. If both Teresa and Grace were going to go with and the other women, there would be no space. Grace said that I could only come along if there was space, but it did not seem like there was going to be any space at all.

The driver, a Zimbabwean man, got out to open the boot. He tried to lift up the heavy bag that Teresa and I had carried up the stairs, but failed. In the end, Teresa helped him load the bag into the back of his car. I sat down on a rock admiring the ocean, prepared to go back home. As the driver filled the boot, he was struggling to push the one bag in and Grace shouted, “Thabo, come help, you are the man here”. I stood up and went to lend a hand. With all the bags loaded in, I tried to close the boot, but with no success. We then unpacked one of the plastic bags and
stuffed all of the items into smaller open spaces in the boot. After this, Teresa told me to get into the car so that she could put stuff on me.

Around half an hour into the journey, I realised that we were going to Addo. It was in the region of the Addo National Elephant Park. We were going to trade in the “village” centre where all the shops were located and all the farm workers were dropped off on Fridays. Today in particular was important because it was ‘pay day’ Friday.

After driving for a while on a narrow and uneven road, we arrived in Greenbush, making our way to the village centre where we would be trading for the day. There were three shops next to each other and three more shops on the other side, and a petrol station. None of the shops were clothing stores, just two grocery stores, a butchery, a bottle store and a post office. The area was dusty but surrounded by lush green vegetation, with all the houses hidden away.

The area was underdeveloped and most of the people appeared relatively poor. All of those who walked past us had dusty shoes on indicating that they had just walked a long distance to get here. No wonder Grace wanted to come sell some of her old clothes here.

We set up in an open space next to a Senegalese man who sold knock-off branded clothing and across from a group of elderly isiXhosa-speaking women selling children’s clothes (mostly baby clothes). Grace greeted the elderly woman next to us, but she refused to acknowledge her. Grace informed Teresa and me to set up our stall, but the elderly women seated next to us fervently objected, with another woman across us joining in the objection. Both women started shouting at us, telling us that we should move and we could not do that. They were saying that we were not allowed there because we were not South African.

Grace tried negotiating with the women, but they refused to listen to her. Instead, they insisted that the space was occupied and that we should move. The elderly women shouted at Grace telling her that she should move and that the space belonged to someone else. They even told her that if she did not move and
proceeded to set up they would move her when the other woman selling vegetables arrived.

Grace sat on one of the twenty litre buckets that she had brought with, ignoring the elderly women as they spoke to each other about her. She spoke to her friend in Shona, looking disappointed and drained. Hopeless that these women did not want to cooperate with her, but also that they did not understand her poverty and that she was also trying to make a living for her family. After a while of just sitting next to the elderly isiXhosa-speaking woman not knowing what to do, a Zimbabwean man walked past and Grace asked him something in Shona.

Grace was furious, but after what appeared to be a steam-blowing exercise she told Teresa and me to unpack the items and put them on display. Teresa and I laid out a large (2 x 2 m) plastic sheet on the ground. We then started unpacking the clothes, putting them on display organising them according to shirts, pants and formal shirts. As we unpacked, the elderly woman continued to object, telling Grace that she cannot do this, but Grace dismissed her. The woman then kept quiet, while the other woman took out her phone and started calling other people, one of whom was the woman they said was on her way. In an attempt to secure the space, the woman kept telling Grace to move.

It is amazing how the elderly woman and her friends were willing to threaten and verbally abuse Grace in order to protect someone else’s space. They were even willing to physically remove us from the area, because we were not South African. As the morning proceeded, one could see that the South African traders were hostile and uneasy with the fact that customers were coming to Grace’s trading stall. As customers kept coming to buy from Grace, the South Africa traders kept called them over to their stalls away from Grace and the other foreign traders that were set up here.

Two women walked up to Grace and looked at some of the shoes. One woman chose a pair of shoes but she was uncertain of the shoe size and was hesitant to buy them, so Grace tried to convince her to buy them. The woman wanted to buy the shoes but as she reached for her pocket to pay, the South African traders
shouted to the women “Don’t buy them if they are the wrong size”. The woman blocked people from buying from Grace; she would constantly plant a seed of doubt in the minds of customers.

5.5 Unpacking exclusion and the management of the ubuhlanti

With the above ethnographic transcription and other academic texts in heritage studies and xenophobia in mind, the exclusion and violence directed towards the foreign in South Africa’s urban and peri-urban spaces will now be unpacked. Xenophobia will also be discussed within the context of heritage studies. When studying xenophobic incidents, we can see that there are various factors that contribute to the “various forms of exclusion of outsiders from the urban space” (Ogunyemi, 2012:17), depending on the context and which resources are being protected.

While South African public spaces have been “de-racialized” in post-apartheid South Africa, urban spaces remain highly exclusionary to those considered to be outsiders and those who are unable to integrate into the mainstream popular culture. Exclusionary practices remain a common phenomenon among immigrants who predominantly have a “persistent feeling of not being sustained, notions of not being important and caginess” (Vandeyar, 2011:451). Most migrants participating in this study felt they were unable to develop a sense of belonging, because their existence was not validated and their lives and cultures were disregarded in public spaces. Their circumspection was drawn from nation-building practices because, in nation building, the ‘other’ has to be identified and maintained in order to create and maintain ‘in groups’.

It is against the backdrop of exclusion that foreigners (immigrants) create what is commonly referred to in the academic arena as “scapes”. Vandeyar (2011) uses the concept of ‘scapes’, drawing on Appadurai’s (1996) original conception of ‘scape’ which describes globalisation as a processes in which global cultural flows are liquid and irregular in nature (Vandeyar, 2011:452). These ‘scapes’ constitute imagined worlds. Vandeyar (2011) pays particular attention to ‘Youthscapes’, which suggests “a site that is not just geographical or temporal but social and political as well, a ‘place’ that is bound up with questions about… power in local and global contexts” (Dirlink,
It is within this context that migrants create their own spaces of belonging within these spaces of exclusion.

In post-colonial South Africa, people are increasingly contesting for spaces in urban and semi-urban areas. The increased visibility of the foreign73 in urban spaces has contributed to the increasing need to question who belongs and who does not belong. The desire to reclaim public spaces and heritages by those who were formerly marginalised in South Africa is contributing to the increased justification for the inclusion and exclusion of foreigners in urban spaces as the country embarks on a process of localisation (Ogunyemi, 2012). “The emergence of migrant communities in South Africa has not only changed the ethnic fabric of most societies” (Ogunyemi, 2012:17), but has also changed the dynamics of urban spaces. It has changed the way migrants and locals interact with each other, and has altered the heritages that people encounter in urban spaces.

In contemporary urban spaces “foreigners are viewed by citizens as potential threats to economic success, national identity and the social order and are likely to become the target of hostility, prejudice and discrimination” (Ogunyemi, 2012:17). This describes what unfolded in Green bushes and mirrors the city centre of Port Elizabeth. It is what happens during service delivery protests where heritages are held hostage as locals blame foreigners for social ills in their societies, as mentioned by Khwezi in his interview answers.

There is a disregard for the diversity that migrants contribute to our urban spaces. This view has contributed to the development of a discourse that view “migrants as outsiders because of their lack of citizenship status” (Ogunyemi, 2012:17). The inference that can be drawn from this is that locals want to rid urban spaces of foreigners (immigrants and migrants) when they attempt to localise urban spaces in post-colonial South Africa. With the country experiencing economic problems and the government failing to deliver basic services to communities, there is now increased competition for resources in communities like New Brighton and the Port Elizabeth inner city.

73 The foreign is not only based on African migrants in urban centres, but also includes colonial heritages that are also considered to be foreign and distant by the black majority.
When migrants move to South Africa and, in particular, to cities such as Port Elizabeth, they engage with the local community that has been given the power to decide who can enter the urban74 (Ogunyemi, 2012) ubuhlanti and who should be excluded from it. Local communities are bestowed with “the powers [to act as] arbitrator of rights and such power, if unchecked, can lead to ‘tyranny’ and discrimination” (Ogunyemi, 2012:20). It is within urban spaces that “community members” such as police officers and locals turn into tyrants that abuse and discriminate against migrants.

Scholars like Nyamnjoh (2005) and Landau (2004) studying similar issues show how apartheid’s policy of spatial exclusion guaranteed the distinction between ‘us’ and ‘them’. In other words, it infused mentally a distinction between the ‘haves’ and ‘have-nots’, in relation to rights and economics within the country (Ogunyemi, 2012:20). This gave rise to the idea of South Africa being urban and developed, while the rest of Africa is rural, underdeveloped and rife with poverty. Based on this, it is clear that South African heritages (public spaces) are constructed to exude the exceptionalism of South Africa and its citizens, ossifying the presence of the ‘other’, for example, the City of Johannesburg’s signage that reads “a world class African city”. These heritages embedded with messages of superiority ensure that our public spaces are specifically designed to celebrate South Africans, while subjugating the ‘other’. As such, when locals see foreigners, especially those from the African continent, they associate them with all the social ills the South African society is facing at the moment.

It is within this context that the reception of foreigners in South Africa is constantly negative, even completely hostile and xenophobic. Dodson (2002:1) argues that “South Africa is a highly xenophobic society, which out of fear of foreigners, does not naturally value the human rights of non-nationals”.

The 2008 xenophobic attacks put the country in the limelight. The Human Sciences Research Council (2008) stated that one of the most striking features of the anti-foreigners violence of May 2008 was just how unsurprising in form the violence was.
(Ogunyemi, 2012: 22). During the fieldwork for this study, it was observed that, although the xenophobic attacks were egregious in most forms, a kind of violence had already been meted out to foreigners by how our cities and urban spaces explicitly reject them and their identity and denigrate their existence.

When studying the xenophobic attacks in South Africa in 2008 and 2015 and drawing on the literature, one can argue that “the anti-immigrant sentiments are motivated by a desire to prevent ‘outsiders’ sharing in the benefits of ‘citizenship’” (Reitzes, 1995:29) and nationhood. This is because foreigners are not considered as citizens, nor are they part of the rainbow nation narrative; therefore, they cannot lay claim to any urban spaces or heritages due to their lack of citizenship and ‘struggle credentials’. As noted below:

**Thabo:** Where does the xenophobic anger come from?

**Sam:** The anger comes from poverty and high unemployment. The most think migrants are taking our jobs. Sometimes there are stories that go around that someone in New Brighton has been shot by my friend and some people are told that they should attack my friend, and this is something that were are taught at school.

When South Africa became a democracy, those who had been marginalised were promised a better life. However, this has not materialised for a large number of people who continue to experience “relative deprivation” as discussed by Pillay (2008:94). The majority of marginalised people in townships and urban areas continue to be trapped in a cycle of poverty. The “influx of foreigners, [is perceived as a threat] … to economic and social opportunities as well as the frustration of insiders [locals] not reaping the fruit if democracy” (Ogunyemi, 2012:22). It is based on this that some South Africans, especially those in contested urban spaces, are of the opinion that “though killing foreigners may not be right, South Africa must remain the domain of those who have sprung from its soil” (Landau, 2008b:106 cited in Ogunyemi, 2012:22). With the demise of the apartheid government in 1994, South Africans embarked on a quest to renew the notion of community and integration:
On two fronts... reproducing among black South Africans, the redefinition of
concepts like belonging and entitlement. [And] on the other hand, it narrowed the
insider/outsider distinction from one drawn along racial lines to discourses
constructed along autochthony and nativism (Ogunyemi, 2012:24).

It is within the discourse and contest for space, entitlement and belonging that the
xenophobic violence of 2008 broke out. However, the persistent nature of xenophobia
in South Africa can undoubtedly be explained in terms of the deepening inequality, no
development in poor areas and the state’s criminalisation of African foreigners
(Nieftagidien, 2011; Gelb, 2008) (Ogunyemi, 2012:25). This is also informed by the
“demonization of the foreigner [which] is heightened by the perception that foreigners
are a threat to a progressive social and economic life” (Ogunyemi, 2012:26).

For Madikzela (2003), the exclusion of migrants from urban spaces (or the ubublanti)
is done in order to maintain the status quo in certain spaces and to protect urban
spaces that are considered to be invaded by foreigners (Ogunyemi, 2012). It is based
on this of protecting urban spaces and heritages from invasion that “perpetrators of
human rights violations redefine morality and start believing that they can commit
systematic crime and other atrocities for the greater good” (Ogunyemi, 2012:27), as
discussed in the ethnographic texts presented at the beginning of this chapter.

However, the desire to exclude the foreign from urban spaces and to protect the
ubublanti often results in xenophobia, which is the “excessive fear or uneasiness
towards those regarded as outsiders in the community” (Ogunyemi, 2012:29). It is
often characterised by violence and the denial of the foreign of their dignity. Those
who are blinded by the illusion of reclaiming urban spaces often consider it morally
acceptable to harass, abuse or kill foreigners, all in the name of reclaiming South
Africa’s urban spaces and heritage.

In conclusion, South Africa’s urban spaces are deeply politicised and contested. South
Africans who were excluded from the county’s urban spaces during apartheid feel that
it is their right to control access to urban spaces. Thus, they feel that they can exclude
foreigners from the country’s urban spaces, because they feel that foreigners pose a
threat to the country’s new social, political and economic order.
CHAPTER SIX
DISCUSSION

6.1 Introduction

Over the past 22 years, scholars on South Africa’s ‘decolonisation’ have documented “the complexity of the imperial pasts in order not only to make visible its continuing legacies but also to indicate its possible future forms” (Loomba et al., 2005:11). Focused on the notion of history, this has highlighted the inadequacy of South Africa’s history and the misconception that history is an absolute truth about past events – a perception that has had wide-ranging consequences, particularly with regard to national history and the creation of both national and local identities.

History and heritage are both narratives of the past that undergo a process of informed ‘selection’ and ‘combination’ in the process of recording. Interpreting is always a problem when engaging with issues surrounding representation. There is a desire to combine the two in order to engage in a process of historic reassessment, writing in those who were formerly marginalised, while attempting to curve out spaces for them. However, this is rarely successful because history and heritage can never fully present the past; rather they are a representation of the past. As such, both heritage and identity “interpret history according to contemporary needs” of the time (Stolcke, 1995:2), each producing multiple interpretations, which demonstrates that the past can be used by people, particularly those in power, as an instrument in the present to shape the future (Bieber, 2002:98).

Under apartheid, the heritages of marginalised communities were intentionally undermined and excluded from public spaces. Black people were considered and treated as socially and culturally inferior. The latter led to their conquest75 and the “destabilisation and disintegration of African societies, heritage and symbols through violent colonial means” (Human Sciences Research Council, 2015:2)76.

75 This was heavily resisted by the San, Khoi – Khoi and Xhosa in the Eastern Cape.

African societies were presented as societies without any form of history or heritage. With the resettlement and defeat of the Nguni and Bantu tribes around the Eastern Cape, European settlers erected monuments and memorials, which served as cultural landscapes saturated with place meaning (Bouchenaki, 2003), while doubling up as physical dimensions within which intangible heritage is displayed and performed.

Therefore, colonialism and imperialism embedded itself into South Africa’s landscape, firstly, through violent means (i.e. war) and, secondly, through the erection and entrenchment of ‘new’ cultural and political symbols that altered the country’s heritage landscape and established a system of dominance and fear in the minds of the subjugated (Human Social Research Council, 2015)

However, in a response to a question from a member of the #FeesMustFall campaign about colonisation and its silencing of ‘indigenous’ and autochthonous people, Boswell (2016) remarked as follows:

Colonisation is never a one-way process, merely using violence to produce victims. Colonisation was and is always a mutually implicating and intersubjective process. It profoundly (and differently) ‘marks’ the coloniser and colonised. Secondly, colonisation is part of a broader, discursive reality and black people the world over have responded to it creatively, systematically and resiliently. In other words, those in power would like the ‘colonised’ to believe that colonisation is absolute, which those 'colonised' have no other reference point for their existence (Boswell, 2016).

On a similar topic, Loomba et al. (2005:1) state then when writing or commenting on events that unfolded in the past (including heritage) we should be cognisant that “histories of unsuccessful and successful colonisation… require an awareness of the struggles that define the present as it is characterised by the past” (Loomba et

---

Therefore, understanding the effects of colonisation and apartheid, itself a form of colonisation, is a complex and nuanced process, which advocates and highlights “the redemptive power of memory and personal testimony” (Comaroff, 2004:127). What Boswell (2016) and Loomba et al. (2005) highlight in their work is that colonised people did not tacitly agree to colonisation and all of its oppressive policies without responding to it. They created alternative spaces of fighting colonisation and expressing themselves. However, those who were formerly colonised should not be regarded merely as victims, because they too have the potential to colonise and oppress others (Stoller, 1995). This will be expanded on later in this chapter.

In this study, working alongside a group of locals and migrants in Port Elizabeth, I sought to understand how Victorian era heritages as well as migrants could be conceptualised as foreign (Marschall, 2015). Positioned in the field of Heritage Studies, this thesis considered how and why Victorian era and/or apartheid heritages were treated as the foreign by those who were formerly marginalised in urban spaces. Urban spaces were regarded as heritages which marginalised communities and individuals have ‘inherited’ at the end of apartheid, and as such they are protective of them, and do not want to share this newly ‘inherited’ social, cultural, political and economic capital that this heritage bestows upon them with anyone, especially immigrants.

The local research participants and people encountered during the research period in Port Elizabeth perceived foreign nationals as a threat to their access to urban resources and space. Victorian era heritages were also considered foreign because they were not representative of the local population and their heritages; therefore, they were seen as epitomising the continued structural oppression of marginalised people in Port Elizabeth and their inability to access resources that they were promised by the democratic government when they were first elected into power. However, it Victorian era or apartheid heritages and migrants being perceived as a threat is not the only problem; there is also an aspect of violence, which is constantly present in the way that locals respond to and interact with migrants and Victorian

78 They were symbolic and visual representations of colonial victories over local people.
era heritages. This violence takes the form of heritages being defaced or broken or migrants being subjected to xenophobic attacks, having their access to certain areas restricted or/and having their movement within urban heritages/ubuhlanti monitored continuously.

As such, this research explored why migrants and Victorian era heritages are feared and why they are met with violence in and around different urban areas around Govan Mbeki Avenue.

At the core of this thesis are the issues of representation of the formerly marginalised majority population and how they are attempting to carve out spaces of expression and belonging within South Africa’s urban spaces. As the field notes indicate, black people are constantly attempting to reclaim urban spaces situated on land they were dispossessed of in 1913, when the Land Act was legislated. They also indicated that the research participants and other community members are constantly in dialogue about heritages and spaces, challenging dominant representations of these heritages, meanings of the past and the ways in which these affect individuals and the broader community. In addition, the research found that representational paradigms that were used to foster a sense of nationhood and inclusivity among South Africans at the end of apartheid have simply created a singular notion of heritage that privileges Victorian era heritages, while sidelining the majority population and their understanding of heritage. As such, marginalised communities have resorted to creative ways such as protest and non-acknowledgment of heritages and spaces to reclaim spaces once occupied by dominant heritages such as Govan Mbeki Avenue, including Vuyisile Mini Square, Statue of Queen Victoria and public areas such as the one occupied by the Horse Memorial.

6.2 Using ubuhlanti to unpack the data
Using the concept of the ubuhlanti as an analytical concept to understand how notions of inclusion and exclusion functions within the city centre, the (quite obviously conservative and yet culturally embedded) concept of the ubuhlanti is elaborated on and proposed as a locally embedded framing, within which we can understand and unpack notions of belonging and exclusion. The framework is
similar to David Harvey’s (2008) *The Right to the City* proposition, which considers how capitalism seeks to exclude poor people from developed urban areas and keep them on the periphery of wealth. Based on ethnographic data and positioned within the field of heritage studies, this thesis intellectualises the locally embedded concept of *ubuhlanti*, linking it to postcolonial theory to demonstrate how heritage can be used to explain xenophobia within urban heritage spaces. As the city in Harvey (2008), *ubuhlanti* functions as both an inclusive and exclusive space; a space that can only be claimed and entered by those who possess the necessary cultural, social and economic capital. It accommodates those who have the right citizenship, but it can also be applied in a different context because it excludes those who do not have the right citizenship card. In the case of South Africa, it also excludes those who do not have the right social mobility. It is a concept that can be applied to exclusive shopping centres and residential areas (i.e. Blue Water Bay) in Port Elizabeth to which affluent people have moved in order to escape the city centre, which they consider to be a space of urban decay, a periphery for the marginalised communities and individuals to occupy.

Drawing on the reports presented in chapters three, four and five, what was revealed from the study of different heritage sites, xenophobia and access to certain spaces was that at the core of everything was the notion of representation and marginalisation. The locals such as Scelo felt that they were not well represented in their different communities and in the structures that existed within the city. Because of this and in order to gain the local government’s attention, express themselves or deal with their frustrations, locals on Govan Mbeki Avenue, Green Bushes and New Brighton would find alternative ways of expressing their frustration with their conditions of poverty, not just in terms of not gaining access to economic and social resources, but also in terms of the representation of their respective heritages in the city centre. Heritages that are supposed to represent them have still not been built or have been in the pipeline for years (i.e. the statue of Nelson Mandela). However, there is a contradiction that arises from the latter, because the locals want their own heritages erected to make their spaces more reflective of their own struggles or practices, but when there are service delivery protests, the first thing they do is destroy or threatened to destroy these heritages to get the government’s attention. For instance, the Red Location Museum, which was closed
down and, vandalised by the local community in New Brighton, because the government did not pave the roads around their homes, and had not built enough social relief housing.

From the data, a second contradiction was noted between what people say and what actually happens on Govan Mbeki Avenue North. Black local South Africans who were formerly marginalised by apartheid are fighting for representation in urban spaces in postcolonial South Africa. They are questioning the dominant presence of Victorian era heritages in urban spaces; however, these locals who are fighting for recognition and representation are the same people who are actively denying migrants the same right to representation in public spaces. This is done through their disregard of migrants and their blatant violation of immigrant rights, heritages and their denial of entrance into urban spaces.

The above highlights some of the many contradictions that exist within South Africa’s legislative framework, attempts at social cohesion and nation building. After the 2008 and 2015 xenophobic attacks across the country, President Jacob Zuma in parliamentary response remarked that it “was the responsibility of all South Africans to promote social cohesion, peaceful co-existence and good relations”79 (Zuma, 2015). The President also stated that “The police have been directed to work around the clock to protect both foreign nationals and citizens and to arrest looters and those committing acts of violence”. Ironically, in Port Elizabeth it was police officers (South African Police Service (SAPS) and a security officer from a private security company hired by the city (and managed by Scelo – see chapter five) who were responsible for arresting and expelling migrants from their trading spots on Govan Mbeki Avenue, while simultaneously soliciting bribes from immigrants; those who did not pay the bribes were threatened with deportation, because most of these migrants were not in possession of proper entry documents. It was difficult for most poor African migrants to obtain proper documents, as is highlighted below where Grace reflects on her trip from the Department of Home

Affairs in Pretoria80 (Tshwane), which is more than 1 200 kilometers away from Port Elizabeth. For the past five years, she undertook this trip every three months to check on the progress of her asylum application:

**Thabo:** How did your trip to Pretoria go? Did you get all your documents?

**Lorraine:** (Laughs) Yes it did. It was also good because my visa was extended by six months. Everyone was given six months and the Malawians were issued with permits. Zimbabweans could also check their status.

**Lorraine:** Zuma (President of South Africa) was there, so everyone was busy. I was so tired and I could not sit, because if you sit then you lose your place, but there were also no chairs to sit at all. There are no chairs for us to sit there.

**Thabo:** He did say that he was going to visit the Home Affairs in Pretoria last week in his State of the Nation Address.

**Lorraine:** Yes, everyone was helpful. You know everyone was helped on that day. Everyone got what they wanted. Things ran fast and smoothly because Zuma was there. Everyone was at work. Normally they would not be there and those there would not be helping us or there were not enough people to help. I am happy that my stay got extended by six months. Normally they give you three months and you have to come back and check your status. I am happy now because I only have to go back and check my status again in six months.

Before being issued with this six-month extension, Lorraine had to travel to Pretoria every three months to find out if her asylum application had been processed, because there is no refugee reception centre in Port Elizabeth. In the few months of fieldwork, she has travelled there four times and every time she came back empty handed. One

---

80 The Home Affairs Refugee Reception Office, which processed asylum applications in Port Elizabeth, was closed down in 2011. This meant that migrants either had to travel to Tswane, eThekwini or Cape Town to apply for South African residency or permits. This decision was then challenged by lawyers for human rights acting on behalf of migrants in the city. This resulted in the Constitutional Court (highest court in the country) ordering the Department of Home Affairs to reopen the office in 2015. However, one year later the department still has not opened the office.  
advantage she has over other people is that she has family with whom she can stay with when she is in Pretoria.

Based on the above, it is clear that we are witnessing an increased struggle for recognition and representation among locals and migrants. Local black South Africans are competing with black African migrants to gain access to, dominate and control urban and peri-urban heritage spaces. As such, the country is at a point where the following question has to be asked:

The shifting and often interrelated forms of dominance and resistance; about the constitution of colonial archives; about the search for alternative traces of social being; about the interdependent play of race and class; about the significance of gender and sexuality; about the complex forms in which subjectives are experienced and collectives mobilised, about representation itself; and about the ethnographic translation of culture (Loomba et al. 2005: 13).

Drawing on the data, one could suggest that when South Africa, a “society in which the colonisers were not the metropolitan power but a group residing in the society itself” (Johnson, 2015:2), became a democracy in 1994, the country did not sufficiently engage with and address the systematic exclusion of marginalised groups from the social, political and economic sphere and urban spaces, apartheid, which “entrench colonial and imperial symbolism through new symbols and tools of cultural dominance like statues and monuments” (Saunders & Southey, 2001:6). These spaces simultaneously operate on an exclusionary nation-building model that favoured white identity, privileging “access to resources by the white minority, which was not afforded to the ‘other’, indigenous populations of the country” (Baines, 1998:2).

Given the negotiated nature in which South Africa’s democracy was attained, there was no clear break from the exclusionary links created by the former government. As such, the exclusionary structures developed during apartheid continue to protect a few people’s economic and political interest. Ndletyana and Webb (2016) explain how, in the dying days of apartheid, the then government funnelled public finances into trusts to protect their interests in the democratic dispensation. As a result of this, heritages that are still positioned in the centre of the ubuhlanti continue to benefit from all the
resources fenced into the space, as they are well positioned at the centre of the *ubuhlanti* – the centre of power and control.\(^{81}\)

Over the past two years with the rise of movements such as #RhodesMustFall, one could suggest that we are living in an increasingly changing world, whereby those formerly and currently subjugated are moving out of the confines of the peripheries of marginalisation and into the centres of power. Those who were previously marginalised are increasingly questioning and challenging the status quo and altering the corridors of power as we know them. Young and old are increasingly chipping away at the hegemonic structures of all institutions associated with the old empire.

We are witnessing the rise of a cultural revolution. Current centres of power, public spaces and institutions of learning that privilege exclusionary heritages are being increasingly challenged in the name of social justice and transformation. However, this is only happening for a select group of people – those who have the right citizenship and the right social class (the in group), while the rest continue to be further marginalised.

Drawing on Frantz Fanon (1965:1) who remarks that it is only “in the revolutionary struggle, [that the immensely], oppressed masses of the colonies and semi-colonies feel that that they are part of life for the first time”. What Fanon (1965) means by this is that it is only when exclusionary and oppressive spaces (both public and private) are transformed, that subaltern communities and individuals will feel and embrace their newly claimed power in the new political dispensation. Drawing on this they construct and express their respective identities in spaces that formerly excluded them.

Nelson Mandela Bay, particularly Port Elizabeth, finds itself in a peculiar moment concerning its institutions of higher education, heritage and public spaces. It is experiencing what Mbembe, Fanon and Hooks refer to as the post-colonial moment, in this case it is in the midst of a post-colonial, post-apartheid moment that the South

\(^{81}\) A sacred tree is planted at the centre of the *ubuhlanti*. It is here where the ancestors live and it is believed to the centre of power because the ancestors are located here.
African have never experienced in 1994. The 2015 and 2016 #FeesMustFall and #RhodesMustFall moments are expressions of not only a significant moment for the post-colony, but also of a moment that not only changed the fabric of the country’s higher education sector, but also that of the arts, cultural and heritage sectors, respectively. It was a moment that called on the city of Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Bay to dig deep and question the messages they were presenting to the general public through their exhibitions and protection of heritages.

Writing on a similar matter, Fanon (1965:1) helps unpack the latter by stating that it is only once the formerly marginalised people accrue a sense of belonging in our public institutions and public spaces that “life acquires a sense, a transcendence, an object: to end exploitation, to govern themselves, to construct a way of life”. Fanon further states that

Liberation does not come as a gift from anybody; it is seized by the masses with their own hands. And by seizing it they themselves are transformed; confidence in their own strength soars, and they turn their energy and experience to the task of building, governing, and deciding their own lives themselves (Fanon, 1965:2).

It then becomes important to examine the role of heritage in creating spaces of inclusion and exclusion within the ubuhlanti. Heritage is a manifestation of selected memories – memories constructed through a process of selective remembering and in other cases, selective forgetting. This process tends to be exclusionary, because one needs to ask whose memory or memorialisation of the past are we privileging? Whose heritage do we prize when we leave particular heritages intact in public spaces?

As noted earlier, heritage, especially on Govan Mbeki Avenue North, much like spirituality, is the personal property of the individual (Smith, 2006). Heritages are dualistic in the sense that it can be both individualistic, resonating only with a particular person, and communal, applying appealing to broader frameworks such as nation building as an inclusive and representative concept of social customs, belief systems and knowledge systems (Jopela, 2011). However, it is within this broader frame that certain individuals and communities might feel sidelined and underrepresented in the
nation state heritages, which are often reflective of the social elite, thus perpetuating dominant cultural heritages and marginalising lesser heritages.

Ashworth et al., (2007) understand heritage as multiple knowledge systems that can be used by individuals as both a cultural product and a political resource. They claim that heritage plays a crucial socio-political function, used to imagine exclusive communities, which in turn can either dominate or lay claim to particular landscapes or spaces of social, economic or political value. An example of this is the situation unfolding in Green Bushes and on Govan Mbeki Avenue.

In post-apartheid South Africa, subjugated communities continue to see heritage as an instrument of empowerment and representation. The erection of liberation monuments, memorials, museums and liberation trails functions as a mechanism of honouring and preserving their cultural belief and memory, and is seen as an avenue through which their neglected stories and memories can be authenticated (Marschall, 2009). When preserving or erecting commemorative monuments in post-apartheid South Africa, a number of inconsistencies come to the fore. One such case is the erection of Route 67 by the City of Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan in an attempt to balance out the exclusionary narrative presented by Victorian era heritages on Govan Mbeki Avenue. The route does highlight South Africa’s transition into a democracy, but it fails to acknowledge the role that earlier generations in the form of the Khoi-Khoi, San and isiXhosa-speaking people played in their resistance of colonisation over 200 years ago. Instead, it promotes partisan notions of liberation heritages and nation building that focus on narrow interpretations of liberation struggles and heritages that put the governing party (African National Congress) in the spotlight, at the expense of other liberation struggles and the role that other African countries played in the struggle against apartheid.

Twenty-two years into democracy, the South African government’s desire to redress the social and political inequalities of the past through its contemporary memory-making process and to transform and localise the country’s post-colonial, post-apartheid heritage landscape by way of constructing monuments, is considered to be representative of marginalised societies who are the main interpreters, supposed
benefactors and main consumers of contemporary heritage monuments (Marschall, 2012).

Marschall (2012) indicates that the heritage framework used from 1994 until 2012 did not create a space conducive to effective transformation of heritage. Furthermore, the structures that had already been in place were not well equipped to deal with the preservation of intangible heritage as it currently stands, instead all they did was perpetuate essentialist notions of eternalising memory though the erection of monumental monstrosities.

In defining themselves or in an attempt to gain access to social, economic or political resources available to the community; individuals call upon their affinity with a particular place or past in an attempt to legitimise their claim to those resources made available to them by the community or by the state (Ashworth et al., 2007; Marschall, 2012).

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2003) argues that heritage is symbolic capital, used by those in power to legitimise their claim to power, but to also legitimise and maintain the prevalent social hierarchy. The erection of monuments and memorials used this principle to “instil new cultural roots that fostered imperialism – to entrench political dominance and subjugation colonial dominance and subjugation [and] imposed new symbols on the indigenous landscape, [through] the construction... military forts which were symbols of colonial” (Human Sciences Research Council, 2015:82) power and domination.

Throughout this thesis, an attempt was made to question and understand how locals in Port Elizabeth, interpret and understand present heritages in urban contexts. Does the erection of new symbols in postcolonial South Africa do enough to create representative heritages and spaces?

Based on the data presented in chapters three, four and five, I wish to argue that heritages and apartheid histories were prevalent and dominant during periods of segregation. Apartheid heritages were privileged over local marginalised heritages. These already dominant heritages were used as symbols of domination and subjected local heritages. As such, when South Africa became a democracy, the former was never questioned\textsuperscript{83}. Victorian era and apartheid heritages were simply incorporated into the country’s new collection of rainbow heritages. However, this was problematic given that these heritages still continued to occupy dominant spaces and marginalised groups are beginning to question this. It is through their non-acknowledgment of these ambivalent heritages or their destruction that local people in Port Elizabeth are attempting to transform the city’s heritage landscape; in a way, they are attempting to even out the heritage landscape. However, the two are not mutually exclusive; they are in fact interlinked.

We are at a point in history where a particular section of those formerly subjugated is starting to question their lack of representation. They are no longer calling upon the government to erect monuments to transform their context, but they are doing it themselves. They are actively exercising their agency by going to ambivalent heritages and questioning them themselves. They are actively questioning why we still embrace ambivalent symbols. Heritages that actively seek to exclude them from their newly claimed spaces are reminders of their enslavement, imperialism and their continued structural oppression. This results in their desire to secure the very little resources they now have access to in the democratic dispensation.

According to some of research participants, ambivalent monuments and memorials do not add value to social cohesion and should therefore be removed. On the other hand, some felt that ambivalent heritages should be left either as they are or should become museums in order to serve as educational resources and reminders for future generations. However, the biggest problem with the latter suggestion about moving ambivalent heritages into museums is that due to a lack of skilled staff, funding and transformation, the majority of museums continue to function as untransformed

\textsuperscript{83} This could have also been as a result of the reconciliation model that the country adopted in 1994, as a way of avoiding the impending civil war at the time.
institutions, which suppress the culture of the majority population that are removed from the broader social contexts of their communities. They remain institutions that perpetuate “Eurocentric psychological orientation” (Human Social Research Council, 2015:4) and they themselves still present local Bantu and Nguni heritages as stagnant, non-transformative and backwards.

As South Africans, we continue to embrace ambivalent “statues and monuments because we are persuaded by the South African Constitution that advocates that we need to respect them” (Human Social Research Council, 2015:5). The Constitution also advocates for the development of other heritages; however, as highlighted in chapter four, not enough money is allocated to Provincial Heritage Resource Agencies in order to perform this vital task of developing and promoting Nguni and Bantu heritages within the provinces. The other issue is that heritage always takes the back seat to service delivery as highlighted by Gauteng’s MEC of Sports, Arts and Culture’s budget speech and in the Eastern Cape’s MEC of Arts, Culture and Sports’ response to the Eastern Cape Provincial Legislature highlighting the budgetary constraints of the Provincial Heritage Resources Agency.

The latter prevents people from realising the relevance of history, heritage and its ability to unite people in a shared sense of heritage and past (Hudson, 2003:16), which would only be possible if there was a proper engagement and well-funded heritage resource agencies to attend to the transformation of the country’s heritage landscape.

At the end of apartheid, South Africa provoked people to seize history for themselves as a means of individual freedom and national redemption (Loomba et al. 2005: 17). However, the government was not cognisant of the fact that the memories evoked by individuals to validate their claim to resources are imaginary, but are still real in their experience of heritage. Despite their fictional nature, they constituted a powerful part of social practices used by individuals to transform their surrounding spaces, in order to gain access to cultural and economic domains that would grant them social mobility (Ashworth et al., 2007).

This is the new aspect that we are experiencing in Port Elizabeth because there is not a fully functional Provincial Heritage Resources Agency in the province to promote the
development of heritage and to inform people how to properly cultivate the heritage as a social, economic and political resources.

Port Elizabeth is now faced with the situation whereby locals whom have recently inhered and/or claimed urban areas as a heritage resource from which they can draw social and economic benefits; they are very selective and hawkishly policing who they allow in the space. It is also faced with the situation whereby African migrants are starting to move into urban areas in search of economic opportunities. However, they are met with hostility and violence from the side of locals who do not want to dispose of their newly acquired resource.

Heritage, which is supposed to “heal the divisions of the past and establish a society based on democratic values, social justice and the fundamental rights that the South African constitution advocates for” (Human Social Research Council, 2015:5), is not being used for that purpose in Port Elizabeth; instead locals are clinging onto their newly acquired urban heritages, because they do not want to lose this resource and be relegated back to the margins from which they are trying to escape.

South Africa, including locals in Port Elizabeth, needs to challenge the ideological and state-driven, post-apartheid master narrative that advocates for social cohesion and belonging, while promoting the exclusion of others. The state advocates for rights for all and social cohesion among those in the country, but yet, through its arm of local government, it uses force in the form of a private security firm and the South African Police Service to harass migrants and remove them from trading on Govan Mbeki Avenue in Port Elizabeth. Because the reason given for this is that, they are a sore eye to tourists visiting self-serving and exclusionary heritages that are not representative of everyone. This contradictory approach needs to be challenged by citizens.

Remarking on the South African government after apartheid, Comaroff (2004) states that the democratic government attempted to reinvent local ‘traditions’ in order to give long-silent ancestors a voice to speak again (Comaroff, 2004:128). It is thought to be a process of selective remembering that memories are selectively chosen by the social and political elite, because they wish to advance a political agenda. They celebrate
selective historical achievements of a particular community and are used to legitimise the exclusionary social hierarchy that exists within in particular societies. In addition, they dictate who can lay claim to the social and political capital that heritage provides (Sack, 1992).

Although heritage is concerned with the production and exchange of meaning through socially constructed ideas, it can also influence the production and consumption of social identity (Hall, 1997; Ashworth et al., 2007). They also serve distinct purposes to different people. However, we do need to question the different heritages in our urban spaces and what they stand for. We do not “need statues and monuments that do not remind them about their troubled past” (Human Social Research Council, 2015:6). However, we do need heritages “that entrench social cohesion and minimise dangerous political divides”.

Therefore, how does heritage and xenophobia come together and how can we understand them within a localised heritage framework such as the ubuhlanti? Ntuli (2015:1) states that the “the vandalism of historical monuments and... xenophobic attacks, [are] symptomatic of underlying frustration fuelled by poverty, slow transformation and unemployment” in the country. Since the advent of democracy, the ANC government have promised black people a better life and a higher living standard. However, for many this has not yet materialised. They continue to be trapped in the same structural poverty created by apartheid and they continue to be underrepresented and located on the periphery. As demonstrated in chapter five, Port Elizabeth is now at a point where marginalised groups are frustrated and they want change. People do not know how to deal with their frustration, so they attack anything they regard as a scapegoat (Harris, 2002).

Marschall (2015) states that “Xenophobia and vandalism of historical symbols are related; they are fuelled by the same source. So people take out their frustrations due to a lack of service delivery, poverty, on what’s in front of them”. How do we then understand this within the concept of the ubuhlanti?

*Ubuhlanti* is a fundamental social and economic unit. Among isiXhosa-speaking societies, *ubuhlanti* helps maintain a sense of social order and value system that is
based on ritual practices (Mtuze, 2004). The ubuhlanti itself is held to be sacred to the ancestors of the lineage; it is in the ubuhlanti that the ancestors are believed to reside. It is also believed that the ubuhlanti is the area where the ancestors visit the living to give them guidance (Opland, 1983).

Therefore, it is suggested that we need to consider the city to be an ubuhlanti as well, a space that is open to serving and providing for people. However, in order to do this, people also need to look after the ubuhlanti to ensure its continued existence. In addition to this, the ubuhlanti not only represents the people who are part of the community, but it can also be extrapolated and applied to the notion of nationhood; it is reflective of and functions as a smaller social unit within which smaller ideas of belonging are created and maintained.

The city centre like the ubuhlanti is sacred to many and needs to be well looked after. It is a space where there is a possibility of existence and interaction based on mutual respect. It is a space where the ancestors reside: ancestors who are fair and unbiased; ancestors who act as mentors, guides and protectors (Buhrmann, 1986; Hayward-Kalis, 2013). These ancestors do not exploit those in need of their assistance, instead they protect them. The ancestors in the ubuhlanti guide individuals, bestow good fortune on them, and attend to their needs. Like individuals who are alive, it is believe that the ancestors can experience “human discomforts and emotions also; such as the ability to feel cold, hungry, and thirsty or even neglected, as well as happy and well cared for” (Hayward-Kalis, 2013:73). It is a common belief that the ancestors can also become annoyed, angry and to a large extent vengeful; so when they experience the latter emotions, they stop protecting an individual from evil spirits and bring misfortune into an individual’s life if they neglect the ancestors. They will only start protecting the individual against such misfortunes again when the individual appeases them by either slaughtering a cow, brewing beer or giving them what they requested\(^{84}\).

However, the idea of the ancestors also experiencing earthly discomforts is not unique to the amaXhosa, but it can also be found amongst the Malagasy people on the highlands of Antananarivo. The Malagasy practices what they call the Famadihana

\(^{84}\) It is believed that the ancestors send messages to the living about their discomforts in dreams.
(dancing with the dead) (Boswell, 2011). The latter is a ritual whereby an individual would have a vision or dream of their ancestors telling them that they are cold or in their tomb. The individual would then be instructed to remove the ancestor's bodies from the tombs in which they are buried and rewrap them in new silk cloth (Boswell, 2011).

This ritual is performed every five to seven years or more often if the individual’s financial situation permits. During the ritual, key ancestors are disinterred, sprinkled with perfume and alcohol, danced with, spoken to, re-wrapped and buried again (Graeber 1995). Boswell (2011) and Graeber (1995) emphasise that the Famadihana continues to be a valued ritual among the Malagasy people and it serves as an indication that the past and the role of the ancestors (Lambek 2002) continue to be relevant in the lives of the living.

However, those who do not attend to the needs of their ancestors, like the AmaXhosa, are often at risk of having the ancestors bringing misfortune into the lives and their families and descendants (Boswell, 2011).

Based on the latter discussion on famadihana and literature on heritage studies by Boswell (2011), Marschall (2012), Graeber (2005) and Ashworth et al. (2007) this study argues that, as it currently stands, the urban heritage landscape is not fully open to understanding localised heritages, although great inroads have been made over the past few years. South Africa’s heritage framework is not yet fully-fledged and able to engage with the constantly changing manner in which people conceptualise heritage. As such, those formerly marginalised now see the city centre like the ubuhlanti as both a tangible and intangible item that they value and need to protect. Therefore, it becomes important for us to find alternative ways of developing alternative conceptualisations and ultimately, experiences of heritages so that we can deal with its increasingly contested nature and advance the democratisation of South Africa.
CHAPTER SEVEN
CONCLUSION

Since the demise of apartheid in 1994, marginalised South Africans have embarked on a process of recognition and reclaiming of urban spaces. Through a series of critical interactions, marginalised communities have attempted to establish a dialogue between themselves, ambivalent heritages and African nationals, particularly Zimbabweans. These dialogues take the form of engagements between locals, Zimbabwean migrants and/or ambivalent heritages, whereby all three are attempting to carve out spaces of recognition for themselves within the new democratic dispensation in Port Elizabeth.

In Port Elizabeth, locals regard migrants and ambivalent heritages as the foreign and distant other that do not belong in these newly inherited and intimate spaces. The presence of the latter on Govan Mbeki Avenue in Port Elizabeth is constantly questioned, met with hostility and extreme violence. As such, in this thesis, positioned in the field of heritage studies, heritages are treated as the foreign by those who were formerly marginalised in urban spaces. The thesis further regards urban spaces as heritages that individuals recently ‘inherited’ at the end of apartheid and they have now become protective of it and do not want to share the social, cultural, political and economic capital that this newly inhered heritage bestows on them with.

In post-colonial, post-apartheid South Africa, urban heritages meet us in different shapes and contexts, some ambivalent, while others are politicised and highly contested. Heritages in the form of settler monuments (memorials) were erected to celebrate victories over Nguni and Buntu people. Since the advent of democracy in 1994, the South African government has attempted to transform the country’s heritage landscape in order to make it more reflective of the country’s diverse demographics. As such, new forms of urban governance, politics and policies85 have been drafted and implemented to pave the way for the construction of new heritages to represent marginalised individuals. The latter has not only informed the

economic and symbolic coding and re-coding, valuing and re-valuing of already existing urban heritages\(^\text{86}\) in the country, but it also has informed the political direction of the country.

In Port Elizabeth, locals, who had for so long been excluded from urban spaces during apartheid, have recently gained access to this important space (Govan Mbeki Avenue); a space they considered to belong to them, an urban space they view as a heritage that they have recently inherited. This heritage space bestows on them economic, social and political capital. As such, migrants entering into this ‘sacred’ space are perceived as a threat to locals’ access to their urban resources and spaces. Ambivalent heritages, on the other hand, are also considered foreign and seen as a threat to locals, epitomising their structural oppression and not being representative of everyone in Port Elizabeth. However, both ‘colonial’ and ‘traditional’ heritages are interlinked. They are both conjoined and exist in relation to each other.

South Africans urban spaces are deeply politicised and contested. South Africans who were formerly excluded from the county’s urban spaces during apartheid feel that it is their right to control access to urban spaces. Thus, they feel that they can exclude foreigners from the county’s urban spaces, because they view the foreigner as posing a threat to the country’s new social, political and economic order.

Since the advent of democracy, when the ANC-led government came into power 22 years ago, black people have been promised a better life and increased living standard by the government. However, for many, this has not yet materialised. They are still trapped in the same structural poverty created by apartheid, underrepresented and located on the periphery. Frustrated by this they do not know how to deal with their frustration, therefore, as a response; they attack anything that they see as a scapegoat.

Slow service delivery, slow transformation and no access to economic transformation made the locals frustrated with the government and they are starting to look for an alternative outlet for their frustration. Migrants and ambivalent heritages have become scapegoats with the latter being linked to the local community’s relative depravity in one way of another. They were met with violence that predominantly took the form of ambivalent heritages being defaced or toppled, or migrants being subjected to xenophobic attacks or having their access restricted and/or continuously having their movement within urban heritages/kraal monitored at all times.

As such, locals use alternative ways of engaging the foreign in urban spaces, ways that take the form of protests and the disregard of ambivalent heritages and their significance. It is through embodied performances of resistance that locals question the dominance of ambivalent Victorian era heritages and through the under-representation and relegation to marginality of foreign migrants that locals question the presence of migrants in their urban heritage space. The notion of the foreign ranged from Victorian era heritages being considered ambivalent to foreign migrants being policed and their attempted suppression of their visibility in Port Elizabeth, urban heritage landscape.

With the above having being outlined, this research sought to understand how and why ambivalent heritages were treated as the foreign by those who were formerly marginalised in urban spaces. This thesis sought to and hopefully has conceptualised of urban spaces as heritages that formerly marginalised individuals have recently inherited at the end of apartheid and therefore they are protective of it and do not want to share the social, cultural, political and economic benefits of the heritage. How do heritage and xenophobia come together and how can we understand them both within a localised heritage framework such as the ubuhlanti?

Leading on from Ntuli (2015), this research in Port Elizabeth concluded that “the vandalism of historical monuments and… xenophobic attacks, [are] symptomatic of underlying frustration fuelled by poverty, slow transformation and unemployment” in the country (Ntuli, 2015:1), because black people had only recently gained access to urban spaces and the benefits that come with it. They were willing do
anything to protect it and it make it more reflective of their own heritages. As such, anyone (i.e. foreign migrants) or anything (i.e. ambivalent heritages) were attacked because (a) they posed a threat to those who had recently gained access to the space and (b) they were easy targets for locals who were frustrated by the slow service delivery and (c) because it formed part of a narrative of asserting kraalhood.

Therefore, using the concept of the ubuhlanti this thesis attempted to show how the Port Elizabeth’s city centre could be conceptualised and compared to the local concept of the ubuhlanti in order to explain the vandalism of heritages and xenophobia. It is through employing the concept of the ubuhlanti that I attempted to understand how marginalised people engage with and understand urban heritage in relation to their own personal narratives. This would enable them to engage with and question urban narratives while inscribing it with their own intangible heritages and stories about issues such as the frontier wars, resistance and post-colonial identities. This meant that anything that deviated from the norm was met with resistance and was not allowed to enter the ubuhlanti, because it posed a danger to the harmony and benefits of the ubuhlanti. Through doing this, I did not “want to replace the concept of heritage with something else or to try expand the political and academic possibilities the concept of heritage carries” (Weiss, 2007:423), but he did attempt to propose an alternative way of thinking of heritage.

Based on this it is argued that it is important that theories as well as approaches in the development and heritage studies need to be more responsive to the societal concerns of the time. New approaches to heritage management need to be introduced into the field of heritage studies. Researchers need to use transformative research approaches that will question dominant heritage narratives they are presented with, but that will also carve out spaces for marginalised heritages to become represented. As such, researchers of heritage need to understand that there are various understandings of heritage. It also becomes important to note that heritage should always be considered for a localised micro-perspective, rather than a disembodied macro-perspective.
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