Places of Complicity in Narratives of Historical Violence: Thiaroye (Dakar) and District Six (Cape Town)

By

Clea M. Goldblatt

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Comparative Literature

in the

Graduate Division

of the

University of California, Berkeley

Committee in charge:

Professor Karl Britto, Chair
Professor Souleymane Bachir Diagne
Professor Gillian Hart
Professor Chana Kronfeld
Professor Debarati Sanyal
Professor Barbara Spackman

Spring 2015

Abstract

Places of Complicity in Narratives of Historical Violence:

Thiaroye (Dakar) and District Six (Cape Town)

by

Clea M. Goldblatt

Doctor of Philosophy in Comparative Literature

University of California, Berkeley

Professor Karl Britto, Chair

In *Places of Complicity*, I consider how narratives of the past of two African places obscure, and sometimes explore, complicity. For primarily activist-intellectual publics, Thiaroye and District Six have been icons of "memory" of racist violence and resistant community. I argue that dominant discourses of memory that surround these two sites share a representational mode and perform analogous elisions of the past. They work primarily through a particularly mimetic form of realism, in which the contemporary subject is interpellated as a remembering subject, interpretation is coded as remembrance, and a representation of the past is conflated with the (remembered) past itself. That past is one of colonial and apartheid violence, and unified, resistant community. These memory discourses thus largely elide the non-dichotomous character of colonial and apartheid rule, with its many "complicit," intermediary positions.

Widely varied intermediary positions were intrinsic to colonial and apartheid rule: among them were those of the civil servant, the native elite, the colonial soldier, the black French citizens of Senegal, and the quasi-citizens classified as "Coloured" by the apartheid state. Occupants of these positions were oppressed by that state, even as they occupied positions of privilege relative to others. The occupancy of these intermediary positions produces what I call "structural complicity" - a complicity defined by an intermediary location within a racialized political and economic structure. Thus, as I am employing the word, "complicity" is not a matter of individual agency; rather, it is produced by a particular position. Colonial and apartheid violence are most readily imagined as consisting of discreet acts of physical violation, committed by perpetrators upon victims. With the notion of "structural complicity," I want to direct attention towards structural violence, and the array of historical positions, many of them intermediary, upon which it depends. In doing so, I hope to provoke related questions of representation and interpretation: How do we write and read structural violence? How do we articulate and theorize the complicity of subjects who benefit from a system of which they are also victims?

Structural complicity, while elided in many narratives of Thiaroye and District Six, was integral to the historical episodes that these narratives purport to remember. In the Thiaroye military camp, in 1944, French forces - West African colonial soldiers among them - massacred a still-unknown number of their own West African colonial soldiers. In South Africa, the apartheid government declared Cape Town's central District Six for white occupation in 1966. The District was razed and, over more than a decade, its approximately 60,000 residents, the majority of whom were classified as "Coloured," were

forcibly removed to the periphery of the city. Despite the differences between these two histories, there are striking similarities in the ways that they have been narratively produced. Idioms of collective memory that surround both sites produce analogous visions of oppression and resistance, and elide structural complicity in similar ways. For their respective publics, District Six and Thiaroye have been sites that should be part of national memory, rather than sites already located securely within it. As symbols that are not fully national, and not always memorial, they allow us to think about the possibilities and limitations of multiple collective imaginaries and multiple modes of narrating the past, both beyond and within the national, and both within and outside of the idiom of memory.

While all the narratives that I examine evoke memory, not all of them are articulated within the idiom of memory. The "idiom of memory," as I use the term, assumes the existence of collective memory and interpellates the contemporary subject – the reader, viewer, or visitor - as a remembering subject: she will "recall" a past that she has not experienced. In my analysis, the best-known narratives express themselves through the idiom of memory, and lesser-known texts narrate and evoke the past outside of that idiom. While the former produce Thiaroye and District Six as "sites of memory," the latter produce them as "places of complicity."

A range of narratives, including literary texts and oral accounts, a film (Thiaroye), and a museum (District Six) have been generated around the two sites. The best-known accounts, such as Ousmane Sembène's film *Camp de Thiaroye* (1987) and Richard Rive's novel *Buckingham Palace, District Six* (1986), are articulated within the idiom of collective memory and recall a largely dichotomous past of white oppression and indigenous resistance, in which perpetrators and victims are clearly defined. The structural character of apartheid and colonial rule - with the many intermediary positions that it entailed - is therefore elided. Instead, a recalled historical family takes the place of a complex colonial/apartheid hierarchy. There is no violence within this imagined family; its hierarchical relationships signify care and protection and its sibling relationships of "brotherhood" join members together in horizontal bonds of solidarity. The identity of this family varies: the family of District Six may be black or Jewish or cosmopolitan, and the family of Thiaroye black and Pan-African, or Franco-African. Because they disavow the historical actors who occupied complicit positions, these accounts tend to "remember" only an unambiguously resistant and unified collectivity. A narrow conception of the historical "family" can produce an analogously narrow conception of the postcolonial nation: a homogenous heteronormative collective of resistant subjects.

In the less well-known narratives of District Six and Thiaroye that I examine, such as Boubacar Boris Diop's *Thiaroye terre rouge* (1981) and Richard Rive's "Riva" (1983), the metaphor of collective memory is absent, or less powerful. These narratives are preoccupied with positions of historical complicity and they evoke complicity in moments of surreal proximity and oblique allusion. Family bonds also figure in these accounts, but they are suspect or marginal; the correctly raced heteronormative family may appear as a location of betrayal or as marginal to the central, queer, relationship. These texts draw our attention to the structural violence of colonial and apartheid rule and prompt questions about the violence of the past and its implication in the postcolonial and post-apartheid present.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements **ii**

Introduction **1**

Chapter One **24**
The Space between Words and Things

Chapter Two **54**
Curating District Six

Chapter Three **74**
Theorizing Complicity: Three Texts by Richard Rive

Chapter Four **102**
Siggi

Conclusion **133**

Bibliography **139**

Acknowledgements

Many relationships, exchanges, and forms of support made this project possible. I am grateful to all my committee members: Karl Britto, Souleymane Bachir Diagne, Gillian Hart, Chana Kronfeld, Debarati Sanyal, and Barbara Spackman. Their committed engagement with this project has been invaluable. I owe particular thanks to Karl Britto, who directed this dissertation. The generosity of his mentorship and the consistency of his support have been invaluable. I am especially appreciative of his meticulous and rigorous reading of this dissertation over its many stages.

In addition to my committee members, many teachers prepared me to undertake this project and provided important assistance during the course of research and writing. Ibrahima Thioub was my first teacher of Senegambian history. Dominique Malaquais offered an early model of politically engaged Africanist scholarship. Suzanne Gardinier continues to provoke me to think about the inter-relationship of words and politics. Mamadou Diouf was an important interlocutor during the research and writing processes. Wolof teachers provided me with essential knowledge and skills; among them are Dienaba Signaté, Oumoul Sow, Mame Thierno Cissé, Paap Sow, and Mariame Sy. Discussions of Wolof literature and Senegalese culture with Paap Sow and Mariame Sy have shaped my approach to the Senegalese texts I examine here.

This dissertation has also been informed by exchange with colleagues who have been generous interlocutors, as well as readers of this work in its various incarnations. In particular, I would like to thank Noa Barr, Laurence Coderre, and Sharone Tomer; the 2014-2015 fellows at the Townsend Center for the Humanities; and the members the Wolof Literature Working Group: Ivy Mills, Jonathon Repinecz, Fatoumata Seck, and Tobias Warner.

Long periods of research in Dakar and Cape Town have resulted in many debts. People in Dakar and Cape Town shared their knowledge of the past with me, in both interviews and informal conversation. I cannot adequately express my gratitude for the generosity of these interlocutors. In particular, residents of Thiaroye-Sur-Mer in Dakar and former District Six residents in Cape Town talked to me about their experiences of place and history. Several opened their homes to me, connected me with other valuable interlocutors, and shared material from their own archives. These exchanges and conversations deeply, albeit largely obliquely, inform the present study. They will, I hope, more explicitly shape this project as it develops onward from its present iteration as a dissertation.

In Cape Town, a number of institutions and individuals contributed to the shape of this project. I conducted research in the archives of the District Six Museum and the Centre for Popular Memory; in the Western Cape Provincial Archives; and in the National Library of South Africa. The Centre for Humanities Research at the University of the Western Cape was a productive place of intellectual exchange and support. One-on-one conversations with Premesh Lalu, Suren Pillay, Ciraj Rassool, and Crain Soudien were also very helpful. The District Six Museum proved to be a essential site of social research and reflection, as well as home to a key archive. I spent many hours conversing with staff members, reading, and engaging both with the exhibit and with visitors to the Museum. I am grateful to all Museum staff members for the generosity of the welcome I received there, and I am particularly indebted to Chrischené Julius, Collections Manager, who made my research there a pleasure. My exchanges with her, as well as my reading of her scholarship on the Museum's curatorial practices, have

been important for my own reflections on Museum practices. During my stay in Cape Town, the friendship and intellectual companionship of several other people was essential. In particular, I would like to thank Heidi Grunebaum, Jacki Job, Aubrey and Lorraine Knight, Ari Sitas, and Obiozo Ukpabi.

In Dakar, I conducted research in the archive of the *Institut fondamental de l'Afrique Noire* (IFAN) and in the Senegalese National Archives. I benefitted from the sustained support and engagement of Dakar-based scholars Charles Becker, Ndiouga Benga, Mame Thierno Cissé, and Ibrahima Thioub. Intellectuals and activists generously shared their personal archives and their knowledge with me; among them are Ben Diogaye Bèye, Dialo Diop, El Hadji Abdoulaye Fall, Cheikh Faty Faye, Cheikh Guissé, Alassane Ndaw, and Magatte Thiam. I am grateful to Adjiratu Bari and Samba Dia for their friendship and support during the most challenging stages of my research. The Becker family made me welcome in their home in Point E. Finally, the support of the Sarr/Sène family made this research possible and often joyful. I am especially grateful to Germaine Sarr and Odile Coly Sène.

Financial support was essential to both the research and writing stages of this project. A Eugene Cota-Robes Fellowship supported the early stages of my graduate study. Two fellowships allowed me to spend a year of research in Cape Town and Dakar: a Rocca Fellowship from the Center for African Studies and a John Simpson Fellowship from the Institute for International Studies, both of the University of California, Berkeley. Two other fellowships from the University supported a final year of writing: a Dissertation Fellowship from the Townsend Center for the Humanities and the Jacobson Memorial Teaching Fellowship.

Introduction

In *Places of Complicity*, I consider how narratives of the past of two African places obscure, and sometimes explore, complicity. For primarily activist-intellectual publics, Thiaroye and District Six have been icons of "memory" of racist violence and resistant community. I argue that dominant discourses of memory that surround these two sites share a representational mode and perform analogous elisions of the past. They work primarily through a particularly mimetic form of realism, in which the contemporary subject is interpellated as a remembering subject, interpretation is coded as remembrance, and a representation of the past is conflated with the (remembered) past itself. That past is one of colonial and apartheid violence on the one hand, and of unified, resistant community on the other. These memory discourses thus largely elide the non-dichotomous character of colonial and apartheid rule, with its many "complicit," intermediary positions.

Widely varied intermediary positions were intrinsic to colonial and apartheid rule: among them were those of the civil servant, the native elite, the colonial soldier, the black French citizens of Senegal, and the quasi-citizens classified as "Coloured" by the apartheid state.[1] Occupants of these positions were oppressed by that state, even as they occupied positions of privilege relative to others. The occupancy of these intermediary positions produces what I call "structural complicity" - a complicity defined by an intermediary location within a racialized political and economic structure. Thus, as I am employing the word, "complicity" is not a matter of individual agency; rather, it is produced by a structural position. I do not intend "complicity" to function as an implicit accusation; it does not signify "collaboration." Colonial and apartheid violence is most readily imagined as consisting of discreet acts of physical violation, committed by perpetrators upon victims. With the notion of structural complicity, I will, instead, direct critical attention towards structural violence, and the array of historical positions, many of them intermediary, upon which it depends. I hope to provoke related questions of representation and interpretation: How do we write and read structural violence? How do we articulate and theorize the complicity of subjects who benefit from a system of which they are also victims?

Structural complicity, while elided in many narratives of Thiaroye and District Six, was integral to the historical episodes that these narratives purport to remember. In the Thiaroye military camp, in 1944, French forces - West African colonial soldiers among them - massacred a still-unknown number of their own West African colonial soldiers. In South Africa, the apartheid government declared Cape Town's central District Six for white occupation in 1966. The District was razed and, over more than a decade, its approximately 60,000 residents, the majority of whom were classified as "Coloured," were forcibly removed to the periphery of the city.

Despite the differences between these two histories, there are striking similarities in the ways that they have been narratively produced. Idioms of collective memory that surround both sites produce analogous visions of oppression and resistance, and elide structural complicity in similar ways. In part because of the complicity inherent in these pasts, Thiaroye and District Six have figured only partially

---

[1] In South Africa, apartheid legislation, and various governmental definitions that predated apartheid, defined "the Coloured" as the product of racial mixing. "Coloured" was an intermediary category in racial classificatory systems: Coloured people did not have the rights of whites but neither were they as targeted by white supremacist policies as Africans. Following currently dominant South African convention, I employ "African," "Coloured," and "Indian" to distinguish between racialized historical experiences and legislative categories, and employ "black" as the term that refers to all "people of color" (as current U.S. racial terminology would have it).

and selectively in national memorial narratives. Thiaroye is not Gorée Island, a Senegalese World Heritage Site and a National Heritage Site – symbol of the Atlantic Slave Trade. District Six is not South Africa's Robben Island, site of world and national heritage, and icon of anti-apartheid resistance; nor is it Sophiatown, the most nationally recognized site of apartheid-era forced removal. Senegalese activist-intellectuals have "remembered" Thiaroye as a place of Pan-African unity that also prefigures the African unity of the nation. South African activist-intellectuals have recalled District Six as a "cosmopolitan" place, a microcosm of the diverse nation. For their respective publics, they have been sites that should be part of national memory, rather than sites already located securely within it. As symbols that are not fully national, and not always memorial, they allow us to think about the possibilities and limitations of multiple collective imaginaries and multiple modes of narrating the past, both within and beyond the national, and both within and outside of the idiom of memory.

While all the narratives that I examine evoke memory, not all of them are articulated within the idiom of memory. The "idiom of memory," as I use the term, assumes the existence of "collective memory" and interpellates the contemporary subject – the reader, viewer, or visitor - as a remembering subject: she will "recall" a past that she has not experienced. In my analysis, the best-known narratives express themselves through the idiom of memory, and lesser-known texts narrate and evoke the past outside of that idiom. While the former produce Thiaroye and District Six as "sites of memory," the latter produce them as "places of complicity."

A range of narratives, including literary texts, oral accounts, a film (Thiaroye), and a museum (District Six) have been generated around the two sites. The best-known accounts, articulated within the idiom of collective memory, recall a largely dichotomous past of white oppression and indigenous resistance, in which perpetrators and victims are clearly defined. The structural character of apartheid and colonial rule - with the many intermediary positions that it entailed - is therefore elided. Instead, a recalled historical family takes the place of a complex colonial/apartheid hierarchy. There is no violence within this imagined family; its hierarchical relationships signify care and protection and its sibling relationships of "brotherhood" join members together in horizontal bonds of solidarity. The identity of this family varies: the family of District Six may be black or Jewish or cosmopolitan, and the family of Thiaroye black and Pan-African, or Franco-African.

Yet despite the unity and normativity of these varied imagined families, disavowed suggestions of complicity emerge. Within the imagined proto-national or pan-national family, a complicit figure or suggestion of complicity appears, only to be rendered irrelevant or explained (away) as the product of misunderstanding. Because they disavow the historical actors who occupied complicit positions, these accounts tend to "remember" only an unambiguously resistant and unified collectivity. A narrow conception of the historical "family" can produce an analogously narrow conception of the postcolonial nation: a homogenous heteronormative collective of resistant subjects.

In the less well-known narratives of District Six and Thiaroye that I examine, the metaphor of collective memory is absent, or less powerful. These narratives are preoccupied with positions of historical complicity and they evoke complicity in moments of surreal proximity and oblique allusion. Family bonds also figure in these accounts, but they are suspect or marginal; the correctly raced heteronormative family may appear as a location of betrayal or as marginal to the central, queer, relationship. These texts draw our attention to the structural violence of colonial and apartheid rule and prompt questions about the violence of the past and its implication in the postcolonial and post-apartheid present.

Produced as "sites of memory," District Six and Thiaroye appear as isolated spaces that "speak" a univocal memory of the past. Understood as "places of complicity," District Six and Thiaroye emerge instead as places of plural, complex pasts and "presents." Following Maurice Halbwach's foundational conception of collective memory, scholars such as Pierre Nora have understood collective memory to belong to the consciousness of a bounded social group. For Nora, who initially theorized "sites of memory," memory emerges organically from the collective consciousness of a people, often defined in national or ethnic terms.[2] In his understanding, authentic memory, unlike history, is not constructed; however, modern peoples no longer live in environments of (collective) memory (*milieux de mémoire*). As a result, their collective memory emerges only in "*lieux de mémoire*." They are "*lieux" de mémoire* because they stand in *lieu*, in place of, real memory. These *lieux* are in a sense constructed, since they may be cultural objects such as flags or texts, as well as spatial "sites." Yet Nora articulates the *lieu de mémoire* as an outgrowth of "memory" itself, not as the product of social processes: it is "where memory crystallizes and secretes itself."[3] While the "site of memory" is thus in one sense a cultural construct, it depends upon, and produces, a notion of an organic collective memory (even if modern memory is disappearing or fragmented) and of equivalence between a territory, a bounded people, and a culture. Like many scholars who have critiqued Nora's conception of the site of memory,[4] I do not consider spaces and peoples to be objectively bounded, nor do I conflate space, social collective, and culture.

My own approach to Thiaroye and District Six as places (of complicity), rather than as sites (of memory), is made possible by a relational conception of space and place. I follow Henri Lefebvre and Doreen Massey in conceiving of place as socially produced, and therefore as always multiple, dynamic, and both productive of and implicated within politics.[5] Rather than considering space to be a static container through which history moves, or upon which it acts, Massey, building upon Lefebvre, conceives of places as "space-times": junctures, or "articulated moments" within relations that necessarily have both spatial and temporal dimensions. Places are not expressions of abstractions such as "a people" or their "memory"; instead, place is defined by necessarily changing social relations, including those of conflict and violence.[6] A relational conception of place can thus help to foreground the politics produced by different ways of understanding a particular place. As abstract "sites," Thiaroye and District Six can contain and speak "memory"; as "places," they are in part defined by the competing claims over their meanings. As "sites" of memory, District Six and Thiaroye appear isolated and clearly bounded, existing apart from African space-times. As "places," they are implicated with other sites and social actors, and they are defined through experiences of complicity as well of perpetration, victimhood, and resistant solidarity. As a relational conception of place can make possible an investigation of complicity, textual evocations of complicity can also facilitate the emergence of a relational and dynamic notion of place.

---

2 A foundational three-volume history of France, edited by Pierre Nora, is framed by the concept of the "site of memory": *Les lieux de mémoire* (Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992). Here I reference the English translation of Nora's introduction: "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire" in "Memory and Counter-Memory," ed. Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph Starn, special issue, *Representations,* no. 26 (Spring 1989): 7-24.

3 Ibid, 7.

4 For an overview of some of these critiques, see Michael Rothberg, "Between Memory and Memory: From Lieux de mémoire to Noeuds de mémoire" in "Noeuds de mémoire: Multidirectional Memory in Postwar French and Francophone Culture," ed. Michael Rothberg, Debarati Sanyal, and Maxim Silverman, special issue, *Yale French Studies* no. 118/119 (2010), 3-12.

5 Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991); Doreen Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994).

6 Massey, *Space, Place, and Gender*, 4-6.

Some recent theorizing of complicity has conceptualized it as a condition that everyone, in different ways, shares. Mark Sanders, theorizing responsibility and complicity in apartheid South Africa, views complicity as a precondition of all social relations, and thus as a state that precedes any taking of responsibility, including that of opposition to injustice.[7] For Debarati Sanyal, the recognition of complicity makes political action possible; she writes that, "The recognition of complicity with structural violence, of the effects that our actions have on the fate of others, can serve as a catalyst for ethical and political action."[8] For Naomi Mandel, the idea that an atrocity is "unspeakable" denies the complicity of the present with the historical violence that is deemed "unspeakable." In another formulation of the potentially fruitful space that the recognition of complicity allows, Mandel writes: "Conceived not as a judgment or a charge but as a way of being, complicity evinces an ethical investment in opposition to the status quo that does not fall prey to the exculpatory lure of the unspeakable."[9] For Mandel, complicity is both inescapable and potentially productive of political critique and ethical action: complicity is "a structure by which identity constitutes itself vis-à-vis the unspeakable; it is finally, the condition of possibility for ethical engagement with the violence of such a constitution."[10] For both Mandel and Sanyal, complicity implicates the present: it ties a violent present to a violent past - it enfolds the contemporary reader into the historical subject and into the historical violence of the text.

Like Sanders, Mandel, and Sanyal, I am interested in the intertwined political and aesthetic possibilities that are opened up when we recognize our inescapable complicity with historical and contemporary violence. I am, however, particularly interested in how and why people are differently complicit, and in how we might understand the way that a structural location can produce a particular form of complicity. While everyone may be complicit in structural violence, people are, of course, complicit from within extremely varied positions. In this project, I consider a specific, structurally produced, complicity that is active in the present because the structures in which it existed continue to exist. "Structural complicity" thus offers a way in which to understand the complicity of the structurally violent present with the structurally violent past. I suggest that no metaphors of memory are necessary in order to think about how and why structural violence, and the complicities that inhered in it, operates in postcolonial and post-apartheid Africa. Nor is a notion of collective memory necessary in order to analyze discourses about the past, and their elisions and disavowals. In this project, structural complicity permits a focus on one kind of structurally produced complicity and the consequences of its elision for postcolonial imaginings of political community and resistance. In the particular cases of Thiaroye and District Six, structural complicity offers a way of thinking about why and how the memory discourses that surround these two sites perform analogous elisions and, as a result, produce analogously restrictive notions of postcolonial nationhood.

I distinguish between two broad types of intersecting memory discourse: national discourses of memory, including those that work in opposition to a state discourse, and an internationally circulating

---

7 In Mark Sanders' understanding, complicity is a condition that precedes any stance, whether of collaboration or opposition: "When opposition does not free one from complicity, but depends on it as its condition of possibility, responsibility is sharpened." *Complicities: The Intellectual and Apartheid,* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 10.

8 Debarati Sanyal, *Memory and Complicity: Migrations of Holocaust Remembrance* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2015), 13.

9 Naomi Mandel, *Against the Unspeakable: Complicity, the Holocaust, and Slavery in America* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press, 2006), 218.

10 Ibid., 23.

discourse of memory. My understanding of an international memory discourse is grounded in the work of Annette Wieviorka, who traces the emergence of a global "era of the witness" to the broadcasting of the Eichmann trial in the late 1960s.[11] Wieviorka traces the centrality of oral testimony in discourses of the Holocaust to this event and argues that it initiated a mode of representing and consuming the Holocaust in which the survivor becomes the authority on the Shoah, and the contemporary listener, the non-survivor, is invited to experience that past by identifying with the witnessing survivor.[12] I follow Sanyal and Michael Rothberg in considering that the primacy of the witness and this mode of reception has extended beyond the Holocaust to discourses about other histories of violence, among them colonialism and the Atlantic Slave Trade.[13] In many of the narratives that I examine in this study, an identificatory mode of reception implicates the contemporary subject as a remembering subject and invites her to remember a past that is voided of the particular forms of structural complicity that are produced by colonial rule. In several of these narratives, the Nazi Holocaust in Europe is obliquely or explicitly brought into close relation with an African site of historical racialized violence.

Unlike most work produced within the field of memory studies, this project does not assume there is such an object as "collective memory." Rather than tracing alternate genealogies of collective memory or proposing new models through which to conceptualize collective memory, this project traces the dangers of "the era of the witness" to the idiom of collective memory itself. The articulations of national discourse that I examine often share the assumptions, representational modes, and elisions of an internationally circulating memory discourse that originated in the media production of the Holocaust. Like the international memory discourses with which they may be intertwined, national memory discourses may interpellate the nation member as a remembering subject, assume or articulate an imperative to remember ("never again"), and represent the past in a realist mode through which the position of victimhood is recalled and the positions of complicity are not.

When memory discourses elide the fundamentally structural character of colonial and apartheid rule, they obscure the continuities of past structural violence with contemporary structural violence. In South African memory discourses, apartheid becomes a "memory" to be "healed" and contemporary structural violence appears as a "legacy" of apartheid rather than a form of violence that is actively produced in the present because racialized structures of inequality remain unchanged. Recent French and Senegalese state recognitions of "Thiaroye" remember the courage of colonial soldiers and the violence of a single historical episode; but they neither remember the violence inherent to colonial rule nor recognize that this violence continues to inform the contemporary condition of formerly French African countries. The elision of structural violence produces a narrow notion of resistance, including a narrow notion of literary resistance. In attending to the structural complicity of the past, contemporary readers and viewers can reconsider the category of protest art, or *littérature engagée*, and the representational modes and interpretive practices appropriate to it.

The central claim of this project - that diverse memory discourses elide structural complicity - questions not only the character of colonial violence and anti-colonial resistance but also the ways in which they

---

11 Annette Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness,* trans. Jared Stark (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2006).

12 In *Memory and Complicity*, Sanyal warns that this affective and identificatory mode of reception might collapse the past with its representation and foreclose analytical engagements with a past that included experiences of complicity and perpetration, as well as of victimhood (8-9).

13 Michael Rothberg, *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2009).

might be represented. In each chapter, I examine how idioms of memory elide structural complicity through a particular mimetic form of realism, and, in doing so, produce dangerously restrictive understandings of colonial violence and of the resistant postcolonial nation. In each, a concluding analysis of a text or place allows me to consider a representational mode or interpretive practice that does not foreclose explorations of structural complicity.

The Pan-African geography of this project allows for a consideration of the ways in which diverse narratives of ostensibly local pasts imagine a postcolonial African subject. Because I follow Mamdani's notion that apartheid South Africa shared with colonial African states a single form of state, and thus a common structure of violence, when I refer to "colonial violence," I include apartheid violence within that category.[14] When I discuss apartheid violence as a particular historical case, as, for example, an object of South African memory discourses, I refer specifically to "apartheid" or "apartheid violence."

The Memorial Production of District Six and Thiaroye

The discursive memorial production of Thiaroye and District Six, including creative and scholarly production, dates to the 1970s and 1980s, respectively. During apartheid, District Six became a symbol of apartheid injustice and lost multiracial community. In a newly independent Senegal, "Thiaroye" evoked colonial and neocolonial violence, as well as African resistance. Beginning in the 1980s, the "memory" of District Six challenged apartheid; in the 1970s, an imperative to remember the Massacre in texts of Thiaroye signified a challenge to, and an indictment of, the Senegalese state. In South Africa, apartheid ended in 1994; in Senegal, four decades of *Parti Socialiste* (PS) rule ended in 2000.

Both sites continued to figure in memorial imaginaries of injustice and belonging. The District Six Museum was established in 1994; in Senegal, in 2004, then-President Wade became the first Senegalese president to acknowledge the Massacre. For Capetonian activist-intellectuals, the still largely vacant land of District Six is to be a "reminder" of apartheid evil and of a destroyed community that is ambivalently racialized – at times, non-racial, at times, specifically black. In Senegal, the changed stance of the state has made the Thiaroye Massacre a sanctioned symbol of colonial violence and African heroism.

While today neither site constitutes a direct challenge to the state, each is ambiguously marginal to a state-sanctioned national narrative. District Six, in spite of its Museum and the voluminous cultural and scholarly production that surrounds it, is not a national icon. In Senegal, despite the public gestures of Wade's administration and recent scholarly and media attention, the number and identity of the Thiaroye dead remains unknown and the "colonial soldier" is only selectively incorporated into a national narrative. The ambiguous position of the sites is epitomized in unsuccessful activist efforts to make claims upon the physical landscape. In 2006, the District Six Museum submitted an application for a portion of the District to become a national heritage site. This application remains pending.[15] In 2006, a Senegalese association of teachers requested that the president halt construction of the new national toll-way in order to excavate a site of suspected mass graves. There was no written response;

---

[14] See Mahmood Mamdani, *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and the Legacy of Late Colonialism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996).

[15] For more about the application for national heritage status and an articulation of the Museum's view of District Six as a site of national and "community" memory, see Bonita Bennett and Chrischené Julius, "Where is District Six? Between Landscape, Site and Museum" in *City, Site, Museum*, ed. Bonita Bennett, Chrischené Julius, and Crain Soudien (Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2008), 52-67.

no excavation occurred and the now-completed toll-way passes over what may or may not be mass graves.[16]

District Six and Its Memorial Production

District Six was a large area of Cape Town to the immediate east of the central city. It was multi-racial and primarily working-class. In the late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century, the District was the first place of residence for many immigrants and migrants; by the post-World War II period, the residents of District Six were primarily "non-white" and majority "Coloured." In Cape Town, the apartheid regime began implementing a master plan of racialized, tribalized, and economically-organized spatial segregation in the early 1960s. District Six was declared an area for exclusive white residence in 1966 under the Group Areas Act of 1950, the legislation under which most of Cape Town's forced removals of the period took place.[17] Physical destruction of the area, and forced removals of the population, began the subsequent year, and proceeded incrementally. The entire population was removed by the early 1980s; the few structures left standing included the three mosques and two of the churches. Private citizens, both residents and not, documented the destruction through photographs. "African," "Coloured," and "Indian" former residents were moved to separate, racially defined areas on the margins of the city.[18]

During the 1980s, the apartheid regime became increasingly repressive in response to widespread popular uprisings that were centered in South Africa's cities. It also began implementing token reforms of its racial policies, including the hollow enfranchisement of South Africans classified as Coloured. District Six was the proposed site of one such token reform; instead of being redeveloped as an all-white area, private companies, led by BP SA (the South African affiliate of British Petroleum that, unlike many multi-nationals never divested from apartheid South Africa) would redevelop the area as one of the regime's new model non-racial areas.

Its buildings and street-grid destroyed and its population dispersed, District Six became the site of a contestation over the future of the land. Local anti-apartheid activists, District Six residents among them, fought the BP-led initiative and advocated for a redevelopment of the District that would, democratically, be led by the former residents themselves, who would return to the land with the end of the unjust apartheid regime. The activist project of fighting an apartheid redevelopment of the land was bound up in the activist project of commemorating the District.[19] For overlapping contingents of activists, scholars, and cultural producers, District Six became a highly visible symbol of apartheid injustice, as well as a site of research, particularly for social historians.

Because of the District's location and size, and the long period over which it was demolished, its

---

16 Mamadou Koné, Secretary General of the Association of Senegalese History and Geography Teachers (*Association sénégalaise des professeurs d'histoire et de géographie*), in discussion with the author. April 26, 2013, Dakar. For the portrayal of these efforts in the French media, see Philippe Bernard, "Les Sénégalais retrouvent la mémoire," *Le Monde*, February 23, 2006.

17 As I discuss in Chapter Two, while the Group Areas Act justified the physical destruction of neighborhoods, pre-apartheid legislation, the 1934 Slums Act, was employed to remove residents.

18 No monograph is devoted to the history of District Six. However, several of the essays in *The Struggle for District Six* specifically address the District's past, such as Vivian Bickford Smith's "The Origins and Early History of District Six to 1910" and Deborah M. Hart's "Political Manipulation of Urban Space: The Razing of District Six, Cape Town." See Shamil Jeppie and Crain Soudien, eds, *The Struggle For District Six: Past and Present* (Cape Town: Buchu Books, 1990), 35-43 and 117-142.

19 See Crain Soudien, "District Six: From Protest to Protest" in *The Struggle for District Six,* 143-181.

destruction was very visible. The apartheid redevelopment of the District as a white area never occurred, in part because, according to many accounts, most white people refused to move there. Nor did the planned "non-racial" apartheid redevelopment of the 1980s take place. The District remained an area largely devoid of new buildings, but for the prominent campus of a new all-white technical college.[20] The largely undeveloped land, today still, can be easily evoked as a visual, and physical "reminder" of the consequences of apartheid injustice.

District Six was the major site of Cape Town oral history research during the 1980s and early 1990s, and the first site of the Western Cape Oral History Project (today the Centre for Popular Memory). Cape Town's District Six Museum, the primary cultural and research institution for District Six, and also the primary institutional producer of District memory discourse, traces its roots to this period, specifically to the 1988 "Hands Off District Six" Conference out of which the "Hands Off District Six Committee" emerged. The conference also resulted in the first work of non-fiction dedicated to District Six history and culture: the collection, *The Struggle for District Six: Past and Present*, a "Project of the Hands Off District Committee," which was edited by two members of the Committee (who later became Museum trustees).[21] Richard Rive, the author whose work is considered in Chapter Three, contributed to the conference and to the volume (His essay, "District Six: Fact and Fiction" reviews the existing cultural and literary production of District Six). The commemorative literary production of the District also began in this period. Foundational works include Rive's *Buckingham Palace, District Six* (1986), a text I examine in Chapter Three, and Taliep Petersen and David Kramer's "District Six Musical" (1988).[22] In the decades since, a voluminous body of work has been produced: works of fiction, collections of photographs, documentary films, and memoirs authored by former residents variously aim to imagine, recall, or document life in District Six.

Since the first democratic elections in 1994, and the formal establishment of the Museum during the same year, there has been a plethora of cultural and scholarly production surrounding the District. Much of it reproduces the District Six Museum as a (or the) site of District Six memory.[23] The District Six Museum explicitly produces itself within the idiom of memory through the Museum Foundation's publications about Museum practice: *Recalling Community: Creating and Curating the District Six Museum* (2001) and *City, Site, Museum: Reviewing memory practices at the District Six Museum* (2008).[24] Overlapping scholarly and Museum discourses articulate visions of the District's past, its memory, and the forms of representation that are most appropriate to it.

---

20 Then the Cape Technikon, today it is known as the Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT).

21 Shamil Jeppie and Crain Soudien, eds, *The Struggle for District Six: Past and Present*. Cape Town: Buchu Books, 1990.

22 Richard Rive, *Buckingham Palace, District Six* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1986). In Chapter Three, I reference the second edition, published in 1996.

23 Among many examples, see Annie E. Coombes, "District Six: The Archeology of Memory" in *History after Apartheid: Visual culture and public memory in a democratic South Africa* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 116-148; Ciraj Rassool, "Memory and the Politics of History in the District Six Museum" in *Desire Lines: Space, Memory and Identity in the Post-Apartheid City*, ed. Noëleen Murray, Nick Shepherd, and Martin Hall (New York: Routledge, 2007), 113-127; "An Archeology of Memory," *Mail & Guardian Online,* March 2, 1995. http://mg.co.za/article/1995-02-03-an-archaeology-of-memory. Published shortly after the Museum opened (and cited by Rassool, above), the article declares that the Museum "creates an archeology of memory," "stages a recovery of the past," and, "witnesses" scenes of remembrance and recognition among residents.

24 Ciraj Rassool and Sandra Prosalendis, eds, *Recalling Community in Cape Town: Creating and Curating the District Six Museum* (Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2001); Bonita Bennett, Chrischené Julius, and Crain Soudien, eds, *City, Site, Museum: Reviewing memory practices at the District Six Museum* (Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2008).

District Six memory discourse produces the District as an icon of apartheid injustice and vanished community. Apartheid created and legislated racial distinction; but in the District - a place of vibrant social interaction and working-class solidarity - race was unimportant. To remember the District is to "recall community" and to consider that community as a metonym of what post-apartheid South Africa is, or should become: a nation of egalitarian, non-racial community. While the District has become an icon for some, it is not home to former residents, despite the existence of a formal restitution process in post-apartheid South Africa. Considering the large number of originally displaced District Six residents (60,000), there are very few claimants.[25] Some of those claimants have accepted a (token) amount of financial restitution in lieu of a home. Others are still waiting for a house. Few households have "returned" to live in newly constructed houses in the District.[26] Despite intense frustrations with, and contestations of, the restitution process, in the discourse that the District Six Museum produces, memory has remained integrally connected with a physical return to the land.[27]

While memory activists recall District Six as a site of cosmopolitan community for the nation, many South Africans do not; instead, they specifically associate the District with Coloured people. Nationalist narratives of anti-apartheid struggle highlight the contributions of the role of the African National Congress (ANC), black ANC heroes and the suffering of black masses, and tend to neglect multiracial and nonracial resistance movements, political resistance in Cape Town, and the contributions of activists classified as Coloured or Indian.[28] Such narratives might highlight the Sharpeville Massacre, but neglect the massive protest march that followed it in Cape Town, then a Pan-African Congress (PAC) stronghold.[29] They might highlight the cultural vibrancy of Sophiatown and the injustice of its apartheid-destruction, but have less to say about District Six, Cape Town's "less African" counterpart.

"Coloured" is a category with strong regional and local associations: with the Western Cape Province, with Cape Town and with District Six. The District is a marginal place in the national imaginary of the current ANC-led state, in part because of its association with Colouredness and with racial and gendered mixing and passing. Unlike Robben Island, which now unequivocally

---

25 The land claims submission period was reopened in 2014 and has been extended until 2019. It seems reasonable to estimate the current number of District Six claimants at less than two thousand. One recent article cites 1,350 registered claimants (families), but it is unclear from the context if this figure is a total: see Carlo Petersen, "District Six claimants want all development stopped," *Cape Times*, March 16, 2015. http://www.pressreader.com/south-africa/cape -times/20150316/281496454763472/TextView. A 2014 article referenced "just over 1 000" registered claimants: Zara Nicholson, "58,000 claimants not on claims list'," *Cape Times*, May 6, 2014. http://m.capetimes.co.za/article/view/s/95/a/406200.

26 Here again, it is difficult to find precise figures; likely, about 140 houses have been built. Phase One of the redevelopment plan involved building 24 houses; it was completed in 2004. It is unclear whether all 115 homes of Phase Two are completed and occupied. See "District Six Claimants urged to approach Justice Department" *SABC,* March 8, 2014. http://www.sabc.co.za/news/a/4f98ee00433133fc92e89a45a23ba143/District-Six-land-claimants-urged-to-approach-Justice-Dept; and Lucille Davie, "District Six lives again, thirty five years later," *Media Club South Africa*, May 28, 2014. http://www.mediaclubsouthafrica.com/culture/3852-district-six-lives-again-35-years-later.

27 This is a central aspect of the discourse the Museum produces. See, for example, Ciraj Rassool, "Introduction" in *Recalling Community,* Rassool and Prosalendis, vii-xii.

28 For a critique of triumphalist post-apartheid national narratives, see Jacob Dlamini, *Native Nostalgia* (Johannesburg: Jacana, 2009).

29 See, for example, Tom Lodge, *Sharpeville: An Apartheid Massacre and Its Consequences* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011). The PAC march in Cape Town is highlighted in Digging Deeper, the permanent exhibit of the District Six Museum.

signifies apartheid (racial) oppression and black (male) resistance, District Six evokes intermediary positions of race and class – the Coloured laborer or craftperson, the Indian shopkeeper, and the not-quite-white Jewish slumlord – that apartheid rule also produced.

The ambiguous and marginal status of the District in relation to a dominant construction of the national past is particularly bound up with the specific complicity that attaches to Coloured identity. Colonial and apartheid-era cultural discourses conceptualized Coloured people as an error and impurity within a family of races; "Coloured" is not devoid of analogous associations in post-apartheid discourses. The ancestors of many Coloured people experienced slavery; the ancestors of other black South Africans largely did not.[30] "Colouredness" therefore remains tainted with the idea of racial, sexual, and political impurity:[31] the proper black resistant subject, a truly liberated South African, is not Coloured.

District Six, like Cape Town - Coloured Cape Town in particular - is also associated with the drag queen and the homosexual; and specifically with the *moffie*, figure of male homosexuality and femininity. The District was home to brothels and cabarets, prominent queens and visible homosexuals, and it was where the respectable city went for its pleasures. Former residents recall "the moffies," particular well-known queens, night spots famous for their drag performances, and the *moffie* netball team. Some apartheid post-apartheid accounts have evoked the District as a specifically queer place.[32]

In the 1970s and 80s, with the prominence of Black Consciousness thought and the resurgence of popular struggle within South Africa, activists rejected "Coloured" as an apartheid creation and chose "black" as a way to refer to all people whom apartheid classified as "non-white."[33] The continued Leftist aversion to "Coloured" hearkens back to that embrace of a national liberation movement and the rejection of apartheid's racial logic. As I will argue in Chapter Two, however, the collapsing of the historical experiences of Coloured people into a black South African "memory"

---

30 For background on the history of slavery in Cape Town, see Robert C. H Shell, *Children of Bondage: A Social History of the Slave Society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1838* (Hanover NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1994). For an analysis of ways in which Coloured Capetonians have commemorated (and neglected) the history of slavery in the Cape Colony, see Kerry Ward and Nigel Worden, "Commemorating, suppressing, and invoking Cape Slavery" in *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*, ed. Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee (Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1998), 201-217. Ward and Worden are particularly interested in the ways in which that history has been claimed and contested since the end of apartheid.

31 Writing in the late 1990s, Zoe Wicomb argues that particular forms of shame attached to "Colouredness"; that it is uniquely linked with not only the sexualized shame of racial impurity, but with political error - the then recent "shameful vote of Cape coloureds for the National Party in the first democratic elections." (In 1994, a majority of Coloured people in the Western Cape Province voted for the party that had created and implemented apartheid.) "Shame and identity: the case of the coloured in South Africa" in *Writing South Africa: Literature, apartheid and democracy, 1970-1995,* ed. Derek Attridge and Rosemary Jolly (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 93. For further analyses of "Colouredness," see Zmitri Erasmus, ed, *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place: New Perspectives on Coloured identities in Cape Town* (Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2001).

32 Post-apartheid texts such as the Rozena Maart's novel *Rosa's District Six* (Toronto: Mawzeni House/TSAR Publishers, 2004); and Jack Lewis' documentary film *A Normal Daughter: The Life and Times of Kewpie of District Six* (South Africa, Idol Pictures, 2004) have sought to reimagine and document the District's lost queer life.

33 There is a non-racialist South African tradition that would not advocate for the use of racial terminology at all, and certainly not without the use of scare-quotes to signify the artificiality of racial categories. That tradition is prominent among Museum activists. For an analysis of non-racialism in District Six discourse, see Crain Soudien, "District Six and its uses in the discussion about non-racialism," in Erasmus, *Coloured by History*, 114-130.

can produce a disengagement with the complicit structural location that people so classified historically occupied; and with a specific past, composed of both racial oppression and (partial and relative) racial privilege.[34]

Thiaroye and Its Memorial Production

On December 1st, 1944, French colonial forces killed an unknown number of their own African soldiers in the *Camp de Thiaroye,* outside of Dakar. These *tirailleurs sénégalais* - West African colonial subjects - had arrived from Europe ten days before; they were among the first to return to French West Africa. Many had been German prisoners of war following the French defeat in 1940. In Thiaroye, they demanded the money that the army owed them, and refused to leave the transit camp before being paid; the army appeared to relent and promised to pay them. During the night preceding the promised day of payment, French colonial forces, including African colonial soldiers, surrounded the camp; in the morning, they killed an unknown number of the *tirailleurs* inside. The true and complete story is unknown; France continues to cover up what really happened.

This outline of events, in which the missing information is given almost as much weight as the information that is conveyed, has been widely repeated over the past decade.[35] Access to the relevant French archives would reveal the true story, in particular the true number of dead, their identities, and the location(s) of their burial. This abbreviated narrative frames "Thiaroye" as a question of the relationship between France and Africa; it foregrounds the hardship the soldiers had experienced during the war; it narrates both the collective act of resistance, and the French betrayal (of its own African soldiers). The Massacre prefigures national independences and decolonization. The killing epitomizes not only the injustice of colonialism, but also French hypocrisy; and the resistance that provoked the massacre was a national and pan-national act of (collective) self-assertion.

"Thiaroye" has posed a challenge to the close relationship between Senegal and its former colonial power; the challenge is evident in the decades of Senegalese public silence, and in the recent and limited ways in which the Massacre has become a subject of both French and Senegalese state discourse. The independent Senegalese state first publically acknowledged the colonial Massacre in 2004, during the administration of former President Abdoulaye Wade,[36] when his state initiated the annual celebration of the colonial soldier, and the Military Cemetery of Thiaroye became a site of annual state visits. A renovation of the cemetery was completed in 2011, including the addition of a structure to house a projected "memorial museum." France still adheres to the official colonial record, albeit with recent expressions of doubt regarding the accuracy of its own public version of events. The soldiers revolted, thirty-five were killed as a result; their actions constituted a military

---

[34] Zmitri Erasmus, "Introduction" to *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place*, ed. Erasmus, 24-26. My claim is informed by Erasmus' call for the ethical embrace of a "Coloured identity." She argues that Coloured claims to black or African identity can confers a moral authority that is not true to historical experience and present reality, and advocates for the adoption of "Coloured" because it does not "deny" the particular "complicity" of Coloured people within an apartheid racial hierarchy.

[35] For historical accounts that provide more detailed information and analysis, see among others, Myron Echenberg, "Tragedy at Thiaroye: The Senegalese Soldiers' Uprising of 1944" in *African Labor History,* ed. Peter Gutkind, Robin Cohen, and Jean Copans (Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1978), 109-128; and Armelle Mabon, "La révolte de Thiaroye" in *Prisonniers de guerre «indigenes» : Visages oubliés de la France occupée* (Paris: Éditions La Découverte, 2010), 193-211.

[36] Wade's commitment to honoring the contribution of African colonial soldiers is said to date to his participation in the French commemoration of the sixtieth anniversary of the August 1944 landing in Provence of Free French forces, many Africans among them.

mutiny, and the response was justified, if tragic. In the words of President Hollande before the Senegalese National Assembly in October 2012 - the first occasion a French president had publically acknowledged the event - the massacre was "une repression sanglante," "a bloody repression." In the same speech, Hollande promised that the French state would give all the relevant government files to Senegal.[37] On November 30, 2014, the eve of the seventieth anniversary of the Massacre, Hollande visited the Military Cemetery of Thiaroye and, later the same day, gave Senegalese President Sall an electronic copy of the promised files.

However, these official state acknowledgements disavow important aspects of the Massacre, even as they publically assert that killings occurred. Despite the symbolism of the location and the date, and despite the information presumably contained in the files, Hollande's 2014 speech neither related new historical information, nor admitted to French responsibility for a massacre. The speech repeatedly referenced a shared, French and African, *mémoire* (eight occurrences), and multiple acts of remembering and of "not forgetting." Hollande declares, for example: "j'avais rappelé la dette de sang qui unit la France à plusieurs pays d'Afrique, dont le Sénégal"(I recalled the blood debt that unites France to several African countries, Senegal among them).[38] He never employs the word "massacre," preferring instead "la repression sanglante de Thiaroye," (the bloody repression of Thiaroye), "des événements de Thiaroye," (the events of Thiaroye), and "cette affreuse tragédie de Thiaroye" (this horrific tragedy of Thiaroye).[39]

For generations of Francophone African intellectuals and activists, the event has been unequivocally understood as a "massacre" and it has symbolized French colonial injustice. Within Senegal, however, the Massacre has occupied a distinct place in a domestic debate about decolonization: under Senghor's administration, to evoke Thiaroye was to evoke the neocolonialism of his regime.[40] The Thiaroye Massacre could be made to usefully signal enduring forms of colonial violence, but the event also poses specific challenges to Senegalese nationalist discourses because it gestures towards forms of complicity that were unique to colonial rule in Senegal: to the regime of citizenship and subjecthood within Senegal and to the unique position of Senegal within French West Africa. Colonial Senegal legislated two unequal categories of black being: (black) French citizens and (black) French subjects. *Originaires*, those "originally" from one of Senegal's Four French Communes, of which Dakar was one, were French citizens, formally equal to the white French of Paris or Dakar. They were conscripted to serve in integrated units of the colonial army, just as French men anywhere were obligated to perform military service. They were rights-possessing citizens, even as they had no right to reject the colonial rule under which they lived. Some of these citizens occupied positions within the colonial political apparatus. However, the vast majority of West Africans, Senegalese included, were subjects, not citizens. They lived under a separate code of law, *l'indigénat,*

---

37 François Hollande, "Discours de M. le Président de la République devant l'Assemblée nationale de la République du Sénégal," October 12, 2012, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-de-m-le-president-de-la-republique-devant-l-assemblee-nationale-de-la-republique-du-senegal.

38 By contrast, in the 2014 speech in the Military Cemetery, "histoire" is referenced only three times and always in close proximity to remembrance; at the beginning of the speech, in conjunction with "memory" and, in the speech's concluding sentence, as a part of a promise to "not forget." François Hollande, "Discours au cimitière de Thiaroye," November 30, 2014, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-au-cimetiere-de-thiaroye.

39 In Senegal, the Massacre may be referred to as "Thiaroye 44," "Musiba Thiaroye" (The "catastrophe" or "suffering" of Thiaroye) or simply "Thiaroye."

40 Senegal remains the West African Francophone country most closely aligned with France. Despite the fact that the Massacre took place in Senegal, for decades there was almost no public acknowledgement of it, as there was in adjacent Mali and Guinea. As colonial territories, both had contributed large numbers of soldiers to the *tirailleurs*.

the men conscripted into the segregated units of *tirailleurs*, and subject to forced non-military labor. In Thiaroye, in 1944, black French citizens lived a few hundred meters from where, within the military camp, white and black colonial soldiers killed members of a black subject army.

Senegalese national discourses must also reckon with, or avoid, the uniquely complicit position of colonial Senegal, and its French citizen elite, in the creation and maintenance of the French Empire in West Africa. Senegal was the base and the *jardin d'essaie* of the French Imperial project in Sub-Saharan Africa: the first territory to be conquered, it was also the site of the establishment of the military force of West African subjects, the *tirailleurs sénégalais*, which went on to incorporate soldiers from throughout West Africa as it conquered those territories on behalf of the Empire. The first colonial schools in French West Africa, and eventually, the only university, were established in Senegal. Members of a Senegalese citizen elite administered the Empire, working throughout French West Africa as teachers, civil servants, and merchants.

The colonial distinction between citizens and subjects, including its manifestation in military service, has been minimized in postcolonial renditions of Senegalese national history. One indication of this is that for post-independence generations, it seems, *tirailleur* means simply "colonial soldier." The dual regime which governed black people under colonial rule has little importance for the way colonial soldiering, and colonial history more broadly, is understood. Colonial military participation is selectively, and briefly presented - narratives laud the role of Africans in liberating France, but do not dwell on their role in maintaining French empire; textbooks present the phenomenon of colonial military participation, but do not reflect on the dual regime of citizen and subject, and the corresponding forms of military participation. These elisions do not constitute omissions: no one denies the historical roles of *tirailleurs* or the existence of *originaires,* or the fact that the French colonial army killed *tirailleurs* at Thiaroye. Rather, these facts are relatively neglected; they are mentioned in passing, but their possible implications for the past and the present are not explored. They are incompatible with a dualistic story of the nation: they fit neither the doubled character of the Senghorian state narrative, nor the opposition between indigenous resistance and European oppression that structures Leftist nationalist histories.[41]

With careful crafting, the Thiaroye Massacre can be made to illustrate a dichotomous version of the French colonial project. However, the historical facts of the Massacre allude to complicit positions that characterized not only the Massacre but the French colonial project in Africa more broadly: the position of Senegal within French West Africa, the position of the black colonial soldier in the violent creation and maintenance of Empire; and the position of the black French *originaire* of the Four Communes. However, the historical facts of the Massacre, and aspects of the narratives that surround it, uncomfortably allude to the complexity of the positions that colonial rule demanded. In the killings themselves, and in the larger political context, race does not neatly correlate with victimhood or perpetration, nor with the political identities of metropolitan citizen or colonial subject.

In discourses about the colonial past, certain subjects are disavowed or elided not simply because they occupied complicit positions within the colonial hierarchy, but because complicity in a colonial structure was associated with degraded positions within a traditional Wolof social structure: until

[41] These dualistic national narratives will be discussed in Chapter Four.

well into the twentieth-century, the *tirailleurs* were essentially a slave army.[42] I suggest that an undignified or non-person status is part of what is rejected in the selective postcolonial disavowal of the *tirailleur* specifically, and of colonial structural complicity more generally.

The traditional Wolof social structure produces understandings of personhood that remain operative in postcolonial narratives and lived realities. Only certain subjects - free and high-caste - are imagined as political actors in their own right, and as endowed with full social dignity. Three hierarchical binary pairs constitute the basis of the structure.[43] Each term of a pair refers to an endogamous group that is traditionally understood to be biologically distinct.[44] The binary opposition of *gor* (free) and *jaam* (slave) forms the basis of the structure. *Gor* is further divided into the superior *géer* (high-caste) and the inferior *ñeeño* (low-caste). *Ñeeño,* in turn, is composed of two hierarchical categories: the relatively higher status artisan castes,[45] and the inferior *sab-lekk*, whose work is to sing or speak for others. The griot - who today largely stands in for the broader grouping of *sab-lekk* - is singer, drummer, (oral) historian, entertainer; a figure degraded by his dependency upon the *géer*. He is allowed a verbal and physical expressiveness that is not publically permitted to the *géer,* who himself adheres to a code of reticence and modesty that is coded as noble. The griot's function of proxy expression is essential yet degraded; while this communication serves a crucial political role, the griot could not be a political actor in his own right.[46]

The imagined Senegalese postcolonial national subject is free, *gor*, and high-caste, *géer*. In some discourses, he is imagined specifically as the *ceddo* - the Wolof warrior of the past. While historically the *ceddo* was a low-caste warrior of slave descent, in certain nationalist reimaginings, he is the free, uncasted, national subject of resistance. Some Senegalese cultural producers of *géer* descent, Ousmane Sembène among them, have positioned themselves as griot; one consequence of this positioning can be the authorizing of a particular narrative of an African past.[47] *Ceddo*, griot (in Wolof, *géwel*); and *tirailleur* are imaginatively transformed and appropriated, and the degraded social status that attached to each term is disavowed.

The literary production of the Thiaroye Massacre has been bound up with the political history of Senegal, and with Léopold Sédar Senghor - poet, Negritude philosopher, and the first president of Senegal.[48] In the 1930s, Senghor was one of the three founding "fathers" of the Negritude

---

42 See Myron Echenberg, *Colonial Conscripts: The Tirailleurs Senegalais in French West Africa, 1857-1960* (Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1991).

43 Other basic divisions, such as that between *buur* and *baadolo*, (king and subject/peasant), *góor* and *jigéen* (man and woman), I do not address here, in part because these are not exclusive binary pairs. Both can be understood to produce a third term, the category of *jambuur* and *góor-jigéen* ("noble" and "man-woman") respectively.

44 In Wolof thought, personhood has both social and biological dimensions. To be a person is the outcome of behavior: you are not born a person, but you may become one - hence the verb, *nitee* - to become *nit*, person. However, *nit* can also functions as a biological category: if one is *nit*, one is human; to be a *nit* is not to be an animal.

45 Among the artisan castes, the *jëf-lekk,* are blacksmiths, jewelers, weavers, cloth dyers, and carvers.

46 See Abdoulaye Bara Diop, *La société wolof: les systemes d'inégalité et de domination* (Paris: Karthala, 1981). For an analysis of the way in which gender figures in within a Wolof timocratic hierarchy, see Ivy Mills, "Sutura: Gendered Honor, Social Death, and the Politics of Exposure in Senegalese Literature and Popular Culture" (Ph.D. Diss, University of California, Berkeley, 2011). See Page Eight for Mills' discussion of the social and biological dimensions of Wolof notions of the person (*nit*).

47 See for example Françoise Pfaff, "The Uniqueness of Ousmane Sembène's Cinema" in *Ousmane Sembène: Dialogues with Critics and Writers,* ed. Samba Gadjigo et al. (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993), 14-21.

48 For sources on the political history of Senegal, see Momar-Coumba Diop and Mamadou Diouf, eds, *Le Sénégal sous Abdou Diouf : Etat et Société* (Paris: Karthala, 1990); and Donal Cruise O'Brien, Momar-Coumba Diop, and Mamadou

movement, which, decades later, was to function as a national cultural ideology during his presidency (1960-1980). Negritude, in Senghor's articulation of the cultural philosophy, conceived of African specificity (tradition) in relation to European specificity; all cultures would converge in an ideal future "universal civilization." In its iteration as Senegalese state philosophy, Negritude explained the position of Senegal (and of Africa) in relation to Europe, and defined a framework within which Senegal would relate to the former colonial power. Negritude did not merely inform the regime's *politique culturelle*; it was also a means through which a notion of African, and national, unity was imagined and enforced, and the repression of dissent justified.

In 1948, Senghor authored the first literary text of Thiaroye, the poem "Tyaroye"; yet the decades of his presidency are notable for the silence which surrounded the Massacre. For most of the twenty years of Senghor's presidency, Senegal was an authoritarian state. The 1960s saw the progressive concentration of power in the hands of a single head of state. In December 1962, Senghor announced that then Prime Minister Mamadou Dia, with his co-conspirators within the government, had attempted a coup d'etat. Dia, Valdiodio Ndiaye, and ten other members of government were arrested and sentenced to prison. A 1963 constitutional referendum abolished the post of prime minister and Senghor became the [single] head of a presidential, and not parliamentary regime. The same year, the results of the first post-independence presidential elections proclaimed a 100% majority for Senghor;[49] the march in protest of electoral fraud was met with violence. By the end of 1966, all opposition parties had been either banned or absorbed into the ruling party. From 1966 until 1974, Senegal was a de facto single party state. There was little independent press; it is difficult to know much of how, or if, the Thiaroye Massacre figured in underground or unpublished textual articulations of resistance during this period.

During the second half of the decade, new independent periodicals and Leftist cultural associations were created. In 1974, the regime began democratic reforms;[50] it introduced a limited type of multi-party system and seventeen political prisoners were released. Among them were the imprisoned brothers of Omar Blondin Diop (who appears in Chapter One), Dia, Ndiaye and their surviving co-accused (two had died in prison). During this period, Senghor's state, and its cultural philosophy of Negritude, was the open target of the Senegalese Left. Culture was a primary terrain for nation-building in the new state, and therefore also a primary terrain on which to contest the state's construction of the nation.

Two postcolonial Senegalese textual articulations of the Thiaroye Massacre were, in part, challenges to Negritude and to Senghor's State. Cheikh Faty's Faye's play *Aube de sang* was published in 1977 and 1978 in the new opposition periodical, *And Soppi*. Boubacar Boris Diop's play *Thiaroye terre rouge* was published in 1981, in a single volume with the novel *L temps de Tamango*, which itself references Senegalese cultural engagements with the Massacre.[51] *Aube africaine*, a choreo-poem by the Guinean

---

Diouf, eds, *La construction de l'Etat au Sénégal* (Paris: Karthala, 2002).

49 Senghor received 100% of the valid votes and 99.47% of all votes cast. In the national legislative elections held the same day, the ruling party received 94.2% of the vote and thus won all the seats in the National Assembly. "Elections in Senegal," *African Elections Database*. http://africanelections.tripod.com/sn.html. Accessed March 18, 2014.

50 By Senghor's departure at the end of 1980, three political parties had been recognized, each representing one of the four recognized political currents (the ruling party occupied the "Socialist current").

51 Boubacar Boris Diop, *Le temps de Tamango, suivi de "Thiaroye terre rouge"* (Paris: Harmattan, 1981). The novel refers to Faty Faye and his 1973 Master's thesis in History (part of which treats the Massacre). In addition, within the novel, one character writes a play about the Massacre, as did B.B Diop. The fictional playwright's friend wants to write a

Fodiba Keïta, is the other colonial-era text of Thiaroye.[52] *Aube*, rather than Senghor's "Tyaroye," functioned as the imagined literary precedessor of these two postcolonial Senegalese plays. Both *Aube de sang* and *Terre rouge* honored Keïta's text and the anti-colonial stance of Guinea, rather than Senghor's poem and his Senegal.[53] Abdou Diouf, Senghor's hand-picked successor, was Senegal's president from 1981 until 2000. Ousmane Sembène's film *Camp de Thiaroye* (1987),[54] by far the best-known text of the Massacre, was primarily produced by, and then banned by, Diouf's state. *Camp* belongs to neither the oppositional context of the 1970s that preceded its production nor the "era of the *tirailleur*" over which Abdoulaye Wade would preside two decades later.[55]

The presidential elections of 2000 brought the first change of ruling party; Wade's state would, with some ambivalence, acknowledge the Massacre. A renewed discursive production of Thiaroye occurred during his presidency (2000-2012). Wade publically recognized the Massacre, initiated state celebrations of the colonial soldier, and authored with playwright M'baye Gana Kébé a play devoted to the Massacre, *Une fresque pour Thiaroye* (2008).[56] Faty Faye's play was brought out by Harmattan, in a slim single volume (2005).

Unlike other scholarly treatments of literary representations of the Massacre, this project is specifically concerned with Senegalese texts and their relationship to Senegalese nationalist discourses and a changing Senegalese political context. I locate the Senegalese literary production of Thiaroye within Senegalese articulations of anti-colonial (and anti-neocolonial) politics and within internationally circulating discourses of memory. Instead of situating my analysis within the idiom of collective memory, I look at how, and with what consequences, some texts produce the past through memory. Rather than asserting that texts produce or instantiate a memory of African "resistance," I examine how they explore, elide, or invite explorations of structural complicity.

Much of the small body of comparative literary scholarship on the Thiaroye Massacre takes for granted the notion of a collective (and resistant) memory and participates in the creation of a discourse of memory surrounding the Thiaroye Massacre. A foundational essay by Janosz Riesz traces the representation of the Massacre chronologically through several texts, beginning with Senghor's "Tyaroye" and concluding with *Camp*. It is included in a collection titled *Conflits de mémoire,* and, in the essay, "memory" is the term that permits a recognition of differing accounts and representations of the past; implicitly, while the past is singular, its "memories" are multiple and potentially conflicting.[57] Yet, within the essay, this notion of memory allows an elision of the historical circumstances and political contestations that have made Thiaroye into an event that has

---

screenplay based upon the play, as the real-life Ben Diogaye Bèye did.

52 I reference *Aube africaine* (Paris: P. Seghers, 1965). The play was first published in 1949 in the journal *Réveil.* See Sabrina Parent, *Cultural Representations of Massacre: Reinterpretations of the Mutiny of Senegal* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014), 49.

53 For example, the title of Faty Faye's play refers to that of Keïta. The protagonist of Diop's play shares the name of Keïta's protagonist. In addition, like *Aube africaine*, *Thiaroye terre rouge* begins in an African village and concludes with a gesture towards a transformed African future.

54 Ousmane Sembène and Thierno F. Sow, *Camp de Thiaroye,* Senegal and Tunisia: SNPC and SATPEC, 1987.

55 In Dakar today, people are more likely to have watched a Wade-era television documentary, or have heard the songs of Ouza Diallo and Baba Maal, and, among younger people, to be familiar with the reference in the name of the Thiaroye-based hip-hop group, BMG-44.

56 Abdoulaye Wade and M'baye Gana Kébé, *Une fresque pour Thiaroye : théâtre* (Dakar: Éditions Maguilen, 2008).

57 Janos Riesz, "Thiaroye 44: un evénément historique et ses représentations littéraires" in *Conflits de Mémoire,* ed. Véronique Bonnet (Paris: Karthala, 2003), 303-319.

accrued multiple political stakes. Riesz addresses, in passing, the decades-long gap between Senghor's 1948 poem and the textual production of the 1970s though a reference to "memories":

> Les poétes et les écrivains ont mis longtemps avant de lever l'hypothèque qui pesait sur les relations entre les deux pays; les débats autour de certain ouvrages littéraires et certains films sont la pour prouver que la dette n'est pas encore payée, que les mémoires restent conflictuelles.
>
> [Poets and writers waited a long time before advancing the notion that has weighed upon the relationship between the two countries; the debates surrounding particular literary works and films prove that the debt is not yet paid, that memories still conflict.] [58]

The only monograph devoted to the analysis of literary representations of the Thiaroye Massacre, Sabrina Parent's recent *Cultural Representations of the Thiaroye Massacre: Reinterpretations of the Mutiny of Senegal,* participates in the memory project that many of the objects of its analysis themselves articulate. The notion of collective memory frames Parent's interpretation of the texts of Thiaroye:

> All these documents representing Thiaroye participate in forming the "collective memory" of West African people. Developed by French philosopher and sociologist Maurice Halbwachs, the concept of "collective memory" is useful in pointing out that artists have transformed testimonies of survivors, dying because of old age, into memories of a people, for whom Thiaroye assumes a role of social cohesion.[59]

Scholars have specifically treated Sembène's film, *Camp de Thiaroye,* within the idiom of memory. In Riesz's essay, the metaphor of memory facilitates his conclusion that film is the representation most suited to the resistant task of "transmission"; *Camp* appears as the text most suited to a memorial task.[60] Scholars have understood the film as the articulation of a resistant memory or as a "counter-memory."[61]

"Resistance" is the primary concept and lens through which Parent analyzes Sembène's film in particular; the chapter dedicated to the film is titled "*Camp de Thiaroye* by Sembène Ousmane: Art and/as Resistance." The notion of historical accuracy is bound up with Parent's understanding of the film as enacting a resistant African recovery of the past. She argues that the film is largely historically accurate; where it diverges from the conventions of realism and from the historical record, it fulfils its role as [resistant] "art" as opposed to "history."[62]

The notion of a resistant memory project is also integral to David Murphy's analysis of *Camp*. In his

---

58 Ibid, 313.

59 Sabrina Parent, *Cultural Representations of Massacre: Reinterpretations of the Mutiny of Senegal* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2014), 7.

60 Riesz, "Thiaroye," 315.

61 Murphy and Parent, as I will discuss, analyze the film as a form of resistant memory. In *Memory and Complicity*, Sanyal refers to the film as a "colonial countermemory" (132). Popular media has engaged with the film as a reflection of the past, as when, for example, an historical account of the Massacre is illustrated with stills from Sembène's film. See "Le massacre de Thiaroye," August 11, 2013. https://dakarecho.wordpress.com/tag/vincent-auriol-a-dakar

62 Parent, *Cultural Representations*, 103.

volume devoted to Sembène's films, the chapter that treats *Camp de Thiaroye* is titled, "Dismembering Empire, Re-membering Resistance: The Memory of Colonisation in *Emitaï, Ceddo* & *Camp de Thiaroye*." Memory and resistance appear as conjoined concepts, as when, for example, Murphy asserts the allegorial role of the silence of a mute soldier, Pays, and goes on to cite Sembène's explanation of the memorial role of his film:

> Pays' silence is emblematic of the silence surrounding the story of the massacre that took place at Thiaroye. Denied by the French and deliberately overlooked by the Senegalese authorities, keen not to offend their former colonial masters, the massacre at Thiaroye becomes an important symbol in the fight for the memory of colonisation. Sembène has described his film almost as an act of 'resurrection' for those who died at Thiaroye:
>
> [...] thanks to the film, these men are no longer dead. The French killed them but their cemetery still exists in Dakar. We still take care of it but my government never mentions it. It does not appear on any official document. No one comes to lay flowers on their graves. Before this film, these were simply anonymous graves, but all that has changed now. Now, when we have friends visiting, we say, 'Let's go to the cemetery in Thiaroye,' and they come with us to see the cemetery. There are graves and crosses but no names or identity numbers. But we are keeping alive the memory of their history.[63]

Unlike Murphy, and Sembène, I do not approach *Camp de Thiaroye* as a form or a facilitator of resistant memory. Instead, I argue that, in part through its reliance upon a notion of collective memory, Sembène's film elides structural complicity and constitutes a departure from the complex critical impulse that animated some of the oppositional cultural production of the 1970s. In my analysis, one text in particular, B.B. Diop's *Thiaroye terre rouge*, epitomizes that critical impulse. It engages with a multiplicity of history, spaces, and political stances; it nowhere positions itself as a memory or mnemonic device.

Sembène's *Camp de Thiaroye* was produced in place of a screenplay authored by Ben Diogaye Bèye and Boubacar Boris Diop that was based upon Diop's play, *Thiaroye terre rouge*. In 1984, "Thiaroye 44" won the screenplay competition held by the newly formed Senegalese state film production entity, the *Société nouvelle de promotion cinématographique* (SNPC). Production work on "Thiaroye 44," to be directed by Bèye, began. A contract transferring rights to the screenplay (*contrat de cession de droits*) to the SNPC was signed in August 1985.[64] The SNPC provided office space and funding; Bèye made trips to North Africa and hired an Algerian co-director who joined him in Dakar for months of pre-production work. Casting calls were held and shooting was imminent. Weeks before shooting was to have begun, the SNPC informed Bèye that work on the film must pause, and the financial accounts examined. The pause, which was neither formalized nor further explained, proved to be permanent. That same year, Sembène was appointed a member of the board of the *Conseil d'administraftion* of the SNPC; and work on his film about Thiaroye began.[65] The SNPC co-produced Sembène's film in

---

63 David Murphy, *Sembène: Imagining Alternative in Film and Fiction* (Trenton: Africa World Press, 2001), 162-163.

64 *Ben Diogaye Bèye v. SNPC*, "Conclusions d'appel," May 17, 1989, Dakar.

65 Ben Diogaye Bèye, in discussion with the author, April 29, 2013, Dakar.

1987.[66] Rumors of French intervention surround the state body's abandonment of "Thiaroye-44," the appointment of Sembène to the board of the SNPC in the role of president, and the subsequent production of his SNPC-supported film on the same historical subject.[67]

After showing for several months in Senegal, *Camp de Thiaroye* was banned. The banning is often mentioned in the literature. However, the fact that Sembène's film was produced with state support, and under ethically and legally ambiguous circumstances, is perhaps more notable than its subsequent banning. Considering the non-production and non-performance of the earlier Senegalese dramas of Thiaroye, the state-supported production of Sembène's film seems more striking than its belated banning. Faty Faye's play and B.B. Diop's play were not, to my knowledge, performed. "Thiaroye-44" was never produced. Senghor's "Tyaroye" is not one of the best known of his poems. Sembène's film was not only produced; it has been received as a critical African act of remembrance. I suggest we turn our attention to the text, *Thiaroye terre rouge*, upon which a film has not been based; a text that is preoccupied with complicity and that provokes questions about the relationships between different spaces and times of violence.

In the first chapter, "The Space Between Words and Things," I describe the shared elisions of multiple memory projects and argue for the necessity of critical space that memory discourses often collapse. Different memory discourses produce similarly dichotomous notions of historical violence and a similarly fixed understanding of place. They therefore occlude the ways in which the structural violence of the past remains in the present. An internationally circulating memory discourse surrounding Gorée Island, and varied articulations of Senegalese national memory, reproduce similar elisions of structural violence and structural complicity. Thiaroye, located eight just across the bay from the "memory island," is among the elisions of an international memory discourse, as is the figure of the postcolonial political prisoner Omar Blondin Diop, who died in detention on Gorée Island in 1973. While recent nationalist evocations of Thiaroye and O.B. Diop celebrate Diop and the *tirailleurs*, they risk inserting them into a vision of an undifferentiated historical *ceddo* resistance that also elides structural violence and complicity.

I begin by examining how a dominant internationally-circulating memory discourse of Gorée Island, "site of memory" of the Middle Passage, collapses the space between interpretation and the object of interpretation - most fundamentally, the physical landscape of the Island itself. Structural complicity and the Thiaroye Massacre itself are actively elided in a commemorative plaque in which excerpts of Senghor's poem, "Tyaroye" and Césaire's critique of colonialism, are "made to speak" the grief of the Middle Passage, rather than to the colonial violence that is the object of the original texts. An adjacent plaque honoring the existence of an imagined trans-atlantic black family, a Diasporic "La famille de Gorée," elides the existence of the *jaam* families who lived upon Gorée, and who historically composed the majority of its population. I suggest that attention to a particular building - today the Senegalese

---

[66] Although the SNPC and Bèye were not bound by a written production contract, the 1989 Senegalese Court of Appeals judgment (cited above) ruled that an oral production agreement was operating, and awarded damages to Bèye based upon the unilateral annulation of unwritten *rapports de réalisation* between the two parties, as well as upon the unilateral annulation of the written rights contract.

[67] For a very brief sketch of events, and an allusion to French influence upon the production of Sembène's film and the "non-production" of Bèye and Diop's film, see also the short piece written by the poet and director Mahama Johnson Traoré: "Cinema and Freedoms: Reflections of a Senegalese Film-maker," *African Experiences of Cinema*, ed. Imruh Bakari and Mbye B. Cham, trans. Paul Willemen (London: British Film Institute, 1996), 67-69. Traoré was Director General of the SNPC when "Thiaroye-44" was beginning production. It is he who, according to Bèye, communicated the decision to halt work on the film.

Historical Museum, once a colonial fort, and a postcolonial prison - might allow to conceive of Gorée as a political site of complicity and of multiple disavowals, rather than a single kind of grief and a univocal memory.

National memory discourses are also articulated on, and upon, Gorée Island; Senegalese state-produced guidebooks to the Island reproduce similar elisions of indigenous structural violence and colonial violence. While national discourses about the past might be expected to counter the totalizing tendency of an international discourse with the specificity of an African local past, they too elide some forms of structural complicity. Articulations of a commemorative project surrounding Omar Blondin Diop, a postcolonial political prisoner who died in detention on Gorée in 1973, reproduce some of the elisions of the internationally circulating memory discourse. In the vision of national resistance that emerges in the Senegalese Historical Museum's "Resistance" exhibit, in which a plaque to O.B. Diop was mounted in 2013, Diop is cast another male figure of national resistance, and the historical exhibit forecloses a critical engagement with indigenous slavery. In my analysis of a Wolof poem that commemorates Diop, I consider the conception of a national resistance that is implied and foreclosed by the parallel it constructs between him and the soldiers of Thiaroye. Finally, I analyze two very different texts that surround Diop: the 1973 Senegalese government white paper that asserts that O.B. Diop's death was a suicide and Jean-Luc Godard's film *La Chinoise* (1967),[68] in which "Omar" appears, ambiguously, "as himself." I argue that the demand to represent the past informs the way in which the first text separates historical fact and commentary, and that the absence of that demand informs the ways in which *La Chinoise* simultaneously collapses and holds apart the space between the world and what we make of it.

In the second chapter, "Curating District Six," I focus on ways that the idiom of memory constructs analogously normative and pure proto-national subjects; these subjects do not occupy complicit positions, and suggestions of complicity do not attach to them. The recalled community appears as a bounded unified family from which betrayal and violence are absent. In "Curating District Six," I focus upon the ways that elements of two museum exhibits deploy memory, and I suggest that these these deployments signal largely unacknowledged contestations over the different ways that groups were implicated in apartheid violence and over the identity of the post-apartheid national subject. I first look to a contemporary South African high school history textbook, *In Search of the Past.*[69]

I examine explanations of "group identity" and "heritage" in which national memory, coded as "heritage," is ambivalently treated as a "real" phenomenon, not (only) as a construct of nationalism. I suggest that this ambivalence towards "memory" allows a particular version of the national past to appear as the past itself - within a generally critical text of post-apartheid South African history. The District's appearance in the textbook, which I go on to examine, suggests the degree to which the District is conflated with the District Six Museum, the institution that claims to represent its memory. The textbook's reatment of the District also suggests the extent to which "District Six" has come to signify "destroyed cosmopolitan community" and "the non-racial democratic nation" far beyond the physical bounds of the Museum.

I then analyze elements of two museum exhibits in which claims to memory are particularly prominent: "Memory Traces," a component of the District Six Museum permanent exhibit, and a

---

[68] Jean-Luc Godard, *La Chinoise* (France, Productions de la Guéville, 1967).

[69] Jean Bottaro, Pippa Visser, and Nigel Worden, *In Search of the Past: Grade 11, Learner's Book* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa, 2006).

temporary exhibit of the South African Jewish Museum in Cape Town, The Jews of District Six: Another Time, Another Place (November 2012-March 2013). In "recalling" only a familal unity of the past, both "Memory Traces" and Another Time disavow historical positions of complicity and those who occupied those positions: the "Coloured" and the not-quite-white, working-class Jew, respectively. In their interpellations of the Museum visitor as a remembering subject, both exhibits suggest that a post-apartheid national subject should resemble the normative family member of the past.

"Memory Traces," despite the cosmopolitan object of the dominant District Six memory discourse, remembers a specifically black local past; it elides the possibility of black complicity and an explication of the structurally complicit position of "Coloured" with white supremacist colonial and apartheid regimes. The memory project surrounding a specifically black past supports the claim to a physical site of national remembrance on the land of District Six, with which "Memory Traces" culminates. Within the context of the District Six Museum exhibit as a whole, "Memory Traces" is notable for this explicitly identitarian object of remembrance and the foregrounding of memory. I argue that the claim upon memory - for the national significance of a site - facilitates the presentation of an identitarian object and the elision of historical complexity (and complicity).

Another Time produces the historical "cosmopolitan" District Six as the container for a cohesive and clearly bounded Jewish world. In its reliance upon photographic portraits and its preoccupation with family life, the exhibit evokes the family photo album of a particular imagined Jewish family - heteronormative, hardworking, perpetually immigrant, and always-already white. By eliding or minimizing power-laden differences within the family, and neglecting to portray the connections between Jews and non-Jews, the family album disavows the complex implication of Jews within an entrenching system of white supremacy. In portraying the District and its Jewish occupants as fixed in time and isolated in space, the album suggests that the Jews were immigrants occupying a "floating" neighborhood, and that only upon moving out from the District did they become South African. Particular Jewish figures are also implicitly disavowed: the queer Jew, the black Jew of racially-mixed heritage, and the working-class Jew who remained resident in the District after most Jews had left.

In the chapter's concluding section, I consider a Victorian painting of Cape Town within two post-apartheid Cape Town contexts. James Ford's *Holiday Time in Cape Town in the 20th Century*[70] is pictured on the cover of the primary ("illustrated") social history of Cape Town, but it is addressed only perfunctorily within the volume. A reproduction of the painting hangs in the home of former District Six residents where, by contrast, it featured as an important referent in the history I learned there. The elision of the painting's political and temporal complexity in one context, and the painting's value in a very different context, should provoke questions about how overlapping projects of post-apartheid history and memory have conceived of the archive of the South African past.

In the third chapter, "Theorizing Complicity: Three Texts by Richard Rive," I consider how the disavowals of overlapping discourses of memory have narrowed conceptions of apartheid violence and of an anti-apartheid literary tradition. Post-apartheid discourses of memory, and the notion of

---

[70] James Ford, *Holiday Time in Cape Town in the 20th Century in Honour of the Expected Arrival of the Governor-General of UNITED South Africa* (1899).

South African nationhood they inform, have produced the quiet marginalization of District Six-born author, Richard Rive; as they have shaped the post-apartheid reception and neglect of three of his works: *Buckingham Palace, District Six* (1986), "Riva" (1983), and "My Sister was a Playwhite" (1955).[71] I argue that the selective recognition, neglect, and disavowal of aspects of Rive's life and work speak to a constricting conception of the South African national subject - black, male, and heteronormative - and to a parallel imaginary of apartheid violence as a series of encounters between white perpetrators upon black struggle heroes (or victims), rather than constituting a capitalist structure of white supremacy that implicated black people in a variety of different positions. *Buckingham Palace* has gained the most post-apartheid attention; I argue that the novel's implication in the memory discourse of District Six, and the dominance of the testimonial form within the novel, makes the work amenable to primarily local readings as a popular text of memory and heritage. These traits also mean that the novel leaves queer sexuality and positions of complicity largely unexplored. *Buckingham Palace* indicts apartheid through a direct parallel between apartheid and the Holocaust. In "Riva," on the other hand, surreal proximities between disparate subject positions and histories of violence allow the text to evoke the complexity of historically complicit positions, and therefore to point to the centrality of apartheid's structural violence. "Riva" constructs "skew parallels" between Table Mountain and Babi Yar, District Six and Long Street, apartheid and the Holocaust, off-white Jew and off-white "so-called" Coloured.

One of Rive's earliest stories, penned under the gender transgressive pseudonym of Mary X, was published in the white-owned black magazine, *Africa,* the short-lived "little sister" to the famous *Drum* magazine.[72] While *Drum* and its Sophiatown home have been celebrated as lost black cultural spaces that prefigure post-apartheid urban culture, *Africa,* Rive, and District Six fall outside of an implicitly racialized, masculine, and heteronormative vision of post-apartheid culture.

Africa, and the publication of "My Sister" within it, suggests a different, and more inclusive conception of the continent than contemporary nationalist and Pan-African discourses imagine: racially, culturally, and regionally heterogeneous, and inclusive of Cape Town. It also suggests a more capacious notion of resistant black cultural production and a more ambiguous conception of resistance itself: *Africa!* portrays varied forms of black experience and resistance, particularly women's experience and domestic drama, within the constraints of a white-owned and controlled periodical published under apartheid. Both District Six memory and apartheid racism are central to "My Sister." The account is produced by the narrator's recollection; her "confession" of her sister's experience of racial passing and its impact on their family. The District plays an important role in the notion of home and the racialized Cape Town geography that this narrator recalls. Yet, the story was not produced within a political project that mobilized District Six "memory." "My Sister" can therefore provoke a reconsideration of both memory and African literary resistance: read in light of

---

[71] "Riva" in *Advance, Retreat* (Cape Town: David, Philip, 1983); *Buckingham Palace, District Six* (Cape Town: David Philip, 1986), 60-72; "My Sister was a PlayWhite" in *Africa!* (July 1955): 27-31. As I note in Chapter Three, an earlier version of "Riva" was published in 1979 and a second edition of *Buckingham Palace* (the text of the novel is unchanged from the first edition) was brought out in 1996.

[72] In his memoir, Rive recounts that Barney Desai, then editor of *The Golden City Post*, commissioned the story and implies that Desai created the pseudonym: "He commissioned me to do a feature article entitled, 'My Sister Was a Playwhite by Mary X'. When I had finished this 'true confession' I took it to his office at Castle Bridge [...]." *Writing Black* (Cape Town: David Philip, 2013), 21. (*Writing Black* was first published in 1981.) Rive does not explain how the story came to be published in *Africa.* However, both publications were owned by the same man - who also owned *Drum* - Jim Bailey.

a commemorative text such as *Buckingham Palace*, "My Sister" can expose limitations that appear particular to memory discourse. Read within scandal-ridden pages of *Africa*, "My Sister" can suggest that African literary resistance might take many forms, including that of a tabloid melodrama of racial passing and familial betrayal.

In the fourth and final chapter, "Siggi," I argue that oppositional Senegalese nationalisms produced varied imaginaries of national resistance and postcolonial nationhood. A nationalist and Pan-Africanist project associated with Sembène, and particularly with his film *Camp de Thiaroye*, imagined the nation as a unified, egalitarian, resistant collective, from which structural complicity is absent; other texts produce more ambivalent and less constricted notions of nationhood, and of historical resistance and complicity. The first project works through the idiom of collective memory; the second project does not.

I analyze articulations of the Thiaroye Massacre in the context of Senegalese oppositional nationalism of the 1970s, and employ two Wolof terms, *ceddo* and *siggi*, to think about the ways that different texts have imagined anti-colonial African resistance and the ideal postcolonial resistant African subject. In nationalist imaginaries, *ceddo* - historically, a Wolof warrior of slave descent - has signified the anti-colonial resistor; *siggi* has signified the upright posture of collective resistant pride. In this chapter, I begin by discussing the *ceddo*, as an historical actor and as an figure within nationalist imaginaries. I argue that the nationalist evocation of the *ceddo* disavows the structural complicity of the historical *ceddo*. That disavowal facilitates the elision of the structural violence of the present and constricts the imaginary of the national subject to a figure who resembles the imagined *ceddo*. The conception of *ceddo* national paternity, and his imagined unambiguous resistance, does not permit the full entrance of another historical subject: the colonial soldier. I then introduce Sembène through the idiom of national *ceddo* fatherhood and examine how the Massacre is evoked as part of a memory of *ceddo* resistance in the periodical he co-founded and co-edited, *Kaddu*.

The remainder of the chapter compares the articulations of *ceddo* present in Sembène's films *Ceddo*[73] and *Camp de Thiaroye,* with the more oblique conceptions of *siggi* resistance that emerge in two other texts of the period: Boubacar Boris Diop's play, *Thiaroye terre rouge*, and "Siggi Nag Faf,"[74] authored by Pathé Diagne. I argue that the concept of *ceddo* dominates the understanding of the massacre produced in *Camp* and in *Kaddu*. These texts are preoccupied with a largely dichotomous relationship of oppression and resistance between France and Africa; and they "remember" the unified black masculine resistance of the *ceddo*. By contrast, Diop's play and Diagne's genre-confounding text are rooted in questions regarding the posture of successful resistance and the identity of the national subject who must *siggi*. Diop's play is concerned with varied forms of African resistance and collaboration, and with challenging Senghor's Senegal on intertwining literary and political terms. The play celebrates and questions the upright posture of resistance, and it provokes questions about how Africans, present and past, are differently implicated in enduring colonial oppression. Diagne's "Siggi Nag Faf!" evokes a sense of nationhood that depends upon *siggi* yet neglects the *ceddo* and the neat dichotomies of external oppression and indigenous resistance that the nationalist deployments of *ceddo* have signaled.

---

[73] Ousmane Sembène, *Ceddo* (Dakar, Doomi Reew Filmi, 1976).
[74] Pathé Diagne, "Siggi Nag Faf," *Siggi,* no. 2 (Feb. 1977): 17-21.

Chapter 1 - The Space between Words and Things

Moi aussi, je parle d'abus, mais pour dire qu'aux anciens - très réels - on en a superposé d'autres - très détestables. On me parle de tyrans locaux mis à la raison ; mais je constate qu'en général ils font très bon ménage avec les nouveaux et que, de ceux-ci aux anciens et vice-versa, il s'est établi, au détriment des peuples, un circuit de bons services et de complicité.[75]
Aimé Césaire, *Discours sur le colonialisme.*

Les «faits», ce sont les choses et les phénomènes tels qu'ils existent objectivement; la «vérité», c'est le lien interne de ces choses et phénomènes, c'est-à-dire les lois qui les régissent [76]
"Omar" speaking in Jean-Luc's *La Chinoise,* and an excerpt of *Le petit livre rouge.*

In this chapter, I argue that different memory discourses produce similarly dichotomous notions of historical violence and a similarly fixed understanding of place, and therefore occlude the ways in which the structural violence of the past remains in the present. An internationally circulating memory discourse surrounding Gorée Island and varied articulations of Senegalese national memory reproduce similar elisions of structural violence and structural complicity. The colonial massacre of Thiaroye, located eight kilometers across the bay from the internationally recognized "memory island," figures among the elisions of both international and national memory discourses. While Senegalese national discourses about the past might be expected to counter the totalizing tendancy of an international discourse with the specificity of an African local past, they too elide structural complicity. Articulations of a commemorative project surrounding Omar Blondin Diop, a young Senegalese intellectual and Leftist revolutionary, and a political prisoner during Senghor's presidency, who died in detention on Gorée Island in 1973, reproduce some of the elisions of internationally memory discourse.

That dominant memory discourse of Gorée Island, "site of memory" of the Middle Passage, collapses the space between interpretation and the object of interpretation - the physical landscape of the Island itself. UNESCO World Heritage narrative "makes the Island speak" a particular "memory" of its past. In the first of two commemorative plaques I examine, the violence of colonialism and the Thiaroye Massacre itself are actively elided in a commemorative plaque in which excerpts - of Senghor's poem "Tyaroye" and Césaire's famous critique of colonialism - are "made to speak" the grief of the Middle Passage, rather than the critiques of colonial violence that the source texts articulate. An adjacent plaque honoring the existence of an imagined trans-atlantic black family, a Diasporic "La famille de

---

[75] Aimé Césaire, *Discours sur le colonialisme,* Paris: Présence africaine, 2004, 23. (*Discours* was originally published in 1950.) "I too talk about abuses, but what I say is that upon the old ones - very real - they have superimposed others - very detestable. They tell me about local tyrants brought to reason; but I note that in general the old tyrants get on very well with the new ones, and that they have established between them, to the detriment of the people, a circuit of mutual assistance and complicity." All translations, unless, otherwise noted, are my own.

[76] Jean-Luc Godard, *La Chinoise* (Paris, Productions de la Guéville, 1967). In the film, Omar does not appear to be quoting a text. In *Le Petit Livre Rouge*, these words are part of the excerpt "Préface et postface aux Enquêtes à la campagne» (Mars et avril 1941) Œuvres choisies de Mao Tsétoung, III." The [electronic] edition that I reference is unpaginated. http://www.chine-informations.com/fichiers/petit-livre-rouge.pdf. "Facts are things and phenomena as they exist objectively. Truth is the internal connections between these things and these phenomena, that is to say, the laws which join them."

Gorée," elides the existence of the *jaam* families who lived upon Gorée, and who historically composed the majority of its population.

National memory discourses are also articulated on Gorée. The National Historical Museum exhibit on historical resistance, within which O.B. Diop's memorial plaque is located, and Senegalese state-produced guidebooks to the Island reproduce similar elisions of indigenous structural violence and colonial violence. In the vision of the past that emerges in the Museum's "Resistance" exhibit, Diop is cast as another male figure of national resistance, and the historical exhibit forecloses any critical engagement with indigenous slavery. His plaque is mounted above the saddles of two *ceddo* warriors that figure within the exhibit proper; its placement positions Diop as a variety of late twentieth-century *ceddo*. In an analogous gesture, the memorial poem that I examine, "Dégluleen Mbokk yi" celebrates Diop and the soldiers of Thiaroye as parallel figures of African resistance. "Dégluleen" thus forecloses a consideration of the complicit position of colonial soldiers, and of the differences between these histories.

Finally, I analyze two very different texts that surround Diop: the 1973 Senegalese government white paper that asserts that his death was a suicide; and Jean-Luc Godard's film *La Chinoise,* in which "Omar" appears, ambiguously, "as himself." I argue that the demand to represent the past informs the way in which the *livre blanc* separates historical fact and commentary. The absence of that demand informs the ways in which *La Chinoise* simultaneously collapses and holds apart the space between the world and what we make of it. While *La Chinoise* can today be viewed within the context of an incipient memorial project surrounding O.B. Diop, such a project did not shape the film. *La Chinoise* itself continuously produces and resists the separation between art and world, representation and represented. This separation-and-refusal-to-separate produces a critical space in which "Omar" can appears both as, and as not, himself, speaking as, and as not, himself.

I am standing in the National History Museum on Gorée. It is May 11, 2013.

A young man holds a cigarette in one hand, an open book in the other. The casual cigarette makes the photograph appear dated, as much as the black and white of the image does. The shirt is bright white, or else so pale that it glows white. The man's whole body seems to curve around the book, right hand cupping across its spine, head craning slightly towards the pages. I cannot read the volume's title, but I think I make out a number: 12.

The book, I later learn, is an issue of Guy Debord's journal, *Situationist International*; Issue Twelve appeared in 1969. The portrait is bordered by a color image of a stone wall; superimposed black letters cross the dim background of stones. Sunlight, pouring through the narrow window above, makes deciphering more difficult:

OMAR BLONDIN DIOP
NE LE 18 SEPTEMBRE 1946 A NIAMEY
MORT EN DETENTION DANS CETTE CELLULE
DANS LA NUIT DU 10 AU 11 MAI 1973

OMAR BLONDIN DIOP
BORN IN NIAMEY SEPTEMBER 18TH 1946
DIED IN THIS CELL IN DETENTION
DURING THE NIGHT OF MAY 10TH TO MAY 11TH 1973

The absence of termporal certainty signals the contestations over O.B. Diop's death and its political meaning: On which side of midnight did he die - how, and why, did he die? Below the plaque, and outside the narrow window, the blue of the bay is dotted with immense container ships. Beyond, the mainland stretches: on the left is Dakar's Plateau, the former colonial city; the green of the present-day French military camp of Bel-Air; then *banlieue* and the so-called "free" industrial zone; Thiaroye, and finally Rufisque, at the base of the Cap Vert peninsula.

In May 2013, O.B. Diop's life was publically commemorated in Senegal for the first time. Long a hero of the Senegalese Left, he began to emerge as a subject of national memory in the extensive media coverage of two tributes.[77] On May 10th, an homage was held at the Université Cheikh Anta Diop in Dakar; "Omar Blondin Diop" was invoked beside the names of icons of the generation of '68 - Daniel Cohn-Bendit, the Panthers and the Situationists. An excerpt of a biographical in-progress film was screened; it included the scene of O.B. Diop's most famous cinematic appearance, in Godard's *La Chinoise*.[78] On May 11th, a memorial plaque was unveiled;[79] the image of O.B. Diop reading is now mounted in the room devoted to resistance in the *Musée historique du Sénégal* on Gorée.

Omar Blondin Diop was born in 1943, in French West Africa, in what was to become the independent nation of Niger. He turned eighteen the year that Senegal gained independence. He became a citizen of a country that those on the Left regarded as only nominally independent; he studied philosophy at university in Paris. In 1968, due to his political activity, he was expelled from the *École normale supérieur de Saint-Cloud* and deported from France. In 1970, he departed again for Paris after Senghor's intervention permitted his readmission into the *École* and re-entry into France. He was arrested in Bamako in late 1971, extradited to Senegal, convicted by a special court in 1972, and imprisoned. He was buried, without a funeral, in the cemetery in Dakar, called by the Lebu, *Bettuwar*: the *abbatoirs* of the colonial city were once located nearby. Gendarmes guarded the cemetery as he was buried, and remained there afterwards, to prevent people first from witnessing the burial, and then from exhuming his body. Spontaneous protests occurred on May 14, 1973, the

---

77 Since May 2013, there has been a proliferation of media attention to O.B. Diop - principally surrounding the May 2013 commemorations, and, to a lesser extent, to a commemorative ceremony held in Bamako in May 2014. Media attention is principally Senegalese, but has included interviews and articles in *Jeune Afrique* and Mali-based news sites. See for example, Mehdi Ba, "Sénégal : retour sur la mort d'Omar Blondin Diop, le Normalien subversif qui défiait Senghor, *Jeune Afrique*, May 21, 2013. http://www.jeuneafrique.com/Article/ARTJAWEB20130521170200/l-opold-s-dar-senghor-dakar-gor-e-black-panthers-histoire-s-n-gal-retour-sur-la-mort-d-omar-blondin-diop-le-normalien-subversif-qui-d-fiait-senghor.html; and "La version néocoloniale de la mort d'Omar Blondin Diop : terrorisme, espionage, atteinte à la surété de l'Etat," *Seneplus.com*, May 10, 2013. http://www.seneplus.com/article/la-version-n%C3%A9o-coloniale-de-la-mort-domar-blondin-diop.

78 Diop also appears in Godard's *Sympathy for the Devil* (Great Britain, Cupid Pictures, 1968).

79 During the event on the eleventh, several people gave speeches in the Fort's circular courtyard before the unveiling, including the director of *Institut Fondamental d'Afrique Noire* (IFAN) - Hamady Bocoum - who is also head of the ministerial "direction" of Cultural Heritage and National Patrimony. The museum is an IFAN museum. Dialo Diop, one of Omar Diop's brothers and the family spokesperson at both commemorative events, himself a former political prisoner who was once incarcerated on Gorée, spoke last and at length.

day he was buried.[80] Omar became a hero to the young Leftist opposition to Senghor's regime; he remained so into - and perhaps beyond - the 1980s, the first decade of the government of Senghor's handpicked successor. The commemorative events of May 2013 provided the first occasions to publically mourn, as if forty years had not intervened. Yet Omar's life felt impossibly distant: as if it had belonged to another world, to a rendition of this world so altered as to be unrecognizable.

Diop is commemorated within the National History Museum that occupies the (former) Fort d'Estrées. A glance at this building's past signals the complicities of the island's history that the dominant discourse of memory elides. The plaque to O.B. Diop is mounted inside a former French fort, former colonial prison, former post- (and neo-) colonial prison, and current national museum. The colonial fort - the Fort d'Estrées - was constructed in the mid-nineteenth century, after Abolition in 1848. It ceased to be a fort in 1950, when it became a prison, and it continued to function as a prison after independence, until 1977. For the past twenty-six years, the building has housed the Senegalese Historical Museum.[81] It has therefore been, sequentially, a colonial military site, a site of colonial social control; a site of postcolonial social control and political repression, and finally, a national cultural site, an official producer of historical knowledge. The sequence of these first three incarnations - colonial military fort to colonial prison to postcolonial prison - signals the enduring character of structural violence across the bounds of formal independence. The most recent transformation of the building - from postcolonial prison to national history museum - might epitomize the ways that processes of social exclusion and political repression are bound up in the construction of postcolonial national culture. The building is also interesting for what it was not: the Fort d'Estrées was never a slave fort. Its construction followed the dismantling of the slave forts in the late nineteeth- and early twentieth-centuries; security reasons justified the razing of the slave forts,[82] and the Fort d'Estrées was erected for defensive purposes. Yet, it is difficult to see what security risks the then-existing slave forts posed, and the Fort d'Estrées saw military action only once, when it warded off the attempted landing of Gaullist and Free French Forces in 1940.[83] In this sense, the colonial construction of the Fort D'Estrées can be understood to disavow the no longer extant slave forts.

At the time of my visit in 2013, the rooms of the ring-shaped Fort d'Estrées are numbered; history proceeds in a semi-circle, a row of thematic units along a chronological, trajectory: *Salle* Number Six is devoted to the megalith monuments of Senegambia; Seven to the Kingdoms, Eight to *Résistances*, Nine to the Trade. Apart from the historical progression of exhibit rooms, in the interior of Room Eight, historical time condenses. Here was Omar's former cell, or as close to it as his brother could

---

[80] The anonymous authors of *Lettre de Dakar* name the date of May 14, 1973 and assert that protests continued all over the country for two weeks: *Lettre de Dakar par une libre association des individus libres* (Éditions Champ Libre: Paris, 1978), 47.

[81] Abdoulaye Camara and Joseph-Roger de Benoist, *Gorée : Guide de l'île et du Musée historique* (Dakar : IFAN-Cheikh Anta Diop, 1993), 29.

[82] See Ibrahima Thiaw, "L'espace entre les mots et les choses : mémoire historique et culture matérielle à Gorée" in *Espace, culture matérielle et identités en Sénégambie,* Ibrahima Thiaw, ed (Dakar: CODESRIA, 2010), 33-34. According to Thiaw, the (intentional) destruction of the slave forts was shaped by the same logic as the commemorative initiatives of the twentieth-century. These intiatives focused upon private homes that had primarily housed domestic slaves, rather than upon the forts that had actually held large numbers of slaves destined for the Atlantic Trade. Thiaw suggests that the colonial administration's desire to erase the evidence of its slave-trading past led it to demolish the slave forts, and to later restore private houses, including the house that was to become *La Maison des esclaves*.

[83] Camara and Benoist, *Guide de l'île*.

ascertain, given the intervening conversion from prison to museum-in-former-fort (and not to museum-in-former-prison). It was either the room of Resistance or the adjacent room devoted to the Trade. Panels devoted to historical resistance figures line one wall; while presented chronologically, they share no single historical period. The initial panels display the familiar figures of the warrior-aristocrats of the nineteenth-century. One of them - warrior-king and imagined father of the nation - is most familiar of all: Lat Dior anchors the historical narrative promoted by the newly independent state. Near the panels are two historic saddles, one on each side of the window. Each is mounted on a stand. A short text identifies each: "Selle ayant appartenu à Gankal Mamadou Makhouredia / Guerrier de Lat Dior et d'Alboury Ndiaye" (Saddle once belonging to / Gankal Mamadou Makhouredia / Warrior of Lat Dior and Alboury Ndiaye); and "Selle ayant appartenu à / Farba Demba War Sall / Chef des captifs de la couronne du temps de Lat Dior" (Saddle once belonging to / Farba Demba War Sall / leader of the captives of the Crown during the time of Lat Dior).

Captif is a French euphemism for *esclave* - the way that colonial administrators, after Abolition, preferred to refer to the subjects of the indigenous slavery that they very much did not want to suppress. In the heart of the unified resistant nation, slavery appears, albeit by another name. High above the saddles of slave warriors, "captives" of the most famous, retrospectively cast, national hero, above the narrow French fort (and Senegalese Museum) window, is O.B. Diop's plaque. In a room of national heroes, many of whom lived before that nation or its nationalisms existed, there is an image of Diop reading about internationalism.

A "site of memory" of the Atlantic Trade, Gorée is rarely conceptualized as a heterogeneous site of other pasts: of colonial-era indigenous slavery and colonial political legitimation, of postcolonial nation-building and postcolonial political violence. Gorée, like the two other African sites that I examine in subsequent chapters, is a site of heterogeneous pasts but of a monolithic discourse of memory. Like Thiaroye and District Six, it can be usefully conceived of as a "site of complicity." As I discussed in the Introduction, for Naomi Mandel, complicity is both an element of historical violence and an element of any contemporary engagement with representations of historical violence.[84] As a result, complicity has a special temporal dimension, implicating the present in the violence of the past, and implicating readers and viewers of representations of past violence in that violence. Gorée is a place that can prompt us to think about the complicities that made possible structural violence, and about the continuities of colonial violence and colonial discourse across temporal bounds, despite a discourse of memory that obscures those continuities. Rather than the vacillating temporalities of memorial discourse - its progressive linear motion and the synchronic time in which the Island bears perpetual witness to the Trade - complicity suggests a temporality of continuity.

Located three kilometers from Dakar and eight kilometers from Thiaroye, Gorée is small - 900 meters in length, 300 meters in width - and distinctively shaped, somewhat like an L.[85] The Island

---

84 Mandel, *Against The Unspeakable.*

85 The Island is also referred to "as ham-shaped," as one early French account has it. The manuscript of Adanson's memoirs dates from 1763; it introduced the "jambon simile" to describe the island's topography: "Goré n'est qu'un îlet de la forme d'un jambon, dont la longueur est à peuprès dans la direction du N et du Sud, le manche qui consiste en une tere basse sabloneuse ..." I reference the following version: Michel Adanson, "Mémoire d'Adanson sur le

was formally recognized as a heritage site during the colonial era, and it remained a national heritage site after independence. During Senghor's presidency, it became a UNESCO World Heritage Site for the "memory" of the Atlantic Slave Trade. Today, Gorée is an international pilgrimage destination, particularly for the U.S. Diaspora, and it has long been a requisite stop on the itinerary of visiting state dignitaries. French President Auriol visited in 1947; Obama and family visited Gorée in 2013. Both heads of state made a stop at *La Maison des esclaves*, the "Slave House": a museum that is the primary site on the island for the commemoration of the Slave Trade.

The claim to the Island's global significance is articulated through metaphors of collective memory. The vocabulary of memory, rather than undercutting claims to historical fact, is charged with conveying those facts. The island itself is testimony; its physical landscape is endowed with the agency necessary to remember and speak history:

> The Island of Gorée is an exceptional testimony to one of the greatest tragedies in the history of human societies: the slave trade. The various elements of this "memory island" – fortresses, buildings, streets, squares, etc. – recount, each in its own way, the history of Gorée which, from the 15th to the 19th century, was the largest slave-trading centre of the African coast.[86]

Gorée is a witness to the tragedy of the Trade and its built environment recounts that tragic history. The island speaks in place of people and their multiple and conflicting historical narratives: while each fortress, street, or square might tell history in its "own way," the reader, or tourist, encounters history as a monolith of suffering that is already fitted into a narrative form - tragedy - that is itself characterized by a temporality of pre-determination.

Some scholars posit a greater historical role for Gorée in the Trade than others; none claim that it was "the largest slave-trading centre of the African coast."[87] The UNESCO heritage narrative thus has an ambivalent relationship to the facts: factual claims are essential to World Heritage site status, yet the substance of those claims appears impervious to the marshaling of factual evidence by historians. The polarized debate about the significance of Gorée - whether among activists, journalists, or historians - often rests on whether the island's symbolic value - as a site of memory - should or should not transcend questions of historical fact or accuracy.[88] Both positions within the debate are thus grounded in scholarly norms of fact and analysis; the disagreements surround the correct interpretation of evidence and the importance that should be assigned to "memory."

Sénégal et l'île de Gorée," Charles Becker and Victor Martin, eds. *BIFAN*, Series B, (1980) 42 (4), 733. http://ucadao.s3.amazonaws.com/agorae/200931418139/C.Becker-V.Martin_V1.pdf. Contemporary popular sources, such as the Sénégal Métis site reiterate the "jambon simile": http://senegalmetis.com/Senegalmetis/Gorée.html.

86 UNESCO, "UNESCO World Heritage Site Criterion (vi)." http://whc.unesco.org/en list/26. Accessed March 10, 2014.

87 For a summation of scholarly positions in this debate, see Djibril Samb, ed, *Gorée et l'esclavage : Actes du Séminaire sur "Gorée dans la traite atlantique: mythes et réalités" (Gorée, 7-8 avril 1997) (*Dakar : IFAN-UCAD, 1997). The debate has also taken place in discussion on HNET West Africa (an academic listserve).

88 See Hamady Bocoum and Ibrahima Thioub, "Gorée et les mémoires de la Traite atlantique," in *Gorée et l'esclavage,* 200.

The dominant memory discourse of Gorée, a discourse which the island's World Heritage status epitomizes, is not interested in colonial continuities. It does not articulate the imperial history that joined the island to Paris and Dakar, as well as to the Americas. It does not approach the island as the final African location within a trade that implicated specific places and networks in the Senegambian coast and interior; nor is it concerned with Gorée as a location within contemporary Senegal and Dakar. It has nothing to say about the institution of indigenous slavery; and about the enslaved people who were not destined for the Middle Passage, who made up the majority of the Island's population in the 18th and 19th centuries;[89] nothing to say of contemporary forms of structural violence and their continuities with the political and social violence that characterized the periods of the Atlantic Trade and of colonial occupation. The dominant memory discourse is concerned with one element of the past, a single geographical and affective trajectory: the trans-Atlantic connection between Africa and the Americas; the grief of the Middle Passage and the longing for return. The discourse is anchored in past racial suffering and a notion of historical progress. It has a three-part temporal structure: the past of the Trade, the reconciling present, and the healed future. Yet the discourse vacillates between that progressive temporality, and the non-linear time in which the present is pervaded by "memories" of particular pasts. The memory discourse articulates the progressive temporality of nationalism, while inserting the island into a timeless space of black suffering and global reconciliation.

On Gorée, an institutionally-supported "site of memory," public acknowledgement of certain historical subjects and historical suffering occludes others; and the labor of constructing discourses about the past and interpreting the present goes unrecognized. The naturalizing metaphor of collective memory forestalls questions about narrative construction, and functions to privilege particular narratives of the past, all the while erasing the contemporary power relations which produce those narratives. Gorée was not only a point of forced departure; it was also a place where diverse elites and a slave majority lived permanently.[90] In Wolof society, and in the creole worlds of the French coastal possessions, the institution of domestic slavery existed alongside the institution of commercial, Atlantic, slavery.[91] The memory discourse of Gorée obscures indigenous slavery, the role of African elites in the Trade, and the continuities of these forms of social hierarchies, including that of slavery, in the postcolonial present.

In "The Space Between Words and Things: Historical Memory and Material Culture on Gorée,"[92] Ibrahima Thiaw critiques the way in which the dominant memorial discourse interprets the island's physical landscape: the dominant discourse of memory recalls only the slaves of the Trade; and, ironically, it attends only to the buildings which, historically, housed the privileged. Domestic slaves built the houses and the forts; their skills and labor made these "European" buildings. They composed the majority of the island's permanent population, and it was they who lived in less durable structures which have left little physical trace. They are the subject of no monuments, and no one's debate about memory. Citing fellow historical archeologist Martin Hall, Thiaw defines "the

---

89 Ibrahima Thiaw, "L'espace entre les mots et les choses : mémoire historique et culture matérielle à Gorée" in *Espace, culture matérielle et identités en Sénégambie,* ed. Ibrahima Thiawb(Dakar: CODESRIA, 2010), 19.

90 Thiaw, 19.

91 In Wolof, *jaamu neg* and j*aamu sayoor*; in the French-language scholarship which followed the Wolof terms, *l'esclave de case* and *l'esclave de traite.*

92 Thiaw, ibid.

space between words and things" as the site where an historical discourse is confronted with a material reality; it is the space of this encounter which prompts an evaluation of the respective limits and possibilities of each.[93] Thiaw reminds us that it is not the object which "speaks," but the archeologist, with a particular ideological and political position, "who makes the object speak."[94] The institutionalized "memory" of Gorée reproduces the power relations which are its object: the island's material culture - the things - are made to speak in a way which aligns exactly with the textual evidence. In the memory discourse of Gorée, there is no space between words and things.

Islands and objects do not simply "tell" us about the (singular) past; nor do texts. It is the memory discourse that places the artifact in service of the past; that "makes" the island, fort, or text testify to the horrors of a single past. By assigning a radical, if univocal, agency to objects, the memory discourse elides human agency, the multiplicity of the past, and the persistence of forms of structural violence in the present. It is not only historical agency that is elided; the agency of the present, in which contemporary discourses and actors interpret a landscape, is also obscured. In situating Gorée within Senegalese and global discourses of memory, I hope to provoke a reconsideration of ways that political relations shape the histories that are, and are not, publically recalled on Gorée, and to suggest renewed attention to the histories that connect Paris and Dakar, Dakar and Gorée, Gorée and Galam,[95] as well as to the history of Senegambian "domestic" slavery.

Not far from Gorée's pier is a large plaque, composed of photograph above and text below. *HOMMAGE - RESPECT* are written large across the top; below reads three names: *Léopold Sédar SENGHOR, Boubacar Joseph NDIAYE, Aimé CÉSAIRE*. The photographic image is composed of three faces: those of Senghor (1906-2001), Ndiaye (1922-2009), and Césaire (1913-2008); each one removed from its original context, they present a single portrait. The photograph of Ndiaye's face, a close-up, appears to be the most recent; his is the face in the center. A middle-aged Senghor looks sideways towards Ndiaye; the elderly Ndiaye, although his head is half-angled away, turns his gaze to stare straight at the viewer; a very young Césaire gazes out at Ndiaye from the sepia distance. Placed closely together, the faces almost touch in a new, enforced, synchronic intimacy.

The unity of the three images is striking politically as well temporally. Senghor and Césaire are frequently paired together. Often known as "the fathers" of the Negritude Movement - Senghor, from colonized Senegal, and Césaire from the overseas *département* of Martinique - both studied in Paris in the 1930s. There their writings were first published, and there they "founded" the Negritude Movement, along with the Antillais Léon Gontran Damas. Both Senghor and Césaire went on to very prominent literary and political careers. Within Senegal, Senghor typically stands alone: the father of the nation, the poet-president, head of state from Independence in 1960, until 1980 - his legacy is all-pervasive. However, in the wider Francophone world, and in pocket renditions of the

---

93 Ibid. "L'espace entre les mots et les choses" est un site où le discours historique est confronté à la réalité matérielle pour évaluer leurs potentialités et limites respectives" (18). Thiaw attributes this idea of a "between space" to Martin Hall who himself references Homi Bhaba's conception of a "third space." See Martin Hall, "Subaltern voices? Finding the spaces between things and words" in *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, eds. Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Sîan Jones (London and New York: Routledge, 1999), 193-203.

94 Ibid. "En plus, la culture matérielle ne « parle » pas comme on pourrait le supposer. C'est l'archéologue plutôt, avec une orientation idéologico-politique et une expérience qui lui sont propres, qui parle" (24).

95 A location in the Senegambian interior from which many slaves destined for the Middle Passage originated.

origins of Negritude like the one above, Senghor and Césaire frequently appear side by side. Only on Gorée, location of Diasporic memory tourism, would Ndiaye be positioned as a peer to Senghor and Césaire. While Senghor and Césaire have analogously prominent positions in an international Francophone literary and political landscape, Ndiaye is famous specifically for his role in promoting Gorée, and its *Maison des esclaves,* as a crucial location for global awareness of the Slave Trade. Former colonial soldier, memory-activist - neither scholar nor politician - Ndiaye was appointed "guardian" of the *Maison* by Senghor in 1962. He was *guardien*, then *conservateur*, of the *Maison* for more than four decades (until 2004);[96] eulogies refer to him as "the voice of the *Maison des esclaves* and "the sage of Gorée." [97] His tour narrative, in particular, remains a powerful element of memorial discourse about the island: even in the guidebook he authored, the orality of his expertise is emphasized in a lengthy concluding section consisting of "Quotations from the Author."[98] The Island's UNESCO World Heritage website hosts a version of Ndiaye's tour;[99] his claims about the island and the house are repeated online, in the two short volumes he authored,[100] and in the oral narratives of contemporary island tour guides.[101]

Below each man's face are three well-known lines each authored. The stanzas read as if they belong together in a single, original text about Gorée and the Atlantic Slave Trade: nothing indicates the distinct authorship and source of each of the stanzas. The first stanza, that of Senghor, does not refer to the Slave Trade: it speaks of colonial solders massacred by the French in 1944; the second stanza, that of Ndiaye, speaks directly of the Island; and the third stanza, originally Césaire's prose sentences, speaks of the barbaric, colonizing civilization of bourgeois Europe. Here, in the ambiguous unity of the plaque, the critiques of colonialism present in Césaire and Senghor's original texts are inaudible. The political impetuses behind their texts disappears into the suffering and redemption articulated in Ndiaye's central stanza. The colonial violence of the Thiaroye Massacre, the violence of colonialism itself, and the distinct anti-colonial visions of the two original texts vanish. Instead, the other two stanzas support the vision of historical suffering that is the original subject of only Ndiaye's stanza. For viewers who might recognize all three sources, the creation of this new three-stanza text suggests the subordination of anticolonial critique to a discourse of racial suffering and inter-racial reconciliation. For these readers, the unity of the excerpted texts would suggest that the specific colonial violence that Senghor's poem addresses, and the kind of decolonization which Césaire *Discours* demands, can be subsumed into a generalized expression of collective African Diasporic loss, without any significant critical loss. The dead of the Middle Passage, and the iconic presence of the three great men themselves, fully occupy the space that anti-colonial and anti-imperial critical force would inhabit:

---

96 Hamady Bocoum and Bernard Toulier, "La fabrication du Patrimoine : l'exemple de Gorée (Sénégal)." *In Situ* 20 (2013), 6. http://insitu.revues.org/10303.

97 Pierrette Hertzberger-Fofana, "Joseph Ndiaye (1922-2009), la voix de la maison des esclaves de Gorée s'est éteinte," *Grioo.com*, October 2, 2009. http://mobile.grioo.com/article.php?id=16316.

98 Joseph Boubacar Ndiaye, *L'Esclavage : ses origines et ses repercussions en Afrique, Gorée : Histoire et traite des noirs, avec des citations de l'auteur* (Dakar: Maison des esclaves, 1986).

99 "Visite virtuelle de l'île de Gorée." http://webworld.unesco.org/goree/fr/. Accessed April 9, 2015.

100 In addition to the guidebook cited above, Ndiaye authored *Il fut un jour à Gorée-- : l'esclavage raconté à nos enfants* (Neuilly-Sur-Seine: Michel Lafon, 2006).

101 Bocoum and Toulier make this claim about the adoption of Ndiaye's discourse by other island tour guides. A glance around the web would suggest an analogous phenomenon has occurred in blogs and articles online.

Non, vous n'êtes pas morts gratuits
Vous êtes les témoins de l'Afrique immortelle
Vous êtes les témoins du monde nouveau qui sera demain[102]

[No, you did not die in vain
You are the witnesses to Immortal Africa
You are the witnesses to the new world of tomorrow]

Puissent les souffrances de cette île historique
Et de cette maison des esclaves
Être le ferment fécond des lendemains heureux et fraternels[103]

[That the suffering of this historic island
And of this Slave House
May be fertile soil for glad and fraternal morrows]

Une civilisation qui s'avère incapable de résoudre
les problèmes qui souscite son fonctionnement
est une civilisation décadente. [104]

[A civilization which proves incapable of solving
the problems it creates
is a decadent civilization.]

Read as the initial stanza of a single text, the first lines appear to address the dead of the Middle Passage and "New World" enslavement. If one considers the plaque as equally a tribute to the lives of the three men, this stanza might also be read to address Senghor, Ndiaye, and Césaire as the witnesses of Immortal Africa and the new world of tomorrow. Yet, in their original context, these lines do not address the dead of the Middle Passage. The plaque's initial stanza consists of two lines[105] from the final stanza of Senghor's poem, "Tyaroye" (1948),[106] the first literary treatment of the Thiaroye Massacre. In the original, the "vous" of these lines refers to the West African soldiers killed during the Thiaroye Massacre of 1944. The title of the poem, and the location and date which follows the original text (*Paris, décembre 1944*) position the poem as a direct response to a specific event of colonial violence: penned in the immediate aftermath of the December 1 massacre, yet from the remove of Paris. "Tyaroye" begins by addressing the dead of Thiaroye: "Prisonniers noirs, je dis bien prisonniers francais, est-ce donc vrai que la France n'est plus la France?" (Black prisoners, that is to say French prisoners, is it true then that France is no longer France?). While the line directly addresses the dead, it speaks through them to, and about, France. An ideal Republican

---

[102] "Tyaroye" in *Chants d'ombre suivi de Hosties noires* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1956), 143-144. The poem was originally published in *Hosties Noires* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1948).

[103] Ndiaye, *L'Esclavage : ses origines et ses repercussions*, 29.

[104] Césaire, *Discours,* 7.

[105] In the original, these are two enjambed lines, not three as the plaque presents them.

[106] The subsequent, very final, line of "Tyaroye" reads: "Dormez mes Morts ! et que ma voix vous berce, ma voix de courroux que berce l'espoir" (Sleep, my Dead! And may my voice cradle you, my voice of rage that hope cradles).

France - with its promises of liberty, equality, and fraternity - is the poem's primary subject, genuine interlocutor and perhaps also its speaker. Senghor's "Tyaroye" is provoked by the death that French colonialism has inflicted, and it imagines an ideal global future that is also French.

The third of the plaque's stanzas is also, in its original textual location, concerned with colonial violence: the stanza is composed of the first, and most-cited, sentence of Césaire's (prose) manifesto, *Discours sur le colonialisme* (1950): "A civilization that proves incapable of solving the problems it creates is a decadent civilization." Césaire's manifesto is concerned with the exploitation of its present, not with the slavery of the past.[107] In the original, colonizing Europe - the historical product of the ascendance of the bourgeoisie - is the subject of the critique. The *Discours* condemns contemporary colonialism, not historical slavery, and does so in part by casting Nazism as the manifestation of colonialism within Europe: the historical outcome of European colonization of other continents. It insists that [colonial] civilization is barbaric and that it functions to "de-civilize" the supposedly civilized. Humanism, at least in its articulation by significant European intellectuals, is the target of the manifesto, as much as, if not more so, than the physical violence of colonial rule and conquest.

Placed on the plaque, Césaire's sentence, like Senghor's lines, is quietly refitted to perform a specific type of grief; the critical impulse of the source text disappears, as does the original target of that critique. The racialized injustice of colonialism - not the Atlantic Trade, nor the suffering of the Middle Passage - forms the historical context and impetus of the original two texts - Senghor's "Tyaroye" and Césaire's *Discours*. Europe - albeit two distinct "Europes" - is the subject of each. France is the explicit subject and implicit addressee of "Tyaroye;" For Césaire, "Europe" is non-national, in fact less a location than an historical moment, dominated by a particular class and a pair of linked, suspect ideas - the nation and humanity. Senghor's poem rages against a particular colonial incident - "Tyaroye" - and it implicitly calls upon France to fulfill its Republican promises. Unlike "Tyaroye," the *Discours* does not ask the colonial power to behave in congruence with its republican mission because no such ideal Europe exists apart from colonial violence. Césaire's tract takes on European humanist discourse itself: the Europe of Césaire's text is a fleeting phenomenon of capitalism.

The plaque's central stanza is originally and unmistakably about Gorée, not Europe, and references the suffering of slaves destined for the Middle Passage and not the violence of colonial rule. Ndiaye's words present his vision of, and for, the Island and its House. The stanza is also politically and temporally distinct from the others: Ndiaye's words do not critique their presenbt; they only eulogize a past and declaim into the future they herald. They also articulate Ndiaye's vision of his own role in relation to the island: fittingly, upon his death in 2009, they functioned as a variety of epitaph:[108]

---

[107] Within Césaire's text, enslavement operates most often as a metaphor for contemporary capitalist oppression, for example: "C'est une société nouvelle qu'il nous faut, avec l'aide de tous nos frères esclaves, créer, riche de toute la puissance productive moderne, chaude de toute la fratérnité antique. Que cela soit possible, l'Union Soviétique nous en donne quelques exemples..." (It is a new society that we must, with the help of all our slave brothers, create, [one] rich with the power of modern productivity and warm with ancient brotherhood) (35).

[108] Herzberger-Fofana, "Joseph Ndiaye (1922-2009), la voix de la maison."

That the suffering of this historic island
And of this Slave House
May be fertile soil for glad and fraternal morrows[109]

While "about" the victims of The Trade, the explicit subject of these lines is the island - the island as a symbol of the suffering of the Atlantic Trade. These words rely on a deeply familiar metonymic slippage from a place to the people of a particular past, from the Island to (some of) the historical subjects who inhabited it. The Island, its house and its soil, make tangible an abstract notion of undifferentiated, historical suffering. The reader can access that suffering by following a familiar chain of implied metonymic equivalences: place to victims to collective pain. The central stanza is notable for the presence of the island, and for the related absence of mourned subjects within it: here the dead of the Atlantic Trade Slavery do not appear; nor do the slaves who survived it and nor do their descendants. Rather, the island stands in for them, or more specifically, for an element of their experience. There is neither the *vous* of Senghor's question, nor the human agency that Césaire's *civilisation* presupposes. Rather, like the memory discourse of which Ndiaye was a significant producer, this stanza employs place to stand in for a social experience. That experience of suffering appears no longer socially or politically located, neither embodied nor particular, but an essence distilled into walls and stones.

This tribute is clearly intended for a literate Francophone public (an intended reception which excludes the majority of the Senegalese public).[110] More particularly, the plaque would interpellate an educated Francophone Diasporic public whose members would recognize the three men and the respective text of each, and for whom the grouping of the three would appear natural because of a shared understanding of race and temporality: a past of black suffering; a present of remembrance; and a future participation in a global world of equals. The plaque's remaining text makes clearer the intentions and geographical location of its creators. Beneath the stanzas, large letters read: Gorée MARTINIQUE SENEGAL UNIVERSEL; in a lower corner a logo - a bird's sickle-shaped wingspan half-enclosing an abstracted face, or mask, itself almost enclosed in a circle - and the words CONSEIL REGIONAL DE MARTINIQUE; in the other corner is the Kreole name of a Martinician carnival band, beside a different logo - a drum upright upon a slightly raised map of Africa.[111]

An adjacent plaque, "La famille de Gorée," offers a different memorial tribute, and from another part of the Diaspora, yet it too participates in the discourse of racial return and healing: that which was severed is now joined. Image dominates; the primarily English text is sparse; the subject is unambiguously the Middle Passage and the return of Diasporic descendants.

---

[109] Ndiaye, *L'Esclavage : ses origines et ses repercussions,* 29.

[110] Senegal is one of eleven countries in the world in which the adult [French, Latin alphabet, literacy] rate is 50% or less: it was 47.9% in 2009 according to a recent UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) Information Paper: "Adult and Youth Literacy: National, regional, and global Trends, 1985-2015" (Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2013), 10. http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/literacy-statistics-trends-1985-2015.pdf.

[111] *TANBOU BO KANAL! MATINIK* This Martiniquais carnival was established in 1973; it also engages in social action. See "Tambou Bo Kannal : Résister pour exister," in *Syncope : La Lettre de la Culture Tambour* no. 12 (May 2005). http://syncope.free.fr/bokannal.htm.

La famille de Gorée

From Ships That Brought Us to Bridges That Unite Us
-- from whence we came, we now return --
-- d'où nous venons, nous revenons maintenant --

"Diaspora Afro-American families" February 21 to February 25, 2012

The title asserts a genealogical connection between the Diaspora and the Island, and the phrases declaim the familiar trajectory of return that would erase the elapsed centuries: from a forced departure of apparent severing, to a bridge which the Diaspora, through its return journey to Africa, affirms. Africa, with its Diaspora, constitutes an implicitly racial family; historically subject to racialized violence, jointly looking towards a future of unspecified harmony and connection. While it does not reference Senghor, the undergirding notion of Diasporic unity would resonate with his notion of Negritude and vision of Gorée as a site of reconciliation. This reunited family of Gorée functions to disavow other families and another legacy of slavery: the families who have historically resided on Gorée and who have no say in the way in which the Island's past is publically represented - the Senegalese descendants of slaves, those who were the majority of the *familles de Gorée.*

A painting occupies the upper half of the plaque: dark slave ships in the foreground give way to a light line arching into the distance. The line of slave ships becomes the regular spaces of darkening water and sky beneath a light-colored bridge. The light color is a pale terracotta, the shade of many a "colonial house" on Gorée, and it separates regular patches of darkness: the ship sails in the foreground become intervals of dark sky in the background. The nearest grey patches are ships outlined against a terracotta sky of sunset or rise; the distant patches appear as darkness glimpsed through the bridge's terracotta arches.

One figure is the reverse of the other. Slave ships or slave ship-shaped spaces beneath a bridge? The doubling figures are reminiscent of those next to which a test question would ask: *Old woman or young girl?* Like the images beside questions of visual perception and cognition, the evocative painting of the ships and the bridge presents only two figures: Bridges or ships? Past atrocity or future, healing connection? The evident correct answer is both; they are simultaneously ships and bridge; cruel severing and new connection; past violence and present reconciliation. No other figures are possible; the dichotomous visual metaphor suggests that its two conceptual terms are as natural as the two visual possibilities that a tessellating image creates. There is no attribution for the painting; it is as if the island, or diasporic longing, summoned into being the synthesis of ships and bridge, sky and sea; as if the landscape of Gorée itself has produced, in miniature, the completed trajectory of exile and return. As the UNESCO narrative endows the island with memorial agency, and as Gorée, in Ndiaye's narrative, witnesses and testifies, the slave ships themselves create the bridge between the New World and the continent.

L.S. Senghor's independent Senegalese state produced a memory discourse of Gorée which partially originated during the colonial era - Gorée as a site of French colonial history, including as a site of the Slave Trade - and was inflected by international discourses of memory that emerged with "the era of the witness." The state classification of the island in 1944 as a site of (French) national

heritage was based upon the importance of the (colonial) built environment that proved the longevity of the French presence on the island.[112] When, in 1948, there were state-sponsored celebrations of the centenary of Abolition throughout French West Africa, a prominent French historian suggested in the colonial daily that a museum dedicated to slavery be established on Gorée:

> Mais au fait qu'attend-t-on pour restaurer, protéger, aménger en musée de Gorée, l'une au moins de ces esclaveries ? Ça parle les vieilles pierres ... Il serait bon, parfois de les écouter raconter un passé dont on se réjouit qu'il soit revolu.
>
> [Why, in fact, are we waiting to restore, protect, and then convert one of these former *esclaveries* into a museum of Gorée? Old stones speak ... At times, it would be good to listen as they recount a past which we are glad is no longer.][113]

A colonial house, located across from today's *Maison des esclaves*, was subsequently bought and restored, financed through loans that were approved during the Centenary celebrations. The rooms of its lower level, like those of the contemporary *Maison des esclaves*, were described as imprisoning slaves awaiting the forced crossing of the Atlantic. In 1954, it opened as a museum dedicated to the history of French West Africa; one of its six rooms was devoted to slavery and its abolition.[114] In an independent Senegal, under Senghor's presidency, the symbolism of the island shifted to articulate Negritude: Gorée could epitomize a place of human reconciliation and black diasporic return. Today's *Maison des esclaves* was restored for the event that formed the centerpiece of Senghor's joined political and cultural ambitions, the 1966 *Premier festival mondial des arts nègres.*

In April 1966, a guidebook to Gorée was published especially for the Festival.[115] The guidebook largely articulates a familiar colonial discourse about the island: it is more attentive to the romance of the island's colonial past of *métissage* than to the Trade, more interested in past suffering and present reconciliation than in colonial or postcolonial complicity. That April was a month of particularly intense political repression, as well as of cultural activity. In the words of one historian and activist, there was, simultaneously: "[...] un veritable 'festival' de la torture dans tous les commissariats du Sénégal: la torture des dirigeants du P.A.I. ! Un Commissaire français très célèbre, Castorel, que tous les militants du P.A.I. ont connu, était LE specialiste en matière des tortures à l'électricité" ([…] a virtual festival of torture in all the police stations of Senegal: the torture of P.A.I. [the Marxist *Parti Africain de l'Independence*] leaders![116] A French commissaire, Castorel, well known to all the leaders of the P.A.I., was the specialist in the area of electrical torture).[117] The *Guide touristique* acknowledges Gorée's role in the Trade, but slavery is not its preferred topic. Slaves tend to be "captives" - and the Trade was, apparently, a matter solely of the Europeans buyers; there is no moment in which one might imagine indigenous slavery, or the collaboration between coastal elites and European buyers.

---

112 Boucoum and Toulier, "La fabrication des patrimoines," *In Situ*, 5-6.

113 Raymond Mauny, "En marge du centenaire de l'abolition de l'esclavage, l'île de Gorée," *Paris-Dakar*, April 22, 1948, quoted in Boucoum and Toulier, "La fabrication," *In Situ*, 6.

114 Boucoum and Toulier, "La fabrication des patrimoines," 4.

115 Charles Babacar Seck, *Gorée : Guide Touristique* (Dakar: SAFER, 1966).

116 The P.A.I was founded in 1957, in the Senegalese town of Thiès. The newly independent Senegalese state outlawed the party in 1960.

117 Abdoulaye Bathily, interview by Falilou Ndiaye, Manfred Prinz, and Alioune Tine, in *Visages publics du Sénégal : 10 personnalités politiques parlent,* ed. Falilou Ndiaye, Manfred Prinz, and Alioune Tine (Paris: Harmattan, 1990), 118.

Most attention goes to charming local detail, with a particularly lingering colonial romance in evidence.

Opposite the reproduction of a portrait of a mixed-race woman, a "Signare," the reader is invited to "Admire the velvety skin of the young *métisse*: it ranges from the color of cream to that of dark café au lait."[118] The caption speaks only to the cream element of the equation: "Portrait de "Signare" métisse d"origine plus ou moins Gasconne, Bretonne ou Normande" (Portrait of The "Signare" a *métisse* of varied (*plus ou moins*) Gasconne, Bretonne, or Normande origins) (25). There is a photograph of French President Auriol's 1947 visit to *La maison*: wearing a white suit, he stands in front of the house, between the symmetrical curving staircases. The foreground of the photograph is filled with men in colonial shorts and pith helmets crowded onto one staircase, cameras around their necks. No nearby text alludes to slavery. An allusion to *La maison* (site number 23), and thus to the Trade, finally appears in a key to the map of visit-worthy sites:

> *La maison des esclaves :* Gorée, avantageusement placée pour le pire comme pour le meilleur, fut la plaque tournante de ces honteuses transactions des nations dites, à cette époque, civilisées. On estime à 40 millions le nombre total de ces malheureux arrachés à leurs pay entre le XVIe et le XIXe siècles don't au moins 6 millions ont péri à la suite des privations ou des traitements inhumains qui leur furent infligés. On peut dire que l'esclavage ne cesse véritablement sur les terres soumises à la souveraineté que le 27 avril 1848.
>
> [The Slave House: Gorée, favorably positioned for the bad as well as for the good, was the hub of the shameful transactions of those nations then said to be civilized. Forty million is the estimate of the total number of those poor souls who were uprooted from their country between the 16th and 19th centuries, of which at least 6 million perished due to the privations and inhuman treatment that was inflicted upon them Slavery never truly ceased in territories subject to the sovereignty until April 27, 1848.][119] (34-35)

The identity of that sovereignty is France - so present still that it requires no articulation. With a single sovereign act, slavery vanished. Number 24, the *jardin public*, the public garden, requires no explanation. The following page presents the pleasantly temperate present: *Avril mois de soleil à Dakar.*

While coy regarding the Slave Trade - and silent regarding indigenous slavery and the contemporary ramifications of both institutions - the *Guide* is bold about the existence of the prison, and inventively connects the postcolonial prison with the Trade. (As I mentioned earlier in the chapter, the Fort was built after the abolition of slavery, and decades after the abolition of the Trade.) The Fort d'Estrées is noteworthy *because* its present function will visually make present the slave-trading past: "C'est maintenant la prison civile, les détenus qui s'y trouvent vous donneront la vision d'un lot en instance de départ pour les Indes occidentales…" (It is now the prison, a glimpse of the detainees

---

[118] Seck, *Gorée : Guide Touristique*, 26. "Admirez la peau veloutée de la jeune métisse : elle va de la teinte crème jusqu'au café au lait foncé."

[119] These sentences are an exact repetition of those found in the very brief section, "Gorée et l'esclavage" on Page 12. The remainder of that section is occupied not with slavery, but with the history of the island after abolition.

will provide you with the vision of a batch of slaves pending their departure for the West Indies) (28-29). This creative summoning of the Trade, in which slaves substitute for contemporary prisoners, neutralizes the presence of the actual postcolonial prison. From the neutral remove of the present, the reader is asked to participate in an imaginative visual romance with the Trade.

The memory discourse of Gorée has summoned visions of suffering captives and captivating signares since the colonial period. Today, as then, stones, or the inanimate forces of history, are made to possess historical agency; tragedy rather than manifesto, suffering rather than anger, remain the principal forms and affective modes. While there is continuity in its metaphors and content, the discourse shifted. Texts of the 1970s and later tend to emphasize the racial and human tragedy of the Trade, rather than celebrate the generosity of France in abolishing slavery in its territories, or the evident achievements of the colonizer. The UNESCO recognition of the island and the emergence of global discourses of Holocaust "memory" appear to have initiated as much of the discursive shift as did formal decolonization.[120] It was not only that the Nazi Holocaust, and the number of six million, came to function as the benchmark for historical suffering. It was also that the notion of a history of violence - voided of political content - could be wholly accessible to the contemporary visitor who, through the testimony of survivors, can himself fulfill the duty to "remember" the suffering that he has not himself experienced. While the Nazi Holocaust was securely within living memory during the 1970s and 80s, the Atlantic Slave Trade was not. Yet the emphasis upon historical *suffering*, and the imperative that the visitor partake of the suffering by listening to the victims, is reminiscent. On Gorée, however, the witnesses are inanimate.

The dominant memorial discourse of Gorée elides historical complicity in favor of dichotomous, morally-inflected narratives of oppression and resistance, past suffering and present reconciliation.[121] In the 1980s, Senegalese producers of memory discourse articulated these moral dichotomies through analogy to the Nazi Holocaust and its commemoration. Ndiaye's memorial construction of Gorée includes explicit comparisons to sites of Nazi genocide; among the numbered "Quotations from the Author" are "31. GOREE ... / DACHAU / THE GULAG / What a long way we have yet to tread before becoming human";[122] and "73. A profound emotion, a symbol of the dignity of each being, of a dignity of each being [sic], Of a dignity denied from Gorée to Auschwitz."[123] Writing a preface to a 1982 history of Gorée, Senghor implicitly references the Nazi Holocaust when he explains the memorial mission of the new international committee formed by the Senegalese government for the preservation of Gorée (*Comité international pour la Sauvegarde de l'île de Gorée*). His assertion that the Slave Trade was the most major of genocides is immediately followed by a

---

120 See Wieviorka, *The Era of the Witness*. As I discussed in the Introduction, Wieviorka argues that the Holocaust emerged not as an event of collective political violence, but as one of suffering that could be meaningfully understood through individual acts of oral testimony. Through testimony, the memory of the "survivor" would become the memory of any contemporary listener (or reader or viewer).

121 Ndiaye, *L'Esclavage*. Several of the "Quotations from the author" make clear that Gorée is a site of memory for humanity, but one with particular significance for the collective memory of black people: "17. La mémoire fait force des peuples" (Memory is the strength of a people)(26); and "43. Le passé de cette île historique a servi de tremplin à la Renovation africaine" (The past of this historical island served as a springboard for African Renovation) (29).

122 Here I refer to an English version of Ndiaye's guidebook: *The Slave Trade at Gorée-Island and Its History, Slavery: Its Origins and Consequences in Africa (with Quotations from the Author),* trans. Momar Khary Diagne (Dakar: Maison des esclaves, [1989?]), 26.

123 Ibid, 31.

statement of Negritude philosophy, in which the forgiveness of "black humanity" can lead to the creation of a "pan-human" civilization:

> Il s'agit d'y élever, entre autres, un monument pour rappeler à la conscience humaine le plus grand génocide de l'Histoire que fut la **Traite des Nègres**. Mais aussi de souligner que l'humanité noire a pardonné en invitant les autres humanités à coopérer avec elle pour bâtir ensemble une civilisation de symbiose : une civilisation **panhumaine.**
>
> [It aims to erect, among others, a monument to remind the human conscience of the greatest genocide in human history: the **Trade in *Nègres***.[124] But it also emphasizes that black humanity has forgiven, in inviting other humanities to build together a civilization of symbiosis: a **panhuman** civilization.][125]

Momar Samb's recent poem, "Dégluleen Mbokk yi," offers a nationalist tribute to O.B. Diop in which he appears a victim of imperialist state violence and a martyred resistance hero.[126] Gorée figures in the poem not as a site associated with the Middle Passage, but as the site of Diop's death. Samb's national memory project is distinct from that of the international memory discourse that surrounds Gorée - within his poem, Gorée figures as part of an African, national, and local political history. Yet, through the parallel the poem creates between two maryred resistant heros - Diop and the collective of Thiaroye's soldiers - the poem, like articulations of the memory project of Gorée, elides the complexity of multiple historical contexts.

I encountered the poem as disembodied sound when I watched an excerpt of Cheikh Guissé's in-progress film about O.B. Diop during the first of the two commemorative events.[127] A landscape fills the screen as a woman's voice sings the poem - devoid of people, it is not a landscape I recognize - not Dakar or Thiaroye, nor Gorée's iconic outline. The extra-diegetic words match neither the landscape on the screen, nor the language and documentary mode of the rest of the excerpt in which, interview-style, individuals speak in French, to the camera about the historical facts.

The poem begins with the sounds of the ferry at Gorée and of the land, both of which provoke the recollection of the poem's speaker. The initial stanza places the poet's body in close proximity with the remembered, resistant dead: Omar Diop, those of the *Centenaire*,[128] and those who lie in Thiaroye. The first line tells us to listen to the Senegalese land as its screams blend with the screams of the ferry at Gorée. The ferry - this is information that the poem does not provide - is the one that is taking Omar's body to the mainland. The speaker's act of recollection collapses the temporal

---

[124] Here, and in my subsequent translations of passages in which "Nègre" appears, I leave the word untranslated. As a Negritude concept, "Nègre" is neither "Negro," the literal translation of the word, nor is it "Black" ("Noir").

[125] Léopold Sédar Senghor, "Préface : De l'île de Gorée à la nation sénégalaise" in Jean Delcourt, *La turbulente histoire de Gorée* (Dakar: Clairafrique, 1982), xi. The bold is in the original.

[126] From the collection *Ru yu Maar* ("Thirsty Souls"), Dakar, publisher and publication date unknown.

[127] Guissé later recited the poem to me and discussed it with me; my transcription and translation follow.

[128] "The people of the Centenaire" refers to Senegalese (postcolonial) protestors killed as they marched towards the presidential residence, the *Palais*, to contest the results of the 1963 presidential election. As they reached the *Allées du Centenaire*, forces of order fired.

distance that separates him from Omar's death. The speaker's suffering is physical and immediate: the memory is painful and his tongue tastes blood, in the present. Omar's murder is like that of others *they* have killed, "those of the *Centenaire*, those of Thiaroye." While the common perpetrator is not named, his identity is what appears to links the three, otherwise apparently unrelated, deaths:[129]

> Dégluleen mbokk yi yuuxu suufu Senegaal
> And ak yuuxu saluup [chaloupe] ba ca Gore
> Suma fàttaliku di metti di naqari
> Suma làmmiñ di saf deret
> Bóom nanu Omar Diop ni nu bóomee waa
> Senteneer ak ni tëdd ci Caaroy
>
> [Listen my people The screams of Senegal's earth
> Join the screams of the ferry at Gorée
> The memory hurts, is horrid,
> My tongue tastes blood
> They killed Omar Diop like they killed
> Those of the Centenaire and those who lie in Thiaroye]

The opening exhortation to listen implies an intimacy with an ambiguous, but likely national, collective of listeners. It addresses *mbokk yi;* literally, *Mbokk* are relatives, but an address to *mbokk yi* may invoke a collective that is unrelated by blood, including the metaphorical blood that a nation shares. Within the poem, then, *mbokk yi* might - in an extension of the word's primary blood meaning - address *the people, the folk*. Alternately, *mbokk yi* may refer to an uncircumscribed collective of *destinaires* and draw them together into an imagined community of listeners.[130]

"Those who lie in Thiaroye" refers, of course, to those unidentified French West African colonial soldiers killed by French forces in 1944, within the military camp of Thiaroye, eight kilometers across the water from Gorée. The [*Allées du] Centenaire* (today's *Boulevard Général Charles de Gaulle*) is a key reference in Leftist narratives of Senghorian state repression: within those narratives it signifies the non-democratic and neocolonial character of Senghor's state. When in December 1963, the first post-independence national elections were held, results proclaimed a 99% majority for the ruling party; activists asserted electoral fraud, and the protest march towards the presidential palace, along the *Allées du Centenaire*, was met with violence.

The second stanza continues the poet's recollection of the aftermath of Diop's death. The stanza is filled with a varied vocabulary of screaming - the city, its objects and its people, the sky and sea and land itself, are in revolt because of Omar's violent death. The lexicon of sound, saturated with

---

[129] The translation emphasizes the unknown perpetrator: the obscure "they" responsible for all three atrocities. The line might be as easily translated, "Omar was killed, as were those of the Centenaire and of Thiaroye." In both translations, as in the original, the victims are named, the perpetrator is not named, and the victims and incidents of violence appear parallel to one another.

[130] *Suuf*, in the poem's first line, yields an analogous ambivalence. Because *suuf* can variously signify land, ground, or soil, *suufu Senegaal* may refer to the implicitly national land, or, it may mean, in a more literal register, simply the Senegalese ground.

Wolof's onomatopoeic intensifiers, each particular to a single verb, makes the inanimate and the spirit world speak. In that stanza's final lines, a very human violence is expressed as if it were not fully human: "Dëmm yi di wër sëg yi / Di xool sëg yi ak seeni der / Sëg yi di salliiru" (The vampires, with their belts, circle the cemetery, watching / the cemetery is screaming). *Dëmm* is often translated as "vampire" - one who consumes other people - here the "vampires" are the gendarmes, identifiable by the belt of the uniform. Soul-eaters, they circle the cemetery as Omar is buried, preventing public grief or witness to the possible evidence of murder.

This merging proximity between animate and inanimate, human and non-human, past and present culminates in the third and final stanza, in which the dead - one thousand Omars - rise as light.[131] On the second occasion that the poem recalls the dead, they are mystically redeemed: Omar is light; Omar is "one thousand" Omars; the one-thousand-fold light exhumes the other dead. The bodily becomes intangible and the intangible operates in the material world; Omar becomes light and light exhumes; Omar is both singular and a multitude; a person and light; a particular political victim besides other political victims, and the light which surrounds the poet and which returns the dead to life. The concluding stanza begins by echoing the first, but when the screams of the land and the ferry harmonize, it is not a prelude to the poet's pain. Instead his tongue tastes honey and the light of the cemetery surrounds him. The light is for and of Omar; however, it is not the light of a singular, single Omar, but a thousand-fold light:

> Dégluleen yuuxu suufu Senegaal
> And ak yuuxu saluup [chaloupe] ba ca Gore
> Suma fàttaliku di bég di neex
> Suma làmmiñ di saf lem
> Ma làmboo leer siyaare sëg yi
> Junni Omar dekki
> Leer googu moo sulli waa Senteneer
> Ak ni tëdd ci Caaroy.
>
> [Listen, the earth of Senegal is screaming
> Joining the screams of the ferry at Gorée
> My memory is joyful, pleasurable
> My tongue tastes honey
> The light of homage envelops me
> A thousand Omars rise
> It is that light which unearths the people
> Of the Centenaire and those who lie in Thiaroye]

The poem's pairing of the "Centenaire" and "Thiaroye" suggests the lauding of resistance heroes and a condemnation of the continuity of imperialist violence across the (merely formal) rupture of 1960. In oppositional references to both Thiaroye and the Centenaire the official number of dead is frequently cited precisely in order to draw attention to the dubiousness of that number.[132] The West

[131] In Wolof Sufi poetry, God's qualities of limitlessness and oneness are often evoked through metaphors of boundless light.

[132] The official count, doubted by several sources, is five dead. See Ibrahima Thioub, "Le mouvement étudiant de Dakar

African dead of Thiaroye are victims of colonial state violence; the Senegalese dead of the Centenaire, like Omar Diop, are victims of postcolonial state political violence. The parallel positioning of "Centenaire," "Thiaroye," and "Omar Diop" suggests that a central concern of the poem is state violence and resistant protest. It implies a direct connection between colonial state violence and postcolonial state violence, between colonial political repression and postcolonial political repression: from Thiaroye of 1944, through the Centenaire of 1963, to Omar's death on Gorée in 1973. The boundary of 1960 – the year of national independence - is merely formal; it makes no difference to enduring imperialist political violence.

In another version of the poem, however, a very different historical referent replaces "Centenaire." In Guissé's film, the unseen singer modifies the first stanza when she repeats it, inserting "Nder" in the place of the "Centenaire": "Bóom nanu Omar Diop ni nu bóomee / waa Nder ak ni tëdd ci Caaroy" (They killed Omar Diop like they killed those of Nder and those who lie in Thiaroye). "Nder," like "Centenaire," evokes past collective suffering, but the two names allude to different historical collectives and types of violence, and thus assign different meanings to the deaths of Omar and the soldiers of Thiaroye. Nder signifies a particular historical episode: the self-immolation of the women of Nder, the capital of the Wolof state of Waalo, in the context of an ongoing conflict with the Trarzas, who live to the north of the Senegal River, in contemporary Mauritania. On a Tuesday in March 1820, the men of the Waalo are absent, fighting the Trarzas; in a devious maneuver, the Trarza army succeeds in eluding the Waalo army, and invades the capital, Nder, where only women remain. When they hear of the imminent arrival of the Trarzas, the royal women of Nder choose death (in the company of their slaves), rather than allowing themselves to be captured and enslaved.[133] The women of Nder resist slavery; they themselves are not complicit in slavery.

In Senegal, *Talaata Nder* (Nder Tuesday) is popularly understood to be an event of national gendered martyrdom. It is implicitly coded in racial and ethnic terms: black Wolof women are the protonational women of Senegal who resist a foreign Arab-Mauritanian assault. In positioning an episode of Wolof history as a foundational episode of Senegalese history, Nder evokes a racialized notion of Senegalese nationhood, in which black (proto-) Senegalese are victimized by the

---

et la vie politique sénégalaise : la marche vers la crise de mai-juin 1968" in *Les Jeunes en Afrique. La Politique et la ville,* vol. 2, ed. Hélène d'Almeida-Topor et al. (Paris: Harmattan, 1992), 269. See also the interview with Madia Diop in *Visages publiques du Sénégal,* ed. Falilou Ndiaye, Manfred Prinz, and Alioune Tine (Paris: Harmattan, 1990), 192-205. M. Diop, then a leader in the *Parti pour le Rassemblement Africain* (PRA), himself a candidate in those elections, by his own account, led the protests: "A partir des Allées du Centenaire, la troupe a tiré. Les manifestants se sont battus. Il y a eu des morts, qu'on n'a pas dénombré jusqu'à présent" (At the Allées du Centenaire, the troops fired. The protestors were hit. Some died, even now we do not know how many) (192). Donal Cruise-O'Brien gives the figure of ten dead and describes the repression in these terms: "On election day [December 1], towards evening, the PRA organized a demonstration against the conduct of the elections. It ended with government troops firing on a crowd which was attempting to break into the presidential palace at Dakar - an incident which left some ten dead and many injured among the demonstrators" (562). See "Political Opposition in Senegal: 1960-67," *Government and Opposition* 2, 4 (1967): 557-66. doi:10.1111/j.1477-7053.1967.tb01185.x.

133 For a brief, non-partisan account of this episode, see Boubacar Barry's history of the Waalo Kingdom, which presents the episode within the larger context of European colonial intervention: *Le royaume du Waalo : Le Sénégal avant la conquête* (Paris: Karthala, 1985), 224. Contemporary Senegalese literary references to the episode include the narrative found within B.B. Diop's *Doomi Golo* (Dakar: Éditions Papyrus, 2003) and a play centered on the episode, Alioune Badara Beye's *Nder en flammes* (Dakar: Nouvelle Éditions Africaines du Sénégal, 1990). Popular accounts are prolific on the internet.

Arab/Berbers to the North. This popular rendition elides the implication of the Waalo aristocracy in violence which was neither dichotomous, national, or racialized; specifically, it absents or renders irrelevant the role of (Wolof) *Ceddo* kingdoms in the Atlantic Slave Trade and the institution of indigenous slavery within those kingdoms, and implies a neatly racialized rendition of slavery and violent conflict in which European power is almost absent: Maures enslave; blacks are victims of the Trade. It also obscures the role of French colonial strategies of domination in generating and maintaining the conflict between the two groups; and it implicitly casts the Senegal River as only a boundary, as it is a national border of Senegal today, rather than producing its valley as the heterogeneous political and social space it has also long been.

Within "Dégluleen Mbokk yi," "Nder" positions the poem's other dead as martyred Africans; and it casts the Senegalese nation as a racially defined collective (to which Wolof royal history is foundational). It thus suggests that Diop and the soldiers of Thiaroye died for a unified Africa because of forces of violence that were fundamentally external in origin. "Nder" elides the complicity of the Waalo in slavery; it elides the political violence of the *ceddos* during the Trade era and beyond, and it elides the violence of indigenous slavery. The pairing of "Omar Diop" with "Nder" suggests that Diop and the soldiers of Thiaroye were victims of violence that was fundamentally non-African. These two iterations of the poem suggest ambivalences that are perhaps intrinsic to projects of collective memory. They straddle the registers of fact and memory, body and spirit, bounded nation and unbounded collective, linear time and an experience of time in which past and present merge.

Claims made in the idiom of memory, like those made upon historical "fact," often rely on a notion of the world as one which will yield its facts to the informed observer, a world in which the land, rather than the people, speak. Places become passive evidence of history, the transparently legible containers through which time moves. The mystical empiricism of of memory discourse resembles that of realism: a text, like the Island or its stones, can simply transmit the past – it exists in passive relation to the active world.

After O.B. Diop's death in detention in 1973, Senghor's government published the conclusions of its investigation: Diop had indeed hanged himself - the facts yield no other explanation. *Livre blanc sur le suicide d'Oumar Blondin Diop* was the state's explanation for his death.[134] Its existence speaks to its evident perception that an explanation was necessary, and to the more general notion that a state must provide an explanation in order to legitimize its authority. The particular facts are irrelevant to the function of the text. However, the notion of accuracy, and the publication and the circulation of the form, are crucial. This *livre blanc* testifies to the demands of the genre, the primacy of form over content within it, and to the relations of power and the positivist conception of knowledge that produces it, and that it in turn reproduces. The epigraph is attributed to Lenin: S*eule la verité est revolutionnaire* (Only truth is revolutionary).

The NOTE DE PRESENTATION presents the unambiguous epistemological distinctions that govern the project: between text and fact, between the facts and the commentary upon them:

---

[134] Ministère de l'Information et des Relations avec les Assemblées, République du Sénégal: *Livre blanc sur le suicide d'Oumar Blondin Diop* (Dakar: Ministère de l'Information, 1973).

> Ce Livre Blanc est un document de vérité, fondé sur les faits. Les faits qui sont y relatés sont été établis avec un souci permanent de conformité avec l'événement. Ils ont ainsi, tous été puisés dans des documents authentiques, qui peuvent être produits à tout moment. Aucun commentaire n'a été porté sur ces faits, présentés, simplement, selon leur survenance chronologique.
>
> [This White Paper is a truthful document, based upon the facts. The facts related here were established in an unceasing concern with their conformity to the event. Thus they [the facts] were all drawn from authentic documents, which can be produced at any time. No commentary has been brought to bear on these facts, which are simply presented in accordance with their chronological occurrence.][135]

The prefacing note asserts a transparent connection between historical truth and textual creation, yet even in these brief statements, that connection appears unstable. Each sentence contains the word "facts," but the relationship between "facts" and text is unclear. Are facts the worldly basis for the document, as the first sentence suggests, or does the document itself contain and present facts, as the second sentence asserts? Where are the facts to be found, and what relation should the truthful text bear to the factual world? The contradictory protestations of "just the facts" deny the processes of selection and interpretation, with which we identify "facts" and employ them to particular ends. Whatever the relationship between evidence and text, it is of such purported transparence that even the most sincere empiricist might have epistemological suspicions, and reconsider ambitions to uncover the truth concerning the historical dead.

The body of the text begins with an assertion of Senegal's long democratic tradition and proceeds to the assertion that the people itself, and not the government, are the true holders of power: since Independence, Senegal has, alongside other free nations, struggled towards *la Civilisation de l'Universel*, towards the full manifestation of man's dignity, and towards the defense of that dignity (5). "Universal Civilisation" is the dialogue between races and beliefs, that is to say, cultures; one relative clause sums up a concept key to Senghor's philosophy and state ideology. ***Homme***, ***indépendence***, and ***Civilisation de l'Universel*** are all printed in bold letters. Several passages cited from the Constitution of 1970 articulate commitments to human rights, for example: "Each person has the right to life and bodily integrity within the conditions defined by law" (5). There is an unmistakable nod here towards international opinion: Everyone, "inside and outside of the country," agrees that Senegal is a *République de droit* that acts in accordance with the laws shared by all civilized nations:

> Chaque fois qu'un événement important se produit dans ce pays, le Gouvernement se fait toujours un devoir de l'expliquer. Ce faisant, il est moins soucieux de se justifier devant une certaine opinion étrangère, a prioiri hostile au Sénégal, que de faire la lumière sur un certain nombre de faits, qui peuvent appeler des explications, et qui caractèrisent, généralement, la vie d'une nation en marche.
>
> [Each time that a significant event takes place in the country, the government takes on

[135] Ibid. The page is unpaginated.

> the responsibility of explaining it. In doing so, it is less concerned with justifying itself before a certain foreign opinion, *a priori* hostile to Senegal, than it is concerned with shedding light upon certain facts that might call for explanation, and that generally characterize the trajectory of a nation.] (5)

The initial section concludes on a similar note of preemptive defense and with an oblique accusation directed towards the French Left ("*a priori* hostile towards Senegal"*)* and those Senegalese whose dissent locates them outside of the true nation. The *livre* then presents its primary purpose: exposing the facts of Diop's recent suicide and locating his death in its appropriate, correct, context (6).

The existence of "the facts" - rather than a presentation of the relevant information itself - is recurrently summoned to do the work of "explanation." Neither the charges against O.B. Diop nor the crimes of which he was convicted are named, but we do learn that they have been "meticulously established on the basis of testimony from his co-accused." A biographical narrative follows the trajectory of birth, schooling, and political activity; its function seems to consist of the orderly provision of names and dates, rather than the provision of any particular content. Rather than an explanation, it is a performance of submission to the idea of facts and correct chronology. Precision appears in the account of Senghor's generosity in attempting to accommodate O.B. Diop after his expulsion from France in 1968. However, with Diop's apparent refusal to behave in an appropriate manner, detail vanishes. On his return to Senegal, Diop is quickly "absorbed into the contestatory movement of certain Senegalese students," and "he became the leader of the most extremist faction" (7). No elaboration is offered: we do not learn the names of the movement and faction, the subjects of contestation, nor a definition of the center to which the faction was extreme. When the narrative reaches the point of Diop's conviction, a familiar circularity appears in the presentation of *the facts*. We are told that Diop was arrested with his accomplices and extradited by Mali on February 4, 1972; he was sentenced to three years of imprisonment on March 22, 1972: the charges brought against him were meticulously established following the legitimate interrogations of his co-convicted. A list of his co-condemned follows, as well as a description of their respective roles in a plot to facilitate the escape of Omar's brothers (themselves political detainees) from prison in Senegal. On the following page, we are informed: "En raison de la nature même des faits retenus contre M. Oumar Blondin, c'est le régime de détenu politique qui lui fut appliqué pendant son internement" (Because of the nature of the facts established against M. Oumar Blondin, the regimen specific to political prisoners would be applied to him throughout his detention) (10).

Particular attention is paid to those details of O.B. Diop's imprisonment that can be named and numbered. Diop was guarded in "room" number 4 in the section of Gorée prison for political detainees; there he had access to a range of personal possessions, including a radio, thirty or so books, and a number of newspapers. A parenthetical statement informs us that an appendix provides a complete list of these objects.[136] From this list of possessions, the text proceeds to his death by hanging (during the night between the 10th and 11th of May); the actions of prison authorities and the prison administration medical personnel; and references to further appendices. It concludes by asserting that the burial was held on May 12, in the afternoon, in the presence of

---

136 The list occupies two full pages (23-24). Entries include "12 paquets de cigarettes GAULOISES dont 1 à moitié; 2 pâtes dentifrice; 1 sachet de gateaux; 1 bouteille de solution no. 42792; 5 pommes; 2 paires de lunettes; 7 plats en verre; 16 chemises anango; 63 journaux "Le Monde;" 33 livres."

family. No location is given. "Ainsi se présentent les faits" (These are the facts) (12). Or, more literally, and in a more accurate transmission of the notion that "the facts" have an autonomous, objective existence: "Thus do the facts present themselves."

Seven pages have been devoted to a presentation of Senegal as an African democracy, and to Omar as a subject of justice; the remaining five and a half pages cite and refute the unjust attacks to which the Senegalese government has been subject. In accordance with the text's clear separation of fact and interpretation, and privileging of fact, the correct facts have been presented: what remains is engagement with the incorrect commentary. Quoted text is the primary component of this section; the *livre* speaks through, and occasionally beside, lengthy excerpts of articles and letters. It begins by citing a French "attack - attributing an article in a French Communist publication[137] to the French scholar Pierre Fougeyrollas:[138] "[...] Aucune déclaration humaniste ou pseudo-humaniste de Senghor ne parviendra à faire oublier l'héroisme et le martyre d'Oumar Blondin Diop" (No humanist or pseudo-humanist declaration of Senghor's can lead us to forget the heroism and martyrdom of Oumar Blondin Diop). The *livre* then proceeds to cite the telegram that current and former students of the École Normale addressed to Senghor upon Omar's death, and explains that these (and other, unspecified) attacks are racist because they are neocolonial: Senegal is a sovereign, independent nation, albeit one open to dialogue with others.

The *livre* refutes the allegations of this ostensible French "Left" by citing the rebuttal authored by "young Senegalese intellectuals" of the ruling party.[139] It mounts a defense of African independence by way of accusing Omar - who appears as an ungrateful political detainee - of benefitting from his relative liberty in order to do away with his own life. It mourns the imagined future *cadre,* not the actual political opponent; accuses its adversaries of covert neocolonialism; and positions Senegal (the state) as the historical victim by identifying it with the "Africa" of the Trade and of colonialism. The final excerpted sentence articulates the implicit equation between the Senegalese state and an Africa who is still suffering from the Slave Trade:

> L'Afrique, qui a trop souffert de la Traite des Nègres, d'abord, de la colonisation ensuite et a subi de ces faits des retards que des générations auront mal à rattraper, est consciente du prix qu'il faut mettre à la défense de son indépendance.
>
> [Africa, which first suffered because of the Trade in *Nègres* and then because of colonization, and as a consequence of these has experienced delays that generations will struggle to overcome, is conscious of the value of the defense of its independence.] (13)

Finally, cited correspondence from a sympathetic Senegalese journalist living in France[140] provides the occasion for Senghor himself to "speak" in response. Blondin Diop's death becomes a civilizational problem; he is a casualty of insufficiently rooted Negritude:

---

137 It refers to the text as a May 18 1973 article published in the journal, *Combat*

138 Fougeyrollas was, as the *livre blanc* states, a former professor at the University of Dakar and former director of IFAN.

139 *Le Centre d'études de recherches et d'éducation socialistes* (CERES), an entity within the ruling party, the *Union progressiste sénégalaise* (UPS) authored the report.

140 Jean-Pierre Ndiaye's excerpted letter is dated May 23, 1973.

> La mort d'Oumar Blondin Diop m'a fait de la peine. C'est une perte, plus exactement un gâchis, bien que je pense qu'il fût dan l'erreur... nous sommes encore, dans une certaine mesure, alienés... S'il faut nous enraciner dans les valeurs de la Négritude, il nous faut, en même temps, rester ouverts aux apports fécondants des civilisations étrangères, notamment de la civilisation européene, pour les assimiler activement...
>
> [The death of Oumar Blondin Diop caused me pain. It is a loss, more precisely, a waste, although I believe that he did it mistakenly ... we are still, to a certain extent, alienated... If we are to root ourselves in the values of Negritude, we must also, as the same time, remain open to the fruitful contributions of foreign civilization, notably of European civilization, in order to actively assimilate them...](16)

Having concluded its voluminous citing of textual evidence, the *livre* itself offers the final message, harkening back to the words of Lenin with which it began: "C'est sur cet échange de correspondances qui n'est pas terminé, que se termine ce Livre Blanc. Car pour nous, et comme le disait, fort justement, Lenine, 'SEULE LA VERITE EST REVOLUTIONNAIRE'" (It is with this unconcluded exchange of correspondance that this White Paper concludes. Because for us, as Lenin very rightly said, "Only the truth is revolutionary") (17).

Seven pieces of appended material follow. These include a 1970 letter from Dr. Blondin Diop to Senghor thanking the president for his efforts regarding the French authorities on behalf of his son (Omar); a 1969 letter from O.B. Diop to the French President thanking him for his annulment of his expulsion from the *École normale*, and committing to refrain from all French union and political activity; an inventory of the objects found in Diop's cell that takes the form of a transcription (of a *procès-verbal*), dated May 11, 1973, of the account of the *Commissaire de Police*, from the Direction of National Security. The last sentence of this appendix (No. 3) reads, "We report that no piece of writing was noted."[141] The final text is another letter authored by Dr. Blondin Diop to Senghor, of the same date as the letter that constitutes Appendix #1 (April 18, 1970); he requests that the President consider two of his younger sons - both then studying in France - for academic scholarships (21-31). The final page states only the printer: *GRANDE IMPRIMERIE AFRICAINE - DAKAR.*

…

For decades, the best-known publically circulating image of O.B. Diop was a sort-of fiction, his appearance as a Marxist-Leninist student of philosophy in Godard's 1967 film, *La Chinoise*. One contemporary review neatly accounted for some of the paradoxical quality of its critical engagement: "a satire that loves its targets more than anything else—that perhaps can see beauty and hope only in its targets."[142] The film's project is, at once, aesthetic and political: its central question regards the correct joining of revolutionary thought and revolutionary practice: how can culture approach the world? For reflection on that question, Diop's words are essential. When he appears, the film

---

[141] "Signalons que la présence d'aucun écrit n'a été constatée" (24). Items Four, Five, and Six pertain to Diop's corpse.
[142] Pauline Kael, "A Minority Movie," *The New Yorker,* April 6, 1968, 162.

withdraws from its habitual ironic stance: his questions are the film's own questions.[143]

The film centers on the development of a short-lived Maoist cell consisting of five French young people who share an apartment in Paris during one summer.[144] The film features only two significant characters beyond the cell members: one is Diop, who plays a Marxist student of philosophy. Many see the film as a satire of Maoism, or a comedy at the expense of the aspiring Maoists.[145] The critical energy is, I think, less oriented toward the content than it is toward the question of representation, and the yearning to (re)present, including the film's own ambivalent yearning to do so: how to take apart a world and show it, at one and the same time? How to assert the absurdity of reality and an aspiration to represent it, within a medium that represents? How does one yearn and critique one's own yearning?

La Chinoise connects and disconnects word and thing, image and word; it wants cinema to act: rather than represent or explain history, it aspires to be part of history. It is tempting to view in the film's student revolutionary the political prisoner who was to die in Senghor's prison six years later; to understand his death as an outcome of his revolutionary ardor on the screen. Yet, it is essential to recognize the desire that propels this slippage between screen and history, and then to investigate the critical space that opens when we hold apart 1967 and 1973 and 2014, the film we can see and the death that we cannot.

Over the course of the film, the director interviews each cell member in turn. The first "interview" is of Henri, an aspiring actor, who responds to a set of mostly inaudible questions from Godard, who himself remains off-camera. As a result, the interview appears to be an odd monologue - one punctuated by pauses into which half-heard questions sometimes intrude, and interrupted by a moment in which the camera turns itself upon (another) filming camera. Henri begins with an apparent attempt to define theater; he does so by recounting a recent event in the international news. As he speaks, he slowly wraps his head with a white bandage: Chinese students had protested beside Stalin's tomb in Moscow; the protest was violently repressed. The next day the students protest in front of their own embassy; one student wraps his head entirely with a bandage, as our own beret-wearing actor himself has done by this point in his performance. As his narrative continues, Henri begins to unwrap the bandage: The bandage-swaddled Chinese student shouts, "Look at what they did, the dirty revisionists!" Reporters photograph the student as he unravels the bandage: the bandage is finally removed - and his bare face appears, unharmed. Our own actor too has now entirely removed his bandage, and concludes: "The reporters shout. They have understood nothing; that is theater, true theater, a reflection upon reality."

---

143 Jacques Rancière comes to an analogous conclusion: that Althusser's political project is Godard's own, and Omar Diop's appearance is a direct articulation of that project. Rancière cites the preface to *Reading Capital* that articulates "our historical mission": "discovery and training in the meaning of the 'simplest' acts of existence: seeing, listening, speaking, reading - the acts which relate men to their works." *Film Fables*, trans. Emiliano Battista (Oxford: Berg, 2006), 144.

144 They name the cell "Aden Arabie" in homage to Paul Nizan's 1931 account: *Aden Arabi*e (Paris: Rieder, 1931). Nizan (1905-1941) was a French writer, intellectual and Communist.

145 See also James S. Williams' discussion of the film's reception, "C'est le petit livre rouge / Qui fait que tout enfin bouge' : The case for revolutionary agency and terrorism in Jean-Luc Godard's *La Chinoise*." *Journal of European Studies* 40, no. 206 (2010). For an insider's account of the making of the film, see Anne Wiazemsky, *Une année studieuse* (Paris: Gallimard, 2012).

Henri's narrative supports the critical, non-mimetic role for theater that he defines; the Chinese student refuses to "reflect" - to visually show - what "really" happened. He does not reveal the injury that violence produces; and thus returns to the audience of reporters their expectation that they will receive the familiar spectacle of violated bodies. Despite the literal meaning of "reflection" and the conventionally visual register of mimesis it evokes, Henri does not say that theater should (or could) reflect reality: he says, evoking Brecht, that it should reflect *upon* reality. However, Henri's physical performance bears a close, mimetic relation to his narrative. While "the theater" of the Chinese student does not reflect, Henri's own theater seems intended to reflect. His bodily performance of the bandaged student-actor is intensely mimetic: Henri's body "shows" his story and becomes that of his subject- his bandaged and then unbandaged head is the head of the protesting student. Henri's performance does not comment upon history from the remove of art; nor does it aspire to erase the distinctions between the real and the artificial. Instead, like the film itself, his performance aspires to be both: to be history itself, *en train de se faire,* even as it provokes reflection upon history.

A brief silence - into which we imagine a question is posed - then Henri insists that, indeed, one must be different from one's parents. He explains the kind of difference that he means through a comparison: between the (implicitly fascist) capitalist present, and the atrocities of the Second World War, product of the fascism of the past: "My father, for example, fought very hard against the Germans during the War. And now he manages a Club Mediterranée. You know, those big seaside resorts. And the terrible thing is that he absolutely does not realize (*rendre compte*) that they are constructed on exactly the same blue-print as the concentration camps [were]."[146] Unlike the film's typically more ambiguous approach to difference, Henri asserts that two, obviously distinct, spatial designs are exactly the same. His words are unconcerned with the specifics of place, in its connected temporal and spatial dimensions; rather, the implication is that two designs of violence, one Nazi and the other capitalist - are identical.

A very early scene opens in an unoccupied parlor. Red predominates, and behind the red-upholstered chairs, above the red lampshade, a phrase is "written" in black tape on the wall: *Il faut confronter des idées vagues avec les images claires* (One must confront vague ideas with clear images). The phrase might be read as an epigraph to the film. Yet, in fact, *La Chinois*e presents an unsteady relationship between idea and image, and it does not suggest that images, unlike words, tell the truth. The film's images are not a transparent alternative to the vagueness of ideas verbally expressed; rather, words and images undercut or reinforce the other, producing irony, uncertainty, or sometimes, unequivocal meaning. Rather than privilege image over word, *La Chinoise* works in the relation between them. It does not posit the superiority of images over words, or suggest that *images* merely "represent;" instead the phrase evokes the way that the film - a medium that combines image and word - explores the possibility of revolutionary culture, cinema as action rather than representation. Jacques Rancière explains the aesthetic engagement of *La Chinoise* as, at once, its political engagement:

---

146 "Mon père par exemple a lutté très fort contre les allemands pendant la guerre. Et maintenant il dirige un Club Mediterannée. Vous savez ce sont des grands camps de vacances qui sont au bord de la mer. Et ce qui est terrible c'est qu'il ne sera absolument pas compte que exactement ils sont fait sur la même schèma que les camps de concentration."

> "One is split in two," the formula reclaimed by Maoists; "two are joined in one," the formula stigmatized as "revisionist." The strength of the film is that it brings together cinema and Marxism by treating those formulas as two different conceptions of art in general and hence also of Marxist cinema.[147]

Maoism is both a matter of representation, and a mode of representation. Metaphor joins two together in one; and the film works, through and about Maoism, to split that one into two.[148] For Rancière, and for Godard - in Rancière's articulation of Godard's politics - metaphor is a crucial principle of language itself since "words make images." Yet, and thus, metaphors are suspect because they make ideas appear natural: they make reality appear real. Art and politics must disassociate word and image, disrupt this fusion, in order to expose the fiction of [all] representation and allow us to question the world that is thus made accessible to our senses:

> [. . .] like art politics also cuts into that great metaphor where words and images are continuously sliding in and out of each other to produce the sensory evidence of a world in order. And like art, it constructs novel combinations of words and actions, it shows words borne by bodies in movement to make them audible, to produce another articulation of the visible and the sayable.[149]

Reality is an unjust fiction - of the world in its proper order - to be "cut into," in order to show that the "evidence" of the senses is a matter of perception, and other evidence, other articulations are possible. Yet reality also appears as the thing that could be made accessible to the senses once the necessary work of demystification, this disjointing of metaphor's ambition, is complete. Diop's status within the film - real or fictional - is ambiguous. As a film "en train de se faire," and thus as a film that (like history) neither begins nor finishes, nor features "actors," *La Chinoise* contains no credits. Publicity materials list a "Comrade X" played by "Omar Diop"; the film itself, however, never references a "Comrade X," but simply, once, "Omar."

In a film of short scenes, fragments, and interruptions, the scene in which Omar appears is relatively long and uninterrupted. The film withdraws its habitual ironic stance: the few insertions run parallel to Omar's words, rather than challenge them. "Omar's scene" begins as a hand scrawls on the blackboard: "Les perspectives de la gauche européene." Cell members lounge studiously on the floor beside an immense pile of Little Red Books. Omar enters the room from the side; martial music, the end of the Radio Pékin broadcast, follows him to his place—standing at the table, before the blackboard. One cell member joins him and says softly: "Je vous présente Omar."

Omar leans forward on the table, and addresses himself to "Comrades and friends." Omar Blondin Diop is astonishingly young, in the chronology of his real life, not yet twenty-five, and full of self-

---

147 Rancière, *Film Fables*, 143.

148 Ibid. Rancière delineates two ways in which theater and cinema can disarticulate metaphor, and thus expose the (artificial) union of thing and idea that metaphor performs: through surrealist transformation, in which the metaphor is made literal, and through a sort of reduction into comparison: one thing is like another, one thing resembles another, but one thing is not another (145).

149 Ibid, 152.

possession and health. A white pointed collar framing his face, hair short, red sweater, grey trousers, he begins by situating Marxist philosophy in relation to Stalin's death: the end of intellectual totalitarianism makes possible genuine inquiry. He raises his eyes, from where they have briefly landed on his pages, to conclude his explanation:

> Ce que la mort de Stalin nous a rendu c'est le droit de faire le compte exacte de ce que nous possedons. D'appeler par leur nom et notre richesse et notre dénuement, de penser haut voix nos problèmes, et d'engager dans la rigeur une véritable recherche. La mort de Stalin nous a permis de sortir en partie de notre provincialisme théorique, de reconnaître et de connaître ce qui ont existé et existe en déhors de nous, et en voyons de commencer de nous voir nous-mêmes de déhors.
>
> [What Stalin's death has given us is the right to draw up an exact account of what we possess: To name our wealth and our destitution; to reflect aloud on our problems; to rigorously engage in genuine research. Stalin's death permitted us to partially exit our provincial theorizing; to recognize and to know what has existed and what exists outside of us and then to begin to see ourselves from the outside.]

Next, he asks about the origin of correct ideas: "D'où viennent les idées justes ?" (Where do correct ideas come from?). There are several responses: the first, he provides himself - social practice. And *la pratique*, he goes on to say, consists of locating the truth within the facts (*chercher la vérite dans les faits*). But what, asks a voice, is a fact? (*Oui, mais précise. Qu'est ce que c'est un fait?*)

> Les faits, ce sont les choses et les phénomènes tels qu'ils existent objectivement; la vérité, c'est le lien interne de ces choses et phénomènes, c'est-à-dire les lois qui les régissent.
>
> [Facts are things and phenomena as they exist objectively. Truth is the internal connections between these things and these phenomena, that is to say, the laws that join them.]

It is from the study of the surrounding world that we can discover those laws that are particular to our position: "... les lois qui sont propres à notre situation et non pas engendrées par notre imagination. C'est à dire trouver les liens des événements qui déroulent autour de nous" (The laws that are particular to our situation and not engendered by our imagination. That is to say, to find the connections between the events that unfold around us).

In the film, these are Omar's last words. Spoken by Diop under Godard's direction, they are in some sense Omar Blondin Diop's "own words," but they are also a familiar articulation of historical materialism, and they are identical to the words found in a passage of *Le petit livre rouge* titled "Where do correct ideas come from?"[150] Despite the faith in metaphor implicit in such utterances as "locating the truth within the facts," or "the internal connections between phenomena and things," historical materialism takes its own metaphors literally. With an accurate understanding of reality, we

[150] *Le petit livre rouge*, ibid.

will correctly identify the laws of the world. Omar appears as a kind of Maoist mystic: firm in the conviction that the intangible can be grasped.

…

When we read texts as reflections of "the real," we subordinate them to the world, casting culture in a role of mere description. We displace culture from its worldly location and thus risk voiding it of its critical potential. Analogously, when we approach places as containers for history, landscapes as self-evident reflections of particular pasts, we lose sight of the multiple kinds of agency and history that places perform. Places become passive evidence of history, transparently legible containers through which time moves. If, however, we understand interpretation to take place within the world, in particular spaces and histories and not at a remove from them, we recognize and investigate the space between words and things, the space in which interpretation too is an historical act. In that space, there is a recognition of the complicity of the contemporary writer, observer, and interpreter with the violent past.

The memory of the slaves of the Trade, and the desires of certain of their Diasporic descendants, are privileged over those of the unnamed and unmourned domestic slaves, whose labor built Gorée - in the sense that economic power and international rhetoric speak of the former and not the latter. The absenting of indigenous slavery paradoxically does not make space for meaningful political attention to the Trade as a force that continues to shape a present of racial injustice. The attention of state actors to Gorée's historical role in the Trade does not signal the political will to do more than rhetorically acknowledge (past) European and American responsibility in the Trade. Rather than justice for one group replacing justice for another group, no collective of descendants or of the disenfranchised within Senegal experiences any form of reparative justice, let alone one linked to the peculiar recognition that Gorée receives.

As a site of mourning for some, Gorée substitutes not only for other West African locations, but also for a form of grief which would be both more precise and more broad in its historical ambition: a grief for contemporary slavery, for the postcolonial political and economic circuits that echo those of the Trade, as well as for the elements of Gorée's past that remain unacknowledged by the official discourse of memory. This chapter is towards a form of grief which would be interested in the complicities of an African present; which would recognize its own implication in national and global projects; towards grief which would make political demands attentive to the present and future.

Chapter Two - Curating District Six

During decades of anti-apartheid struggle, both activists and many ordinary South Africans had assumed that the demise of apartheid would also mean the demise of capitalism in South Africa. The national struggle against apartheid had been articulated as necessarily also a struggle against capitalism.[151] However, the establishment of a formally non-racial democracy in 1994 was a product of negotiation between political elites, and not a socialist revolution. The transition of the early 1990s insured that the economic interests of the racial beneficiaries of apartheid could continue to dominate the economy, within the future formally non-racial regime. This condition of "partial liberation" has produced clear contradictions. Apartheid has ended, but the racialized world of apartheid has not: patterns of spatial segregation and wealth distribution remain almost unchanged. National liberation has not meant the liberation of everyone in the nation, and the end of apartheid has not signified the end of intertwined racial and economic oppression.

In the South African 1990s, in the aftermath of this incomplete transition, the national past, and the proper way in which to narrate it, were subjects of intense debate. State and non-state projects sought to narrate new, or newly public, narratives of the past. State projects, such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), the creation of new national curriculum guidelines, and the provision of restitution involved the creation of new national histories. Non-state projects of "public history" or "heritage" told site-specific or local histories of resistance, community, and social life. The notion of a collective or national memory featured prominently in many of these projects. Varied accounts of the past juxtaposed "memory" to a previous or dominant "history"; an often oral memory would speak where a textual history had lied or been silent. Memory emerged as an object in the restitution process mandated in the Constitution and in the discourse of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. The TRC would produce a new national memory from many individual memories, and collective restitution claims were dependent upon a shared community narrative of the past. Social historians and activists debated how the "memories" that oral narratives constituted should be treated. Memory was part of the object and practice of activist history projects, and the object of marketing in the emerging sector of heritage tourism.

It is not surprising that this period of political transition and state-initiated nation-building would be characterized by debates over how to account for a violent past. What, however, accounts for the predominance of "memory" in the varied responses to the challenge of producing a "new" history? I suggest that South African discourses of memory emerged in the '90s in response to the contradictions produced by the negotiated transition to formal democracy: "Memory" became a primary way that different producers of historical narrative sought to respond to the fact that racial and gendered positioning continues to matter in the nonracial, democratic state. Yet, I argue, the concept of memory, and the sometime replacement of "history" with "memory" has not always yielded a space of critique in which very different narratives of the past challenge us to conceive of

[151] The African National Congress (ANC), the primary national liberation party, and the South African Communist Party (SACP) have been very closely connected since their re-establishment in exile in the early 1960s. Since 1962, the ANC/SACP has been committed to a two-stage revolution: a national democratic revolution followed by a socialist revolution. This was not necessarily the vision held by activists and intellectuals within South Africa during the 1980s, nor was it interpreted in the same way by all who saw themselves as represented by the ANC and SACP.

the present in multiple ways. Memory can instead serve to elide the existence of irreconcilably different conceptions of the past and serve to obsure the profound implication of the violent past in the post-apartheid present. In District Six memory discourses, invocations of collective memory can elide the construction of a more specifically located remembering subject and a racialized or identitarian narrative of the past. While the dominant object of Distict Six memory is non-racial community, memory facilitates the covert acknowledgement, and disavowal, of identitarian narratives of the past. [152]

In this chapter, I examine articulations of District Six memory discourse and suggest these employments of memory signal ongoing, largely unacknowledged, contestations over the differential ways that groups were implicated in apartheid violence and over the identity of the post-apartheid national subject. I first look at two sections of a contemporary high school history textbook, *In Search of the Past*.[153] I examine explanations of national identity and "heritage" and suggest that "national memory," coded as "heritage," is ambivalently treated as a "real" phenomenon, not (only) a construct of nationalism. I then turn to the textbook's treatment of District Six in order to show the extent to which "District Six" has come to signify "the destroyed cosmopolitan community of the past" and "the non-racial democratic nation of the present." The District's appearance in the textbook also suggests the degree to which it is conflated with the District Six Museum, the institution that claims to represent its memory. I then analyze elements of two museum exhibits in which claims to memory are particularly prominent: a component of the District Six Museum exhibit, "Memory Traces," and a temporary exhibit of the South African Jewish Museum in Cape Town, The Jews of District 6: Another Time, Another Place.[154] Both manifest an identitarian impulse and produce a normative national subject. In the process, they disavow the complicit positions that apartheid produced, most clearly those of "Coloured" and Jew, respectively.

"Memory Traces," despite the cosmopolitan object of the dominant District Six memory discourse, lays claim to a specifically black local past, as well as to a national non-racial future remembrance

---

[152] Many scholars have discussedd the emergence of memory and heritage in public debate during the 1990s; in post-apartheid South Africa, the two are closely related, sometimes synonymous, concepts. For example, Ciraj Rassool noted the emergence of "heritage" in the place of "history" during the 1990s and argued that "heritage" offers a multiplicity of perspectives and pasts absent from scholarly historical production: "The Rise of Heritage and the Reconstruction of History in South Africa," *Kronos,* no. 26 (August 2000): 1-21. Vivan Bickford-Smith, Sean Field, and Clive Glaser describe the new centrality of "memory" to oral history work in South Africa during the 1990s because of the new national context: "The Western Cape Oral History Project: The 1990s," *African Studies* 60, no. 1 (2001), 16. The change in name of the Oral History Project itself illustrates the new prominence of "memory": in 2001, the Western Cape Oral History Project became the Centre for Popular Memory. Writing in the late 1990s, Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee describe the commodification of the past and the emergence of a "heritage industry": see *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa* (Oxford: University Press, 1998), 10. There is a large scholarship on "memory" in post-apartheid South Africa; I engage with this scholarship in more depth in Chapter Three.

[153] Jean Bottaro, Pippa Visser, and Nigel Worden, *In Search of the Past: Grade 11, Learner's Book* (Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa, 2006).

[154] "Memory Traces" is one component of Digging Deeper, the permanent exhibit of the District Six Museum. Another Time (November 2012 until March 2013) was exhibited in the South African Jewish Museum in Cape Town. My citations of exhibit text reference the catalogue that reproduces the text and images of the exhibit panels: Millie Pimstone, Milton Shain (convener) and Adrienne Folb, *The Jews of District 6: Another Time, Another Place* (Cape Town: Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies, 2012).

rooted in the land of District Six. In doing so, it can disavow the possibility of black complicity and elide an explication of the structurally complicit position of "the Coloured" with white supremacist colonial and apartheid regimes. Another Time produces the historical District Six as the container for a cohesive and clearly bounded Jewish world. In its reliance upon photographic portraits and its preoccupation with family life, the exhibit evokes the family photo album of a particular kind of Jewish family - heteronormative, hardworking, perpetually immigrant, and always-already white. By eliding or minimizing power-laden differences within the family, and neglecting to portray the connections between Jews and non-Jews, the family album disavows the complex implication of Jews within an entrenching system of white supremacy. Particular Jewish figures are also implicitly disavowed: the queer Jew, the inter-racial Jew, and the working-class Jew who remained resident in the District after most Jews had left. In a concluding section of the chapter, I consider a Victorian painting of Cape Town within two post-apartheid Cape Town contexts and argue that it provokes questions that the metaphor of collective memory elides.

Post-apartheid South African high school history students study apartheid in Grade Eleven. Apartheid figures within a year dedicated to the study of the interlocking systems of capitalist and colonialist projects and varied African and Asian responses and forms of anti-colonial resistance. Students are encouraged to think critically about nationalism, identity, and representations of the past.[155] In a popular Grade Eleven history textbook, *In Search of the Past,* students learn about national identity and memory within a chapter about "competing" African nationalisms and identities. While the text asks students to consider the construction of identity and heritage, it simultaneously naturalizes both concepts. The section on identity and nationalism in South Africa - "What is identity in South Africa?" - conflates individual and collective experiences of selfhood**.** "Group identity" appears to be the product of the same basic psychological operation as that which produces individual self-differentiation. Both are captured by the phrase "the way you see yourself in relation to others":

> Identity is the way in which you see yourself in relation to others. It is what makes you distinctively who you are. Group identities are forged in different ways at different times in history[...] An important type of identity in the 20th century was national identity - the feeling of belonging to a particular nation. This could be marked by a common language, a sense of common culture or a shared history. New nations encouraged and built on a sense of national identity. (171)

Individual self-perception and the experience of national identity are cast within the same developmental logic: as a young child learns that she is distinct from others, so a group identity emerges from an equally organic and progressive process. National feeling is a natural development for social groupings of the twentieth-century. This implication is reinforced when South Africa emerges as a special historical case, a deviation from the typical trajectory of national development:

---

[155] These are the pedagogical goals that the 2003 national curriculum statement articulates. The final section of the Eleventh Grade year curriculum, which is transnational, is almost exclusively devoted to South Africa, and specifically to apartheid and anti-apartheid resistance within the country. See Department of Education, Republic of South Africa*, National Curriculum Statement, Grades 10-12: (General) History* (Pretoria: Department of Education, 2003).

> Because of the divisions caused by segregation and apartheid, it was difficult for South Africans to develop a sense of a common identity. A common South African identity, which rises above differences of race or class, of urban or rural, or differing religions and languages, is only starting to develop today. (171)

Because of the artificial imposition of apartheid, South Africa has not followed a normal trajectory of national psychological development. Due to its past of legally enforced racial distinctions, a shared, implicitly unimposed, national identity is only just beginning "to develop." The metaphor of collective memory, and the specific notion of the remembering nation, furthers this suggestion of an organic model of nation formation. "Heritage," defined as "the way in which the past is remembered," appears as both an object of consciousness (memory) and as an historical construction (part of nationalism):

> Heritage (that is the way in which the past is remembered) is often used to support nationalist ideas, and also to construct identity. Sometimes there may be competing ideas about what aspects of heritage are important, about what this identity should be, and about what form the nationalism should take. (182)

The student is told that "nationalism," "heritage," and "identity" are subjects of (unspecified) debate: "competing ideas" are acknowledged. Yet national memory (heritage) seems to precede the debate that would shape it; it exists and can be employed to construct identity and nationhood. The remembering subject is not identified, and the passive voice gives the impression that "heritage" has an existence independent of any particular agent of recollection.

District Six is not typically taught as a site of historical resistance in South African high school history curriculum. Rather than a place of past political engagement, it is cast as a lost home to cosmopolitan community. The District makes its most substantive appearance not as a place in history, but as an object of memory, within discussions of national "heritage."[156] *In Search of the Past* mentions the historical District Six in passing, but devotes significant attention to the District Six Museum. The District makes a first, very brief, appearance as an exemplary object of apartheid legislation, one of two named as a destroyed community within the subsection "People are separated."[157] It appears for the second time as its most famous memorial representation. The District is pictured, literally, only in its institutional memorial instantiation: there are three photographs of District Six Museum.[158]

The District Six Museum is the exemplary response to the question that the textbook chapter title poses: "How has our past been publically represented?" It is a museum for a democratic South

---

[156] In South Africa today there are national curriculum guidelines and a national matriculation exam. However, there is no single curriculum, or single textbook, which all teachers and students of a particular subject follow. Thus there is no single text to which a researcher can refer to as *the* national representation of the District within the schools.

[157] "In many cases whole communities were torn apart and suburbs destroyed. Two of the most infamous examples were the destruction of District Six in Cape Town (in terms of the Group Areas Act) and of Sophiatown in Johannesburg (in terms of the Native Resettlement Act of 1954)" (205).

[158] All three images are iconic and reference elements of the museum exhibit and mission that I will discuss. One photograph depicts a former resident writing on the "Floor Map"; another, the hanging "Memory Cloth"; and the third portrays a land claims hearing held in the Museum.

Africa because of the breadth of who and what it represents, and because it does so through the principles of the new museology that mirror those of democracy itself. The Museum provides an inclusive representation of "our" past, in which all South Africans can find themselves portrayed.[159] The visitor has autonomy and the exhibition is not anchored in the authenticity of objects. Curators have relinquished control; there is no single correct order in which to proceed through the exhibit. Exhibit elements - not necessarily objects - allow for varied kinds of engagement. Choice and interaction, rather than the unidirectional transmission of objective information and preservation of a monolithic past, are valued.

The District Six Museum, the primary producer of District Six memory discourse, traces its origins to the 1988 activist conference, "Hands Off District Six," which convened to fight against the British Petroleum-led redevelopment of District Six as a model "non-racial" area under the apartheid regime.[160] The Museum trust deed, signed in April 1994, just a week after the first democratic elections, articulates a mission of activist memory, historical documentation, and imaginative recovery that implicates District Six residents and all South African victims of forced removal. The Museum exists "to ensure that the historical memory of forced population removals in South Africa endures. Central to its mission is the imaginative reconstruction of the laboring life and material culture of the District Six community."[161] From the beginning, "memory" appears to be both assumed and fraught. On the one hand, the Museum has always been publically committed to non-racialism;[162] on the other hand, the subjects and objects of the past it sought to "remember" at times also appear racialized. By the late 1990s, memory had become an increasingly important element of the way that the Museum conceived of its purpose. For Museum workers, "memory work" was an ethically accountable alternative to history, as it was practiced in the academy, with its restrictive notions of evidence, and implicitly racist conceptions of analysis and expertise.[163]

From its inception, the Museum was engaged in a project of memorialization that was at once nonracial and racial.[164] Political commitments to non-racialism and the historically mixed character of the District Six population meant that the subject and object of recollection was non-racial. At

---

159 The textbook emphasizes that the Museum presents a broad social history, rather than a narrow history of struggle. Unlike some new museums that are devoted to "the struggle for democracy" (the Robben Island Museum is given as one example), the District Six Museum is a new museum that presents a broader picture: "Social history, and not just political history, is emphasized. For example, visitors see the insides of living rooms that have been reconstructed, and the everyday household items that were used; they listen to the music that was popular; they see wedding, family and school photographs" (259).

160 As I described in the Introduction, the idea of a museum came out of the "Hands Off District Six" Conference in 1988, as did the first non-fiction volume devoted to the District, *The Struggle For District Six Past and Present* (1990).

161 The Museum Foundation Trust Deed, April 11 1994. District Six Museum Archives, Cape Town.

162 In Rassool's introduction to *Recalling Community*, this position is clearly articulated: "One of the most important aspects of the mission of the District Six Museum is to question race at every turn and to assert a politics of nonracialism and anti-racism in every facet of its work," including its "memory work." Nonracialism is defined, in passing, as "a position which questions the validity of race and racial categories" (x).

163 Chrischené Julius has argued that, in turning to memory and away from history, the Museum partially disavowed the ways in which its curatorial practices, specifically its use of the words of former residents, resembled the practices of social history that it critiqued: "'Digging Deeper Than the Eye Approves': Oral Histories and Their Use in the Digging Deeper exhibit of the District Six Museum," *Kronos* 34, no. 1 (2008): 106-38.

164 For more about nonracialism, particularly as it has informed discourse about District Six, see Crain Soudien, "District Six and Its Uses in Discussion about Non-Racialism" in *Coloured By History, Shaped by Place*, 114-30.

the same time, however, the "memory" sometimes possessed a necessarily racialized subject and object: the black victim of forced removal. The imagined former resident, the living, remembering subject, is less ambivalently, if usually implicitly, racialized. She is the victim of forced removal, or the descendants of such a victim, and she is also the contemporary black South African subject. Today, the Museum's imagined constituency is composed not only of the black people who were forced to leave District Six, but also of black people who had moved from the District before it was declared white. The borders of this imagined community also extend to encompass black South Africans broadly: to include all those who could have been, or whose family members were, victims of apartheid forced removal.[165]

While memory remains central to the Museum's mission, it is rarely explicit within the permanent exhibit, Digging Deeper. Before turning to "Memory Traces," I would like to look briefly at three components of the exhibit that interpellate Museum visitors as remembering subjects: the "Memory Cloth," the "Floor Map," and the "Memorial Text." I suggest that, considered together, these components demonstrate tensions about the subject and object of the remembrance to which the Museum is dedicated. While the first two elements specifically interpellate former residents, the third vacillates between multiple objects and positions of remembrance. The "Memory Cloth" consists of hanging swathes of calico upon which former resident recollections have been embroidered; the cloth visually displays the written "memories" of former District Sixers. The large "Floor Map" of the District is annotated with years of former resident notes - often indicating the location of a former family home. While anyone can engage with the map in a variety of other ways - it can be walked and danced upon, photographed, regarded from all angles - it has a primary and visible role as a mnemonic device and cartographic memorial for former residents specifically.

The "Memorial Text," however, begins by addressing the reader – any Museum visitor. Yet it goes on to expose unresolved tensions regarding the identity of the remembering subject and the remembered object, tensions that are only partially contained within the idiom of memory. The identity of both subject and object shift; they may be racialized or non-racial; be from anywhere in the world or be specifically from District Six or South Africa. Positioned near the museum entrance, the Memorial Text interpellates the visitor, any visitor, as a remembering subject. It exhorts her to remember District Six among other sites of apartheid destruction; to remember the racial system that destroyed all of "our homes"; and to remember "our" determination to retain "our" humanity. It thus casts District Six as a national site of memory that can and should be assimilated into the memory of any individual:

> REMEMBER DIMBAZA. / REMEMBER BOTSHABELO/ONVERWACHT, / SOUTH END, EAST BANK, / SOPHIATOWN, MAKULEKE, CATO MANOR. / REMEMBER DISTRICT SIX. / REMEMBER THE RACISM / WHICH TOOK AWAY OUR HOMES / AND OUR LIVELIHOOD / AND WHICH SOUGHT TO STEAL AWAY OUR HUMANITY. / REMEMBER ALSO OUR WILL TO LIVE, / TO HOLD FAST TO THAT / WHICH MARKS US AS HUMAN BEINGS: / OUR GENEROSITY, OUR LOVE OF JUSTICE / AND OUR CARE FOR EACH OTHER. / REMEMBER

[165] Bonita Bennett, Director of the District Six Museum, in discussion with the author. December 12, 2012, Cape Town.

> TRAMWAY ROAD, / MODDERDAM, SIMONSTOWN.
>
> IN REMEMBERING WE DO NOT WANT / TO RECREATE DISTRICT SIX / BUT TO WORK WITH ITS MEMORY: / OF HURTS INFLICTED AND RECEIVED / OF LOSS, ACHIEVEMENTS AND OF SHAMES. / WE WISH TO REMEMBER / SO THAT WE CAN ALL, / TOGETHER AND BY OURSELVES, / REBUILD A CITY / WHICH BELONGS TO ALL OF US / IN WHICH ALL OF US CAN LIVE, / NOT AS RACES BUT AS PEOPLE

The first stanza begins with notorious sites to which Africans specifically were removed - Dimbaza, Batshabelo/Onverwacht - before continuing to urban neighborhoods, analogous to District Six, from which black people were removed, such as South End (Port Elizabeth); Cato Manor (Durban) and Sophiatown (Johannesburg). "Racism" too must be remembered, as should a resistant will to live, ethically, "as human beings." The stanza concludes with three locations of apartheid forced removal within Cape Town. The second stanza explains the injunction to remember that the first stanza articulates: not in order to reproduce the lost District Six, but to "work with its memory" in order that we may acknowledge our whole past and rebuild a city for all us, in which race is irrelevant.

In the second stanza, the remembering subject slips from the original *destinataire* - the human who is enjoined to remember experiences of suffering that are not his own to - a human who is, perhaps, specifically the former resident whose "memory work" can serve to transform the apartheid city of Cape Town. The remembering "we" of the poem slips from "the human" to racialized victims of apartheid forced removal, back to an all-encompassing "people" in the final line. Yet, when, in the final lines, we are told that the purpose of this remembrance is not to recreate the District, the non-racial Cape Town of the hoped-for future becomes directly linked to the notion of the historical District Six as a place of non-racial community. The object of memory also moves - from varied experiences of racialized forced removal, evoked in the litany of place names, to racism, to implicitly resistant "human" qualities that survived in communities such as District Six.

Apart from the three exhibit components that I have discussed, Digger Deeper primarily invokes memory implicitly: through the excerpted and transcribed recollections of former residents. The District is recalled as a cosmopolitan and nonracial community: a place in which race was non-existent or unimportant. The apartheid construction of race is condemned, and former residents of apparently varied racial backgrounds are visually represented, as are textual renderings of their recollections. While an attentive Museum visitor may observe that the majority of this represented District Six is "Coloured," race is rarely mentioned and even more rarely recalled as important.[166] Through excerpted former resident recollections, in particular, the exhibit emphasizes the ease of exchange and connection across social boundaries, and the irrelevance of race. The presentation of transcribed recollection (and of cultural information and images) may signal racial and cultural particularity, but race is rarely named; for example, short pieces of untranslated Afrikaans

[166] Digging Deeper devotes particular attention to the historical African presence in District Six through the reconstruction of an African former resident's childhood bedroom, of the 1950s (Nomvuyo's Room), and through the narrative of Horstley Street and the selection of the Street as the site for a future Memorial Park. See below in my discussion of "Memory Traces."

recollections signal the dominant linguistic heritage of the majority of "Coloured" District Six residents, but texts do not recall particular experiences as "Coloured." When race is recalled, it may function precisely to assert its irrelevance, as when a Jewish former resident remembers his having been the only white child at the movie theater, and it never occurring to him to notice.

In Digging Deeper, the District that residents "recall" is primarily nonracial and "ordinary": a place of daily and domestic, implicitly resistant, working-class life. However, "Memory Traces" (2005), a section of the exhibit in which the concept of memory is explicit, casts the District as a specifically black place of African and Coloured solidarity that is significant for the nation. The District's Horstley Street is appears as a foundational site of black occupancy and black solidarity, and as the original site of racialized forced removal in District Six and in Cape Town. Together, a description of archeological excavation and a narrative of the shared black historical experience of Cape Town support a memorial claim upon the future: the construction of a memorial park on the former site of District Six's Horstley street. The claim upon the future is also a national claim; the park is a central feature of the Museum's still-pending application for National Heritage status for District Six.[167]

"Memory Traces" is located in an area in the back of the Museum known as "Memorial Hall." The notion of "memory" also literally frames "Memory Traces;" it begins with a story of site-based remembrance and concludes with the evocation of the future Memorial Park. Intervening texts describe Horstley Street's history of racialized occupation and racialized forced removal, the archeological excavation of the foundations of nine dwellings, and the findings that the excavation yielded. Excavated material traces of "memory" support the implicit claim that intangible memory should be allotted a physical space in the redeveloped District of the future. That proposed physical space, a Memorial Park, is described in the final panels, the text set against the background of a photograph of the current-day site.

An opening anecdote of recovery and redemption suggests that memory and land are inextricably linked, and sacred; the final Memorial Park text affirms this suggestion. The word "pilgrimage" is used twice in this narrative which begins by explaining that the empty land of District Six received few visitors, but for former residents who made pilgrimages to the site of their former home. One of them is a man who comes to the Museum and tells the story of how he and his brother had gone to the former Horstley Street to find the site of their destroyed home, but, in the absence of former landmarks, they became disoriented. They knelt on the sidewalk of the old street and prayed, and when they began to search again they found the horseshoe that had hung above the door of their home.[168] This relayed account of individual remembrance and recovery reinforces the role of the Museum as a holder of District Six memories and implies the necessity of the District Six land for memory in the future.

That necessity is made explicit at the end of "Memory Traces," when the visitor learns that the Museum Foundation advocates the creation of a "Memorial Park" on the site of the former Horstley Street. The Park would be "the central space of a redevelopment project that pays respectful attention to memory," and it "serves [sic] as acknowledgement that the bare earth of District Six has

---

[167] [Former] Horstley Street was chosen as the site of a future Memorial Park in 1993, before the Museum had opened its doors. The application was submitted in 2006.

[168] My paraphrase.

become a powerful symbol and reminder of the history of forced removals throughout South Africa." In the slippage between the still-imagined future and the present ("serves"), the text conflates a political desire and a present-day place. In the seamless movement from "memories" to "memory," the narrative elides the distinctions between individual memories, individual narrative accounts, and the abstraction of a collective memory. The Memorial Park is a logical culmination of these elisions: since the Museum holds the memories of former residents, it is an advocate for a place of collective remembrance. Since the site of a former home is crucial for many former residents, the land of the District is essential for future memory.

The "Story of Horstley Street" performs a valuable recovery of black urban history and recasts Cape Town as an African city. In the effort to centrally position the District and Cape Town within an imagined [South] African nation, however, the account also elides differences between distinct historical experiences. Historical change and differences in racialized experience are asserted, only to be rendered irrelevant for an imagined black familial solidarity that spanned almost a century.

The historical narrative begins by recounting that, in 1901, "African" dock workers became ill with bubonic plague. "White authorities," understanding the causes of the disease in racial terms, scapegoated Africans.[169] The narrative of the consequent forced removal of 1901 asserts black resistant solidarity:

> Under the guard of mounted police, soldiers turned people out of their homes and emptied dwellings of their furniture. Up to 1500 'African' people were evicted from Horstley Street on the first day, while "a large crowd of Coloureds" objected to these removals.
>
> In spite of strong resistance, including a meeting on the slopes of Table Mountain on 13 March and a protest on the Grand Parade on 14 March, 'Africans' were marched to the stating and reluctantly transported to Uitvlugt. All personal belongings were burnt. Uitvlugt was later renamed Ndabeni.
>
> The removals from Horstley Street in 1901 were part of Cape Town's first forced removal.

In this account, Africans of Horstley Street appear as foundational racial victims, not only within District Six but also within Cape Town. Their distinct racialized experience is asserted; Africans were removed, others residents were not. The visitor also learns that, while Africans were specifically targeted, a resistant consciousness shared by Coloured and African people produced not only spontaneous protest, but - ultimately unsuccessful - organized resistance.

A brief description of local social history further inserts Horstley Street into a shared black historical experience of Cape Town and functions to support the notion of a shared awareness of a shared

[169] I have paraphrased the following panel text: "At the end of January 1901, 'African' workers in the docks began to fall ill. The cause was bubonic plague which had been spread by infected rats, brought to Cape Town in hay meant to feed British army horses. However, the causes of plague were understood by white authorities in racial terms and Cape Town's 'Africans' perceived as alien, dangerous and contaminating, were scapegoated as the cause of the disease."

racial oppression:

> The story of Horstley Street typifies the systematic approach undertaken by authorities to map social relations through discriminatory urban planning. The emancipation of the slaves and the settlement of Xhosa-speaking people in Cape Town resulted in a settled black population of 10 000 by 1900. This population had found homes in District Six, Woodstock and in different areas [...] After 1950, the strategic removal of black pockets of settlement along Table Mountain to the outskirts of the city to the townships [...] marked both a physical and emotional shift away from the centre of the city.

Horstley Street appears as an exemplar of both the historic black presence within Cape Town and the government's consistent response to that presence - removal from the city. Because the category of black encompasses all "non-white" people, this brief narrative of urban history suggests a simultaneity and similarity in African and Coloured peoples' experience of the city: arrival, integrated residence, and shared mid-century racialized forced removal. This temporality, and the underlying notion of a unified historical experience, undermines a central element of the "Story of Horstley Street": that the forced removal of Africans preceded (and presaged) the subsequent forced removals under the Group Areas Act of people primarily classified as Coloured. The implication that there was a single, shared black historical experience of urban residence and forced removal neglects important elements of the past and collapses significant differences between differently racialized collective experiences and positions.

Horstley Street, imagined as the original site of black residence and forced removal, allows District Six and Cape Town to appear foundational and exemplary within a national past of white racism and a resistant black presence. The collapsing of "Coloured" into "black" positions District Six and Cape Town securely within a liberated and healed African nation. The explicit assertion of Horstley Street's unique historical position furthers an equation between two distinctly racialized experiences, in two distinct time periods, and secures the street within an historically black Cape Town:

> Horstley Street was the site of both the first and last forced removals in District Six. First in 1901, an outbreak of the plague resulted in its African residents being relocated to Ndabeni. The street survived apartheid-era removals until the early 1980s. A video, *Last Supper in Horstley Street,* captured the grief and alienation of a family torn from its roots and moved to Belhar on the Cape Flats.

The temporal structure of an original African dislocation and a final racialized dislocation of "a family" implies an essential sameness between two distinct black histories and experiences. While "African" is mentioned, "Coloured" is not; the omission facilitates the impression that not only is forced removal produced by an unchanging racist logic, but the Street and the District themselves existed in an essentially unchanging condition of black family life.

This temporality of sameness, and its association with family and home, is perhaps most explicit in the explanation of how a visitor should understand the material "memory traces" that the archeological excavation has yielded. Beneath visitors' feet as they read the panels, there is a

rendering of the foundation of a house sunken below the museum floor. Through transparent tiles, visitors can see the material fragments of domestic life contained within its lit cavities. Panel text describes the yields of the archeological excavation and lists the objects visible below, implicitly inviting the visitor to witness a memory of "ordinary" family life that other elements of the exhibit narrate as black and resistant:

> [...] the people lived their daily lives, swept rubbish into the yard, and over time bits and pieces were dropped throughout the site and were lost through the floorboards. Some artefacts bear witness to children's games (marbles, toys, a slate pencil), other to household chores (dressmaking pins, buttons) and meals (sheep bones, peach pips, a spoon, cup, and saucer).

These recovered "memory traces" themselves model the stance of the remembering witness that the visitor should assume. While memory is a pervasive element of Digging Deeper, it is largely implicit, appearing in representations of former resident recollections. However, "Memory Traces" is notable for the explicit and central importance of memory within it, and for the way in which material fragments are made to witness, or to constitute the traces of, a racialized memory. While in much of the District Six Museum, the visitor encounters a recalled cosmopolitan District Six, "Memory Traces" asks excavated domestics fragments to testify to an historical District Six imagined as a home of resistance. This resistance is specifically, if largely implicitly, black, and it belongs to the timeless space of the domestic, ordinary and familial. Racial, cultural, and historical specificity is absent from this home; difference is irrelevant for the unchanging routines of - implicitly black and working-class - domestic life. The memory of a black family history, voided of structural complicity, extends from the excavation of a single house, to all of Horstley Street, District Six, Cape Town and South Africa, and across almost a century.

The idea of collective remembrance brackets the South African Jewish Museum exhibit, Another Time, Another Place: The Jews of District Six, and implicit claims to memory pervade it. The press release announcing the exhibit's opening and introductory text within the exhibit present Another Time as an act of remembrance: a telling of a "neglected story" at risk of being "forgotten." The disappearance of the "memory" of the Jewish community of District Six makes the exhibit necessary, and visitors are urged "to remember," in the implicit place of those who had personal experience of the Jewish District. The press release characterizes the exhibit's sources as themselves "memories": "The exhibition brings together memories that have been collected in the form of personal interviews, candid recollections and character filled [sic] photographs [...]." It promises a "first-hand account" of the experience of these Jewish immigrants, and suggests that the visitor's own memories will be provoked: a visit will "bring back fond memories that will take you back to another time and place."[170]

Familiar tropes of District Six memory discourse introduce and conclude the narrative of Another Time. The panel "District Six" reads in part: "... It was a densely-crowded, working class area whose population constituted a microcosm of every race, culture, religion and nationality then living in the

[170] South African Jewish Museum,"New Exhibition: The Jews of District Six: Another Time, Another Place." Press Release. South African Jewish Museum, Cape Town. [October 2012, document not dated.]

Cape Colony..." "The End of an Era" presents the destruction of the District in equally familiar terms: "In 1966 the declaration of District Six as a white group area sealed its fate and its inhabitants began to be moved out of houses that many of them had occupied for generations to townships on the bleak and windy Cape Flats [...] The last image, "Shared Memories," is a photograph of a Jewish and a non-Jewish (Muslim and "Coloured") former resident seated together in front of the Memory Cloth in the District Six Museum.

Despite the assertion of "Shared Memories," and the photograph that accompanies it, the imagined remembering subject is Jewish and she recalls a unified, bounded, and specifically Jewish community. She "remembers" community cohesion, and progressive assimilation, rather than cosmopolitanism and apartheid injustice. The primary narrative is defined not by the existence of District Six and its destruction, but by Jewish arrival in South Africa and departure for the suburbs. Early panels describe immigrant origins in the shtetls of Lithuania and Latvia, and describe the District Six where the new immigrants settled; Jewish life in District Six is arranged thematically ("Good Neighbors," "Living Conditions," "Education" "Making a Living"); final panels recount the moving-out of the Jews before the District's destruction.

The Jews appear unimplicated by their location in an integrated District Six and a white supremacist South Africa. District Six's non-Jewish residents rarely appear. With the replacement of some local detail, the exhibit might well portray another urban immigrant Jewish community of the early twentieth-century. Another Time produces District Six as a time and place apart - not only from the present, but from South African history and historical change. It is a District Six of timeless Jewish identity; the linear progression of history from "Arrival" to "Moving out" transforms nothing of the coherently Jewish identity of a Jewish District Six. Few dates intrude. The District appears as an abstracted "space," an essentially homogenous location in the fixed "memory" that the exhibit constitutes. It does not emerge as a "place:" a dynamic location connected to other places within Cape Town and the continent.

Another Time declares the cosmopolitan tolerance of the District, but it depicts a Jewish community that is almost isolated from its social surroundings. White Jews and black and brown non-Jews appear to be *only* amicable neighbors. Jews lived beside, but not with, the other residents of the District. In the panel titled "Good Neighbors," the only one to treat relationships between Jews and non-Jews, there are no photographs. Statements are made, only to be qualified, or be rendered doubtful by an adjacent element of the panel. "Good Neighbors," the panel title confidently asserts; however, the notion of neighborly proximity is not supported by the directory pages that are reproduced as evidence. Inter-racial sexual relationships and antisemitism are recalled; almost immediately it is made clear that, if Jews engaged in such relationships, it was not sanctioned by the family; and that antisemitism, although it existed in some sense, was negligible.

Text and images are set against a portion of a hand-drawn District street map: they consist of a main text, a small map of the District, two reproduced pages from a 1906 street directory, and a recollection set in the familiar script-like font of first-person narrative. The main text begins by describing the significance of the street directory pages:

> Cape Town Street Directories reveal the polyglot nature of the District Six

> community and the growing Jewish presence. Shop window advertisements in English, Afrikaans, Yiddish and Hindi reflected the multi-ethnic nature of a community living side by side [...].[171]

An examination of the street directory pages themselves does not substantiate this vision of multicultural tolerance. They suggest the relative proximity of Jewish businesses to non-Jewish businesses; but they also suggest intense block-level segregation. While one block features an Edelson (Tailor) beside an Abbas (butcher), that degree of proximity is exceptional in the pages that the exhibit reproduces.[172] Furthermore, despite the confident presentation of revelatory directory pages, Street Directories themselves are an ambiguous source. It impossible to know from the pages whether a family resides on the premises of their business; and most of these Hanover Street listings are of merchants. While many surnames suggest a particular ethnic background, social reality is more contingent and mixed than a one-to-one equation of name and racial or Jewish identity.

In the second of the two paragraphs, the voice of confident curatorial objectivity acknowledges the historical existence of antisemitism and of intermarriage, and almost immediately suggests that their occurrence was trivial:

> Relationships between Jewish immigrants and other residents of District Six appear to have been supportive and amicable, but traditional Jewish parents would not countenance inter-marriage. Anti-semitism was not a feature of life. Indeed one former resident described experiencing only one incident when children of an Afrikaans family living in Wicht Street used to hurl insults at her as she walked past their house on the way to school. It was Dr. Abdurahman's daughters (one of whom was Cissie Gool) who came to her rescue by walking with her to provide protection. (13)

Intermarriage is not tolerated by "traditional" Jewish parents; the passage sidesteps the question of its actual occurrence. The evidence of the negligible presence of antisemitism - if not its complete absence - is a recalled childhood experience in which white Afrikaners are the agents of prejudice and the daughters of the District's most illustrious [and non-Jewish] family appear as saviors and the implicit representatives of inter-racial and inter-religious solidarity.[173] Beside the reproduced street directory pages, a first-person narrative alludes directly to more intimate racial contact. Yet that contact does not involve the Jewish family directly. The racial background of the speaker's maid, adopted into the Jewish family, is the closest that the family comes to more intimate racial mixing:

---

171 Pimstone, *Jews of District 6*, 14.

172 For example, on one block, most of the surnames suggest Ashkenazi origins: Mendeltort, Caplan, Goluskin, Kesler. Only one name is identifiably non-Jewish: Jimal (ie Jamal). On another block, the appellations and surnames attached to another block suggest no Jews, but instead a diversity of primarily black merchants, with typically "Coloured" and "Asian" surnames such as Carelse, Simon, Goliath, Booshkeen, Barwoodeen, and Petersen.

173 Dr Abdullah Abdhurahman (1857-1940) was a doctor and a politician: president (1905-1940) of the African Peoples Organisation (APO); member of the Cape Town City Council (1904-1940); and member of the Cape Provincial Council (1914-1940). Cissie Gool (1897-1963), the more famous of his two daughters, was a prominent political activist, served on the Cape Town City Council (1938-1951), and, late in life, became a lawyer. *Drum* magazine dubbed her Cape Town's Coloured Joan of Arc." See http://www.sahistory.org.za/people/zainunnisa-cissie-gool.

> *Christina our maid was the offspring of a white father and a Coloured mother and we became her family. She learned Yiddish and used to call out to us children on a Friday afternoon: 'Grayt zich tzu af Shabbos' (Go and get ready for Shabbat').* (14)

Through this instance of doubly relayed, and translated speech, the visitor to Another Time is implicitly hailed as a Jewish child. The reader is brought into the inclusive Jewish family of the past, addressed by the mixed-race maid who speaks Yiddish.

The exhibit conjures "the Jews of District Six" as a Jewish family, and itself resembles a somewhat didactic family photo album. As in a typical album, photographs are a primary component, and they frequently portray family members together. Short texts and general themes provide the scaffolding upon which the images of the historical Jewish family are grouped. Outdoor images of District Six - streets, a building facade, a view of the harbor from the District - sometimes appear as background. Most photographs, however, are portraits of Jews and Jewish establishments. Photographs rarely complicate, or even illustrate, a textual narrative. Instead, photographs are visual testimony to the historical presence of Jews, pictured in portraits: of families, groups of children, and prominent individuals. When occasionally non-Jews figure in a photograph, they are not identified or acknowledged. Short texts narrate the recollections of former District Six residents. They are set in a font reminiscent of hand-writing that visually evokes the notes added to personal albums or scrapbooks. As in a typical family album, the identity of the photographer is not noted and photographs are not dated. The sources of photographs (and of other images and text) are not identified. This omission furthers the resemblance to a private collection and suggests that the exhibit is somehow the product of decades of family life, rather than an institutionally supported product of professional research and curation.[174]

The exhibit catalogue, a reproduction of the exhibit in book form, most closely resembles a family album. Its front cover consists of two photographs: a clearly dated portrait superimposed upon the landscape of Cape Town and its mountain. In the foreground, a Jewish family is seated around a laid table: bearded father, mother, two young sons and a daughter. They seem to float above old Cape Town. Table Mountain rises behind them;[175] the floor beneath their feet gives way to the town stretched out in spare colonial order below and to the east. "The Jews of District 6" crosses the top of Table Mountain in pink script-like font; "ANOTHER TIME ANOTHER PLACE" is printed across the mountain's lower slopes in block-like letters. A band of pastel-colored stripes, evocative

---

174 The "Acknowledgements," displayed at the end of the exhibit and printed on the final page of the catalogue, recognizes a number of research institutions and organizations from which materials were sourced, and individuals (former residents) whose words are quoted, but it does not attribute any particular text or image to any particular source. A lengthy list of primarily local institutions, including the District Six Museum, are acknowledged, as are "involved" individuals. A separate paragraph asserts the importance of oral history interviews with former residents, and names some of the interviewees whose words were directly quoted in the exhibit ("Many of the quotations used in the exhibition were drawn directly from these interviews, in particular those of [...]"). Three of the "many" secondary sources that were consulted are singled out by name, among them are the two-volume social history of Cape Town (*The Making of a City* (1998) and *Cape Town in The Twentieth Century* (1999)) that is referenced later in this chapter.

175 Unlike most of the photographs within the exhibit, these two photographs are dated, and for one, the background photograph, the photographer is named: "Cover photograph: Rev. Yehuda Leib Schrire and family. District Six, 1901" and "Cover background photograph by W.F.H Pocock c.1884."

of a rainbow, is superimposed upon sky, the mountain cliff and slopes, and then runs behind the seated figures. The delicate pink letters, and the unexpectedly pastel palette of the predictable national rainbow, might evoke the District's historic reputation as a location of sexual and gendered difference. A short time spent with the book, however, make clear that the color scheme it not intended to allude to the queerness of the District, let alone to that of its Jewish family.

Differences among Jews are rarely acknowledged and do not disturb the progressive and totalizing narrative: a trajectory of assimilation which begins with immigration and ends with the upward economic mobility that the move out of the District confirmed. The whiteness of Jews is simply assumed; allusions to class differentiation appear only occasionally in captions and cited speech. All Jews, it is implied, were equally white and, eventually, equally upwardly mobile.[176] "Moving Out" implies a collective, uniform and almost inevitable, departure from District Six.[177] A limited acknowledgement of differences among Jews of the District does not produce an exploration of the varied positions of Jews within communal, local, or national life. Certain political and religious differences - "socialism," "Zionism," and variations in religious practice - are presented, and contained, within a single section, *Communal Divisions*. These differences are significant, we are told, because they produced a range of community institutions, and, eventually, a heterogeneous - but, implicitly, unified - national Jewish community.[178]

The "Zionism" and "Socialism" panels constitute the only treatments of political activity. While Zionism is portrayed with specificity and vibrancy, socialism remains vague. "Zionism" coheres thematically; visual and textual reference to the Balfour Declaration joins the lengthy main text, single photograph, and cited speech. Zionism is defined, depicted as central to local Jewish life, and its important institutions are named. Socialism, on the other hand, is not defined, its Jewish organizations are not named, and the contributions of its actors are described minimally or not at all. Socialism appears to warrant inclusion in the exhibit only because once, in another time and place, many important socialists were Jews.

In "Socialism," the four-sentence main text casts the socialist affiliations of the new immigrants in the pluperfect, as if socialism was already no longer current when they arrived. The subsequent demise of Jewish socialist organizations appears inevitable, an impression that the reliance upon "to be," and upon the passive voice in particular, facilitates:

---

176 A rare mention of race implies that Jews shared a uniform racialized class status: the children of the Jews of District Six "were fast becoming an integrated part of the privileged white community."

177 "As their economic situation improved, so Jewish families moved out of District Six to more up-market areas [...]" (72). Another exhibit section, "Making a Living," describes Jewish poverty, but only as an initial immigrant condition that preceded inevitable prosperity: With the exception of the image of a market ("informal trading"), photographs of worklife portray only prosperous businesses and the prominent merchants themselves. Only a brief excerpt of a first-person narrative, set apart by the script-like font and position on the margins of the primary text, conveys the desperation of poverty and a greater range of labor that Jews performed: "...bakers, builders, and harness-makers. But quite a lot of them had no trade but became traders in the sense that they opened up little shops and would do anything to make a living. They worked very hard from early in the morning until very late at night" (43).

178 "These differences were to play an important part in the nature of the community as the new immigrants set about fashioning institutions that would meet their own religious and cultural needs. Their presence was to alter dramatically the composition of the South African Jewish community" (28).

> Among the immigrants were those who had identified with movements such as the General Union of Jewish Workers in Lithuania, Poland, and Russia, the Yiddishe Arbeiter, better known as the Bund, that had been established in Vilna in 1897. By 1910 virtually all the Jewish socialist unions in Cape Town had either collapsed or were being absorbed into the more mainstream [not specifically Jewish] unions. The most significant of these was the International Socialist League (ISL) with premises in District Six. The majority of its leadership and the most militant were Jews, referred to by their critics as 'Russians', because Jewish representation was so pronounced, the League began to publish its announcements in Yiddish, as well as English and Dutch. (36)

The final sentence emphasizes the significance of Jews within socialist organizations by imparting two disparate pieces of information. Yet the first is to have the same meaning as the second: the Jewish presence was important. The conjunction of antisemitism and anti-communism warrants no commentary.

Socialism belongs essentially to the early twentieth-century and to Eastern Europe: a vague, archaic tendency that, like the specifically Jewish socialist organizations themselves, collapsed. It has no relation to the present except as an object of the visitor's dutiful recollection. Socialism is somehow not South African, not contemporary, and not Communism. It appears unconnected to struggles against white supremacy and apartheid.[179] Except for the information that Jews became participants in "mainstream" socialist organizations, there is little suggestion of how socialist organizing changed over the (never-specified) decades. The apparent disconnection of the "Jewish socialism" of District Six from other places, times, and political struggles renders it merely a quaint object of vague recollection.

Photographs visually overwhelm the main text. The portrait of Ray Alexander is the largest and most visually compelling of the five images of "Socialism." Ray Alexander Simons (1913-2004) was an exceptional figure in South African history. She was a prominent Communist and anti-apartheid activist, co-author of the foundational *Class and Colour in South Africa: 1850 - 1950* (1969), and a recipient of ANC's highest honor, "Isitwalandwe."[180] "Socialism" presents her as a daughter, sister, and recent immigrant. The black and white photograph is both intimate and familial: a young Alexander is seated on a front step, almost in the center of the photograph. Two other young women are beside her; two more women stand right above. The closeness between them is almost palpable. Three gazes are fixed on Alexander and the young woman closest to her. Alexander looks directly at the photographer. The caption evokes her at the moment of initial arrival in South Africa, and barely hints at her subsequent contributions: "Ray Alexander (left front) with her sisters and mother. When she arrived in Cape Town from Latvia at the age of 15, Ray initially stayed at a sister's

---

[179] The Communist Party of South Africa was dissolved by the apartheid government in 1950; it went underground, reemerged in exile as the South African Communist Party (SACP), and became very important in the anti-apartheid struggle: this is information we do not learn from the exhibit. Only a brief reference within suggests any connection between socialism and the SACP. Beside an image of a front cover of a socialist paper, the caption explains, "[*The Bolshevik*] was the official organ of the ISL which merged with other socialist groups to form the Communist Party of South Africa in 1921."

[180] Alexander Simons was also, in the 1930s, secretary of the Communist Party of South Africa.

flat in Roeland Street. Shortly after her arrival, she joined the Communist Party and became a prominent labour activist" (37). The portrayal of Alexander domesticates her politics and freezes her in a moment of youth, within her own family and within the larger family that the album evokes. It removes her life from the determining context of apartheid and thus also removes the Jewish family from its implication in apartheid.

On the back cover of the Jewish family photo album, a black and white image of a District Six street is partially superimposed upon the base of a prominent peak. The street appears ghostly; the mountain and city landscape are clearly visible through it. The image of an almost empty street, a lone child, and a dilapidated building facade evoke hundreds of other shots of the streets of the District taken during the '60s, '70s, and early '80s, just prior to and during the District's destruction. Unlike the family and individual portraits, but like the photographs of District Six within this album, this photograph is nowhere mentioned and no attribution is noted. A visual "memory" of the destroyed District, unmoored from a particular time, space, or subject position floats against the mountain slopes.

In a foundational 1998 critique of both South African revisionist historiography and post-apartheid public history, Minkley and Legassick suggest that South Africa's "missed" revolution is to blame for the lack of emergence of a new post-apartheid school of history. They ask, citing the questions of another scholar about then-contemporary debates: "But what kind of history of the struggle is being demanded in this critique? Is it a popular 'history from below'? Or is it a triumphalist national history? Or a 'reconciliation' history?"[181] My suggestion is that the idiom of memory, rather than a new historical school, has emerged as a dominant response. Memory can "recall" narratives of triumphant struggle, working-class resistance, or reconciliation, but it frequently does so from a particular identitarian subject position, even when the object of recollection is, or is ostensibly, a cosmopolitan community. The metaphor of collective memory can function to disguise or elide the particularity of the remembering subject and the politics of her "remembrance" of the past.

I want to suggest a renewed engagement with the "production of history" and the "production of space," rather than with remembrance and recovery. To make this suggestion, I look to the cover of another book, a volume of the social history of Cape Town published in the same year as Minkley and Legassick's critique of social history. Like the photographs of the streets of District Six, the image is nowhere explored within the volume itself. The neglect of the painting within the social history should provoke us to think more about what constitutes the current archive of South African history, and about what is absent and why. Encounters with the image in another Cape Town context, the home of former District Six residents, serve as a reminder that the metaphor of memory is not necessary in order to articulate the continuing material and social presence of the past in the landscape of Cape Town.

Cape Town: The Making of a City[182] is the first volume of the best-known revisionist social history of the city. The book cover portrays an iconic view of the Mother City: the viewer's eye, poised

---

[181] Martin Legassick and Gary Minkley, "Current Trends in the Production of History," *Alternation* 5, no.1 (1998), 108. They cite a commentary on the 1996 conference, *The Future of the Past,* held at the University of the Western Cape.

[182] Nigel Worden, Elizabeth van Heyningen, and Vivian Bickford-Smith, *Cape Town: The Making of a City* (Cape Town: David Philips, 1998).

somewhere above the sea, looks out over the center city from the pier to Table Mountain. When I first encountered the image, it was immediately familiar: like thousands of others, it presents a picturesque city from the habitual vantage point of European "discovery." The sea is in the foreground, the distinctive shape of Table Mountain forms the backdrop. Appropriately for the era in which the book first appeared, a rainbow arcs from the lower slopes of the mountain and beyond the cover edge. Like the rainbow nation appellation of the post-apartheid 1990s, the Victorian painting portrays a political aspiration, rather than a contemporary reality.

The image is a reproduction of the Victorian-era painting, *Holiday Time in Cape Town in the Twentieth Century in Honour of the Expected Arrival of the Governor-General of the United South Africa*. In its life as the cover image of a non-fiction text, the painting appears to be a portrait, if an idealized one, of an historical city. The cover image does not include the gold curtains that are gathered to either side of the original painting – an omission that lends the cover image a realism that the curtains of the original belie. The painting has been the object of little critical attention, as if it were the product of a false consciousness that would look to the imperial, and even apartheid, past with uncritical nostalgia. I understand the *Holiday Time* to instead provoke questions about the archive of post-apartheid South African history - which images, texts, and social experiences shall be analyzed and how.

The Making of a City does not present the painting as an historical source, despite the book's typically didactic engagement with reproduced primary source material, both image and text. The cover image seems to function as an exemplary representation of an imagined imperial past, rather than as a cultural artifact that might resonate in unpredictable ways in the post-apartheid present. The painting is merely acknowledged: "Detail from 'Holiday Time in Cape Town in the Twentieth Century in Honour of the Expected Arrival of the Governor-General of the United South Africa' by James Ford." Ford, an Englishman, completed his painting in 1899; the year of the inception of the South African War, and prior to both the twentieth-century and the existence of a political entity called South Africa. Thus, rather than depicting historic Cape Town, in however stylized a manner, the painting depicts an imagined, political future. However, Hayden Proud, a curator at the South African National Gallery in Cape Town suggests that it is mistaken to understand the painting as merely futuristic or utopic.[183] Its temporality is mixed; not only does it look forward to an imagined future, it also evokes the past. The majority of the real buildings it depicts were no longer extant in the late nineteenth-century of the painting's creation. To the informed viewer, then, *Holiday Time* portrays a Cape Town outside of time and space, an anachronistic city in which vanished historic buildings stand beside contemporary and imagined structures, and genteel crowds gather to welcome the leader of an imagined imperial polity.

Present on the book cover, *Holiday Time* is barely explored in the revisionist social history within. While the volume diligently engages with beautifully reproduced primary sources, modeling a critical, post-partheid engagement with historical sources, the painting does not appear as part of the archive that the text interprets. Unlike the most frequently reproduced images in the volume - photographs - the painting cannot be read as literally representational; it is obviously fanciful, shaped by an imperial

[183] Nicolaas Vergunst, *Hoerikwaggo: Images of Table Mountain* (Cape Town: South African National Gallery, 2001), 83. The text references unpublished exhibit notes (1999) authored by Hayden Proud.

imaginary that is nowhere an explicit part of contemporary South African democracy. I see the elision of the painting within *The Making of a City* as signaling a disavowal of the presence of an imperial imaginary in the present. The text thus avoids an investigation of the connections between imperial notions of multi-racial nationhood, and those that have circulated in the post-apartheid present. [184]

I first encountered the painting as a framed reproduction in the home of a former District Six family. It featured in my education in that house: proof that Cape Town was once a different city. *Holiday Time* was the historical evidence to which we returned: once an interlocutor referenced the Adderley Street pier and my host interjected to orient me geographically by way of the painting - the old pier features in the foreground. The painting also functioned as an instructive reminder to me: I must be sure to write about how *old Cape Town* was, not only about District Six. Indeed, former residents often did not make a clear distinction between the two. District Six was not only a part of Cape Town; narratives frequently merge the two completely - District Six *was* Cape Town and Cape Town District Six. To be in the *Kaap* was to be in the District; to be "thrown out" of District Six was to be purged from the city.

The reproduction of *Holiday Time* hangs in the living room of a house in Factreton, an area of - or perhaps outside of - Cape Town. The house is located on Lugmag Laan, Airforce Avenue, one street removed from the undeveloped expanse of Cape Town's old airport. Other, primarily Afrikaans, place names share the preoccupation with military aviation: Vliegtuigstraat, airplane street; Lysanderstraat (the anglicized name of a Spartan general as well as a British World War II aircraft); Kitty Hawk. Factreton, like most of Cape Town's townships, was an apartheid state creation. During World War II, the government envisioned the area for occupation by the returning white soldiers of World War II. But white people, my host explained, had not wanted to live surrounded by the black settlements of that time, so the government zoned the area for Coloured occupation instead. His own father had moved into this house; he had recently returned from the War in North Africa; a metal plaque proclaims the name he gave the house: *Tunisia*.

A mixed temporality characterizes both the painting and the actual present of Cape Town: multiple forced removals, and a racialized history of World War II military participation, are not erased from Factreton's contemporary landscape. Before there was Factreton, the area was known as Windemere; it was a racially mixed area of primarily shanty dwellings. In the 1950s, residents were primarily black and Coloured; efforts to forcibly displace all of them through the implementation of only Union-era legislation – the 1934 Slums Act – had little effect on the racially mixed composition of the area, as black migrants continued to arrive in large numbers from the countryside. At its most population-dense peak, the Windemere (and adjacent Kensington) area was home to 30,000 people, approximately 55 to 60 percent of whom were black.[185] After it was zoned a "Coloured area" in

---

[184] One way that the painting might be seen as expressing a multi-racial "rainbow" imperial imaginary is in its depiction of the human figures in the foreground. However, this social diversity is difficult to discern without historical knowledge, and particularly if the viewer encounters only a small reproduction of the painting in which details cannot be made out. Carol G Silver discusses the racially and otherwise heterogenous urban populace that is depicted in Ford's painting: "Images of Empire: Art and Artifacts in Cape Town, South Africa," *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34, no. 1 (2006): 335-342. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25058751.

[185] Sean Field, *Oral History, Community, and Displacement: Imagining Memories in Post-Apartheid South Africa* (New York:

1958, and with the creation of the "African" township of Gugulethu in the early 1960s, forced removals of those classified as African accelerated. Today, Factreton could be described as a calm "Coloured village." Despite poverty and some notorious incidents of gang violence (and violent popular response to gangsterism), Factreton does not share in the notoriety of the larger townships - Mitchell's Plain, Hanover Park, Manenberg, Bonteheuwel - to which many people from District Six were removed. In a city whose residents assess the centrality of a location by reference to "the Mountain," Factreton is not far: a short bus or "taxi" ride to "town," a clear view of Devil's Peak at the back of the house.

On Lugmag Laan, the painting suggests the shifting relations between the idea of District Six and that of Cape Town: the District was (is) variously a microcosm of Cape Town, its origin, an island apart, the heart of the city, the city itself. In contrast to its absence in the history text, *Holiday Time* was an important reference within the histories that were narrated on Lugmag Laan in the house named Tunisia. Depicting an imagined time and place rather than one which actually existed in the past, the framed reproduction in the house on Lugmag Laan echoed the actual presence of the past in post-apartheid Cape Town, and instructed me about the ways in which people have experienced the relationship between the District and the city. *Holiday Time*, and the house where it hangs, can make us think about the temporality of present-day South Africa - a present that is not an eternal "post," but instead one in which varied pasts and places are materially and socially present.

Palgrave Macmillan, 2012), 25-26.

Chapter Three - Theorizing Complicity: Three Texts by Richard Rive

This chapter begins by reflecting upon the overlapping ways in which different contemporary South African nationalist discourses construct apartheid and considers how these discourses have informed post-apartheid receptions of three texts by Richard Rive (1931-1989). Relying on the shared idiom of collective memory produced in part by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC), different nationalisms frame apartheid in similarly dichotomous ways that serve to obscure and marginalize critical aspects of Rive's work. My subsequent rereading of three texts - the novel *Buckingham Palace*, *District Six* (1986), and the short stories "Riva" (1983) and "My Sister Was a Playwhite" (1955) - suggests that we reconsider the limits of national memory discourses and recognize the multiple other ways in which South African narratives have articulated apartheid violence.[186] Through their evocations of forms of complicity that were inherent to the structure of apartheid, these fictional texts provoke reflection upon the character and temporality of apartheid violence and of a literature of resistance to it.

Within a dominant national discourse of memory, the violence of apartheid has come to be most readily understood as physical rather than structural, moral rather than political, dichotomous rather than constituted through multiple positions: epitomized by the violence committed by policemen upon activists, rather than by the disenfranchisement, dispossession, or segregation that violently structured the lives of black South Africans. A narrow understanding of apartheid violence has come to dominate national discourses about the past, in part because of the way in which the TRC publically performed, and then textually produced, a national relationship to the apartheid past. Collective memory is a primary metaphor of the discourse, and its privileged narrative form is first-person testimony. In the larger memory discourse, as in the hearings and the Commission's final report, apartheid forms the background to a very long series of individual rights violations, rather than appearing itself as a structure of violation that targeted racialized collectivities and depended upon intermediary, or complicit, positions occupied by people who were both targets and beneficiaries of its violence.

The three texts that I examine are concerned with characters who occupy such intermediary positions - of structural complicity - within an apartheid racial and economic structure. All three provoke experiences of both temporal and conceptual disorientation for the contemporary post-apartheid reader: each, at moments, evokes the continuities of apartheid with the colonial period and the post-1994 period, and each implies that the primary violence of apartheid was structural and intangible, and thus that historical actors suffered and benefitted in ways that do not always align with apartheid racial designations, nor with contemporary national discourses about apartheid. While

---

[186] An earlier version of "Riva" was published in the March 1979 issue of the literary journal *Staffrider;* the version referenced here was published in the widely disseminated collection of Rive's short stories, *Advance, Retreat* (Cape Town: David, Philip, 1983), 60-72. *Buckingham Palac*e was first published by David Philip in 1986. Ten years later, David Philip brought out a second, "learner's" edition, which includes notes and an introduction intended for students by Robin Malan; this is the edition that I reference here. The text of the novel is the same in both editions. "My Sister was a PlayWhite" was published in the July 1955 issue of *Africa.* To my knowledge, it has not been reprinted since.

all three narratives are framed as products of the narrator's recollection, within that conventional narrative frame, the reader can become disoriented, whether as a result of the narrator's own disorientation, temporal and spatial discontinuities within the narrative, or because of continuities between apartheid South Africa and other space-times.

Inclusive and exclusive iterations of contemporary South African nationalism produce similarly dichotomous understandings of apartheid as a primarily racial (and not always also economic) system comprised of two fundamental, racially-coded, positions.[187] The exclusive strand of nationalism conceives of South Africa as African and understands African to mean black and heteronormative. Some African nationalisms, such as the ethnic nationalism connected to current President Zuma, or the African Renaissance vision of democratic South Africa's second president, Thabo Mbeki, are produced by, or strongly associated with, the African National Congress (ANC) state. However, African nationalism also figures in varied articulations of popular and populist opposition to the ANC state.[188] The inclusive strand of South African nationalism encompasses multiracial conceptions of the nation; its most powerful articulation was found in the liberal vision of the 1990s - South Africa as Mandela's "rainbow nation." It is primarily this conception of South Africa that nation-building projects such as the Truth and Reconciliation Commission produced, and it is this notion of nationhood that District Six memory discourse frequently articulates. Yet "rainbowist" projects, state and non-state, echo elements of a more explicitly racial nationalism. The national history produced by the TRC, for example, in the time period it considers and in its focus upon activists and state actors, resembles a Struggle history. In the centrality of "the land" and in the sometime equation between a racial collective and the District, District Six memory discourse can echo conventional nationalist preoccupations with indigeneity and territorial belonging. While in its African nationalist iteration, "black" signifies African, and in its rainbow iteration "black" signifies the multi-racial solidarity of Black Consciousness, both kinds of nationalism frequently privilege a racialized and dichotomous notion of apartheid violence. They articulate a similarly dichotomous notion of apartheid temporality and morality; they imply that 1994 constituted a clean line of rupture between the present and an apartheid past populated by heroes and oppressors, victims and perpetrators, blacks and whites.

Both Africanist and "Rainbow-ist" discourses about apartheid reflect discourses of memory produced by, and around, South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission.[189] The nation-

---

187 In *Rethinking the South African Crisis: Nationalism, Populism Hegemony* (Scottsville: University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press, 2012), Gillian Hart identifies three processes of post-apartheid "re-nationalism" that have emerged with neo-liberal processes of de-nationalism led by corporate capital (including, but not limited to policies of structural adjustment and the denationalization of formerly national economic enterprises): "rainbowism;" draconian anti-immigration policies and sentiments ("Fortress South Africa"); and the discourse surrounding the National Democratic Revolution (NDR), the model adopted by the ANC and the SACP in 1962 that would understand the present as the national (capitalist) stage in a two-part revolution: the socialist revolution is still to come (6-9).

188 For an analysis of ways in which articulations of nation and liberation are not simply state impositions, but figure in popular consciousness and populist resistance to the ANC- state, see the volume by Gillian Hart cited above, in particular Chapter Five, "The Unravelling of ANC Hegemony: Generations of Populist Politics."

189 The Commission's legislative mandate is set out in "The Promotion of National Unity and Reconciliation Act 34 of 1995" (for the text of the Act, see http://www.justice.gov.za/legislation/acts/1995-034.pdf). The nation-building intention is explicit in both this legislation and in the final article of the Interim Constitution of 1993 which committed the government to granting amnesty to perpetrators (nothing is said of victims or reparations). The article begins and concludes with declarations of commitment to the new nation: "The pursuit of national unity, the well-

building function of the TRC was an explicit element of its mandate: the Commission would hear the truth of the past, produce a history in which all South Africans would share, and thus mark the clear separation of a violent past from the new national present. One of the Commission's essential roles was to research apartheid-era human rights violations and to publically hear the testimony of (selected) victims of rights violations. Only rights violations illegal under the laws of the apartheid state could be subject to investigation, and the Commission interpreted the "gross human rights violation" of its mandate to mean acts of [illegal] physical violation that emanated "from the conflicts of the past" and for which a "political objective" was clear.[190] Forms of apartheid structural violence thus did not qualify; administrative racial violence, such as the notorious pass system to which black African people were subject, was not a "gross violation" of rights.[191] The interpretation of violation (and violence) was as circumscribed as the interpretation of "political"; in practice, "violations" were recognized when they were committed upon (or by) members of political organizations and agents of the state: apartheid violence became a matter of security policemen, informers, and activists.

While "human rights violation" and "political" were subjects of interpretation and extended public contestation'[192] the Commission's mandate was temporally unambiguous: the historical scope of its investigations was bracketed by two dates that were already understood as key in grand narratives of political resistance: 1960 - the Sharpeville Massacre, the resultant banning of the ANC and the PAC, and the emergence of armed struggle - and 1994 - the first democratic elections. The banning of the nationalist parties in 1960, rather than the inception of apartheid in 1948, correlates with the

---

being of all South African citizens and peace require reconciliation between the people of South Africa and the reconstruction of society," and "With this Constitution and these commitments we, the people of South Africa, open a new chapter in the history of our country." For the complete text of the *Interim Constitution* of 1993, see http://www.justice.gov.za/Trc/legal/sacon93.htm.

[190] The Promotion of National Unity Act begins by defining its scope. The open-ended phrase "emanating from the conflicts of the past" permitted the Commission to define the kind of violence that concerned it in narrow terms:

> To provide for the investigation and the establishment of as complete a picture as possible of the nature, causes and extent of gross violations of human rights committed during the period from 1 March 1960 to the cut-off date contemplated in the Constitution within or outside the Republic, emanating from the conflicts of the past, and the fate or whereabouts of the victims of such violations; the granting of amnesty to persons who make full disclosure of all the relevant facts relating to acts associated with a political objective committed in the course of the conflicts of the past during the said period. [...]

The Constitution stated a cut-off date of 1993; it was later extended to 1994.

[191] Mahmood Mamdani's critique emphasizes that the Commission did not interpret its mandate in a way that allowed it to address the structural violence of apartheid. See "Amnesty or Impunity? A Preliminary Critique of the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC)," in "Ethics," special issue, *Diacritics* 32, no. 3/4 (Autumn-Winter, 2002): 32-59; and "A Diminished Truth" in *After the TRC: Reflections on Truth and Reconciliation in South Africa,* ed. James Wilmot and Linda van de Vijver (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 2000), 58-61.

[192] In its final report, the TRC, as Mamdani points out in "Amnesty or Impunity," describes the contestation over the scope of its investigations, while simultaneously denying that it had engaged in an act of interpretation. The report implies that the Commission was helplessly bound to its mandate:

> This definition [that resulted from interpretation] limited the attention of the Commission to events which emanated from the conflicts of the past, rather than from the policies of apartheid.[...] Many organisations lobbied the Commission to insist that these issues should form part of its investigations. Commission members, too, felt that these were important areas that could not be ignored. Nevertheless, they could not be interpreted as falling directly within the Commission's mandate. (Vol. 5, 11, Art. 48)

Commission's focus upon activists and state actors, and its production of a history of political parties and armed resistance, rather than one of repression, structural violence, and resistance by historical actors who were not "activists." By locating apartheid in a particular period of the apartheid past, and producing a teleological and linear notion of history, the Commission unequivocally located the new unified nation in the present. Heidi Grunebaum clearly articulates the function of this temporality for the nation-building project:

> In forging a conceptual matrix for the "conceivable," a shared reality to which nation-building could refer, it has been the "past" that has provided a common symbolic referent in constructing an inclusive notion of *nation*. That is why, as Richard Wilson also observes, temporal tropes, in particular, have been such effective reference points around which a collective and cohesive sense of nation-ness could be constructed.[193]

In addition, by exclusively addressing extra-legal acts of physical violation, the Commission largely represented apartheid violence in the polarized, static, and individual terms of "victim" and "perpetrator." By working with a narrow understanding of what constituted a political conflict or objective, the Commission produced a textual history and a discourse in which "the political" was narrowly defined and divorced from everyday life. First-person testimony of violation was primary to these connected impacts; in hearings, as in the larger national discursive field, testimony performed the separation between past and present and functioned to suggest that apartheid's essential violence consisted of extralegal acts of physical violation by individuals upon individuals. The articulation of autobiographical narratives, especially those of victims, would transform past violence into peace, and many individual narratives would join together in a single national narrative.[194] While the Commission named apartheid as a crime against humanity - and thus as a crime of a collective and structural character - its reports, as well as the discursive production which surrounded it, suggest[ed] that apartheid injustice could be told through narratives of individual criminal acts, individual perpetrators, and individual victims.

Buckingham Palace, "Riva," and "My Sister" are primarily set in the same liminal historical period - of the "long 1950s"[195] - that is also the period of apartheid rule that the TRC did not investigate. This

---

193 *Memorializing The Past: Everyday Life in South Africa after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2011), 32. Grunebaum refers to Richard Wilson's article "The Sizwe Will Not Go Away: The Truth and Reconciliation Commission, Human Rights and Nation-Building in South Africa," *African Studies* 55, no. 2 (1996): 1-20.

194 In addition to the works I have cited, there is a broad scholarship on the Commission and the discourses that it produced, and that have been produced around it. See, inter alia, two collections: Graeme Simpson and Deborah Posel, eds, *Commissioning the Past: Understanding South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2002); and Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee, eds, *Negotiating the Past: the making of memory in South Africa* (Cape Town: Oxford, 1998).

195 The "long 1950s" is my term to refer to the period between 1948 and 1961. Some ambiguity surrounds the temporal location of "Riva" and *Buckingham Palace*. "Riva" appears to be set in the 1950s (no year is specified) and recalled from the 1970s. The Babi Yar Massacre Nazi intrudes upon post-war Cape Town. The first two parts of *Buckingham Palace a*re set in 1955 and 1960 (the long 1950s); Part Three is set in 1970. Within the novel's apparently explicit temporal framework however, temporal ambiguities intrude in the italicized sections of first-person recollection that precede each of the novel's three parts. The reader does not learn the age of this narrator and his historical/temporal

was the early apartheid period of relative freedom that was also the period of British apartheid rule. From the election of the National Party in 1948 until the secession from the Commonwealth in 1961, South Africa was both an apartheid state and a Dominion within the British Empire. The South African 1950s are thus particularly suggestive of the continuity of colonial forms of violence; forms that precede the establishment of the apartheid republic and extend beyond 1994. The ambiguous sovereignty and colonial continuities of this long decade is reflected in all three texts, as is the liminal situation of the city in which they are set: Cape Town was "English," the Mother City, formally ruled by apartheid as well as by the British Queen, poised on the cusp of the intense repression of the 1960s and the exit from the Commonwealth.

In a common variety of post-apartheid hindsight, the "long decade" of the South African 1950s appears as a reprieve between the election of the National Party in 1948, and the Sharpeville Massacre in 1960: the 1950s were years of relative freedom, intensive cultural production, and increasingly organized political resistance, punctuated by the Congress Movement's Defiance Campaign,[196] the development of a national opposition alliance, and the 1955 adoption of the Freedom Charter.[197] Rather than as the relatively benign interstice that preceded 1960, they might also be seen as years of intensifying repression; famously marked not only by the long Treason Trial,[198] but by the destruction of Sophiatown[199] - an iconic location in South African imaginaries of black cosmopolitanism and apartheid injustice, as well as the initial Johannesburg location of the *Drum* offices. In the magazine's first brief incarnation as *African Drum*, its offices had been located in Cape Town, in District Six, before "becoming" *Drum* and relocating to Sophiatown at the end of 1951, its first year of existence.[200]

Drum is one of the best-known, and the longest-running, English-language African magazine. *Drum* of the early 1950s provided a unique cultural and political forum for its readers, as well as its writers. For literary scholars, the magazine is significant for its early support of young black, and all male, literary talent - "the *Drum* Boys" or the "*Drum* Generation" - whose journalism ran parallel to their literary production.[201] The *Drum* short story competition, of which, for two years, Langston Hughes was the judge,[202] helped to launch the careers of several writers, among them Rive, whose stories

---

location, nor do his recollection consistently match a single historical time period.

196 Of 1952. Alan Paton's 1982 novel, *Ah, But Your Land is Beautiful*, brought the Defiance Campagin enduring international recognition.

197 Immediately following the Sharpeville Massacre, the government declared a State of Emergency and banned the African National Congress and the Pan-African Congress. One might also consider the "long decade" to conclude with the Rivonia Trial (1963-64) which ended with the imprisonment of Nelson Mandela and his co-defendants.

198 One hundred and fifty six Congress Movement leaders were tried (1956-1961).

199 The forced removals began in 1954, and were justified by new apartheid legislation, the Natives Resettlement Act of 1954.

200 The magazine began in March 1951 as *African Drum*. By the end of that year, it was *Drum* magazine, under new editorship (of Anthony Sampson), and based in Johannesburg. In its new incarnation, it sought to attract more urban African readers and employed black reporters and writers. See Michael Chapman, "More than Telling a Story: Drum and its Significance in Black South African Writing" in *The Drum Decade: Stories from the 1950s*, ed. Michael Chapman (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1989), 183-227; and Anthony Sampson, *Drum: The Making of a Magazine* (Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 2004). The first edition of Sampson's volume was published in 1956.

201 Among them were Todd Matshikiza, Bloke Modisane, Es'kia Mphahlele, Nat Nakasa, Lewis Nkosi, Henry Nxumalo, and D. Can Themba.

202 In April 1953, Nxumalo, then the fiction editor, wrote Langston Hughes to ask him to judge that year's short story

won second place.[203] The end of the competition signified the shift in the magazine's orientation away from aesthetically and politically challenging material; however, Hughes maintained relationships with several of these young writers, and several, Rive among them, went on to be published in the African literary anthology that Hughes subsequently edited.[204]

While a number of these writers have become known as "*Drum* writers," Rive has not. Today, to be recalled as a "*Drum* writer" does not only signify the strength of the writer's relationship to the magazine; it suggests his belonging to the "*Drum* Decade." That decade is black, Joburg, and, especially, Sophiatown; it is men penning hard-hitting social commentary and protest writing. Thus, in the post-apartheid period, *Drum* connotes a specific racial and gendered position, an association with Johannesburg and a kind of national recognition that is not currently available to Rive: a black heterosexual masculinity that briefly occupied the resistant cultural space of Sophiatown (its jazz, hard-living, and intellectual exchange) before its apartheid destruction. In this dominant story, the destruction of Sophiatown, the emigration of black intellectuals and artists, and the decade of the 1950s itself merge together.

The 1950s are often constructed as a key decade in the history of black South African literature: *Drum*, and the specifically black cosmopolitanism associated with Sophiatown, has been a rich source for post-apartheid imaginings of South African culture, past and future.[205] These historical sources, however, have produced exclusive understandings of race, gender, and national belonging. Desiree Lewis has argued that the creation of black literary canons in which autobiographical writing is a predominant mode has functioned to imply that blackness itself is a self-evident category in South Africa. In those canons, *Drum* has a foundational place, followed by the period of Black Consciousness in which Rive again wrote prolifically (although he was neither a *Drum* nor a Black Consciousness writer):

> The idea that the meaning of blackness is somehow 'natural' or self-evident is clear from the way in which canons have been created in autobiographical, testimonial and confessional South African literature. It is usually argued that the 1950s witnessed the first coherent upsurge in black South African writing [...] These writers it is commonly claimed, gave literary expression to 'black life' as it confronted the early years of apartheid and institutionalized racism. Following the cultural silence of the 1960s, Black Consciousness politics between the late 1970s and early 1980s shaped a new

---

competition (stories were submitted to Hughes in December, 1953).

[203] In addition to facilitating some of Rive's first publications, the relationship between Rive and Hughes produced a long correspondence, and. eventually, in-person meetings.

[204] Langston Hughes, *An African Treasury: Articles, Essays, Stories, Poems by Black Africans* (New York: Crown, 1960).

[205] Brenna Munro's description of post-apartheid representations of 1950s culture is illustrative. She, however, does not acknowledge that this re-presented urban culture is frequently specifically black and associated with Johannesburg and Sophiatown (and not with Cape Town and District Six):

> A host of memoirs, popular histories, and coffee-table books of photography focusing on South Africa's urban past have been produced, many of them about *Drum*. To name just a few of the projects that have returned to the material of the 1950s in order to build a postapartheid culture, Can Themba's short story "The Suit" was made into a play by Barney Simon and Mothobi Mutloatse in 1994; Todd Matshikiza's son John reprised his father's *Drum* column, "With the Lid Off," throughout the 1990s in the *Mail and Guardian*; Zola Maseko directed the film *Drum* (released in 2004) [...] (134)

militancy in black writing.[206]

Rive's marginal relationship to the *Drum* Generation suggests the degree to which his subject position, his (contradictory) articulations of blackness and non-racialism, and his literary production, are all located on the margins of post-apartheid constructions of blackness and nationhood.

Since the end of apartheid, many of Richard Rive's black literary contemporaries, notably writers of the *Drum* Generation, have been recognized as significant national writers, and important producers of anti-apartheid protest literature. Fellow Capetonian writers then classified as "Coloured," such as Alex La Guma and James Matthews, have also received some post-apartheid national recognition. Rive, however, is more often viewed as a local and minor author, and he is less recognized as a "protest writer" than he was during his lifetime. Rive's oeuvre, like the Western Cape province and the historical District Six where Rive was born and with which he is now so closely associated, falls largely outside of a narrowing conception of Africa and South Africa. Rive was gay and classified as "Coloured" by the apartheid regime; neither his social location, his non-racial political orientation, nor the manner in which he died, can easily be made to adhere to the dominant post-apartheid notion of the South African nation and its Struggle past. The quiet marginalization of Rive and the current association between the author, District Six, and [local] heritage, signals the extent to which Rive's life, and elements of his work, challenge contemporary conceptions of the nation and its apartheid past.

During apartheid, Rive's oeuvre, like that of the *Drum* Generation writers, was considered protest literature; and, as were many of the works of his *Drum* peers, several of Rive's books were banned in South Africa. Yet, today, Rive appears most prominently as a (merely) local author, or, with some ambivalence, as a gay author.[207] He is not considered to be of the *Drum* Generation, nor has he received the symbolic post-apartheid national recognition that many of those writers have received. Rive's quiet marginalization is inextricably linked to the unsuitability of his life to the historical narrative that contemporary national identity politics provides. His social and geographical location, middle-class anglophilic intellectual aspirations, his non-racial political commitments, and his formal [racially-defined] relationship to the apartheid state, differed from those of *Drum* Generation members. His self-presentation was distinct, as were his circumstances and the choices he made within them. Rive did not live in Johannesburg, did not cultivate a heterosexual persona, and was not African. Rive was Capetonian, publically silent about his sexuality, and classified as Coloured. Unlike most of the *Drum* writers, Rive lived his entire life in Cape Town, leaving South Africa only for periods of travel and study. His racial classification informed his decision to stay; relative to the *Drum* writers, his life options within South Africa were less limited; when he did apply for a passport, the government did not assess him as a threat - he was granted a passport and allowed to return.[208]

---

[206] Desiree Lewis, "Writing Hybrid Selves: Richard Rive and Zoe Wicomb" in *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place,* ed. Zmitri Erasmus (Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2001), 131-2.

[207] In the District Six Museum, Rive's photograph is transposed onto a banner where it hangs beside other banner-portraits of District figures - who vary from the widely valorized (Cissie Gool), to those who are simply "ordinary" former residents of the District.

[208] Under apartheid, numerous people, including several *Drum* writers, applied for a passport and received an exit visa - meaning they had permission only to exit and not to return. Intended travel or emigration became exile with the

Rive appears unavailable for national-level recognition not only because of how he lived, but also because of how he died: Rive was murdered in his home by two young men who were his guests. Both his death and the subsequent trial (the men were convicted) were thoroughly reported in the local papers. The press coverage not only outed Rive as gay, but also as someone whose homosexual desires were sadomasochistic and directed towards (Coloured) young men. Rive's murder thus meant that an area of his life about which he had been intensely private became intensely public.[209] Because this posthumous disclosure of information was non-consensual, and the information itself outside the bounds of respectable discourse, friends, colleagues, and biographers have confronted a doubled violence: first of Rive's murder and then of the violation of his own boundaries of privacy and sexuality. They have also been faced with a form of sexuality about which they themselves might feel uncomfortable and for which there was (and is) very limited discursive space. The response has been to say little of the way in which Rive died, and few have considered the ways that queer desire figures, or is disavowed, within his work.[210] A number of *Drum* writers also died violently; however, they, unlike Rive, lived - and sometimes died - in exile, and without any hint of taboo sexuality in their deaths.[211] The post-apartheid-era has seen scholarly interest in their oeuvres and lives, as well as some state recognition of their contributions. Posthumously, and post-1994, several have been recast as a variety of struggle hero whom the liberated nation must honor. Most recently, Nat Nakasa's remains have been "returned" to South Africa where a flag-draped coffin was greeted by an honor guard of the former liberation army, Umkhonto we Sizwe (MK).[212]

Since the 1990s, there has been limited attention to Rive as a gay writer. Three years after Rive's death, "Riva," alongside the first biographical essay on Rive, appeared in the first anthology of South African gay and lesbian writing, *Invisible Ghetto* (1991).[213] Two scholars have recently engaged with

---

State's provision of an exit visa.

209 According to his biographer, Rive does not refer to his sexual desires or relationships in his correspondence. To friends, there were only mentions of "nephews," which some understood as coded references to young men who may have been lovers. See Shaun Viljoen, *Richard Rive: A Partial Biography* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2013). For Viljoen's discussion of race and (absent) sexuality in the correspondence between Hughes and Rive, see pages 103-7. I have also noted the omission of sexual relationships and desires in my reading of the published correspondence between the two; even more so than Rive perhaps, Hughes was scrupulous in his avoidance of any sexual or even somewhat personal matter. See Shane Graham and John Walters, eds, *Langston Hughes and the South African Drum Generation: The Correspondence* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010).

210 Viljoen also makes this observation in *Richard Rive: A Partial Biography*, xxi-xxii.

211 Henry Nxumalo was murdered in Johannesburg in 1957 in the course of a journalistic investigation; Nat Nakasa committed suicide in New York in 1965; Can Themba died in Swaziland in 1967 or 1968; John Matshikiza died in London in 1968. Other exiled *Drum* writers went on to achieve more secure circumstances. Modisane, actor and writer, died in 1986 in West Germany. Mphalele returned to live in South Africa in the 1970s and taught at the University of the Witswatersrand until 2008. Lewis Nkosi left on an exit permit in 1960, and lived abroad, teaching, for the remainder of his life. He published two books of fiction to critical acclaim: *Mating Birds* (1986) and *Mandela's Ego* (2006).

212 Nat Nakasa's remains were disinterred, and returned to South Africa on August 20, 2014. The return was initiated by the government; the coffin was welcomed at the airport by an MK honor guard. Nakasa's death is generally referred to as a suicide. The *Mail & Guardian* refers to "death due to a fall from a high building," likely a suicide: Fatima Asmal, "'Welcome back home' The Return of Nat Nakasa," *Mail & Guardian*, August 20, 2014. http://mg.co.za/article/2014-08-20-welcome-back-home-the-return-of-nat-nakasa

213 Matthew Krouse, editor, assisted by Kim Berman, *Invisible Ghetto: Lesbian and Gay Writing from South Africa* (Johannesburg: Congress of South African Writers, 1993).

Rive as a gay writer, and with *Buckingham Palace* and "Riva" as specifically queer texts: the Capetonian Shaun Viljoen, in his literary biography of Rive, offers queer readings of both texts, as does the U.S.-based scholar, Brenna Munro, in her analysis of queer sexuality in texts of struggle.[214] However, most post-apartheid attention to Rive's oeuvre has not been scholarly, queer, or national(ist). Within South Africa attention has focused on *Buckingham Palace, District Six* and implicitly references the marginally national commemorative project centered upon Cape Town's District Six. The novel's significance, like that of District Six itself, is frequently understood to be local rather than national, cultural rather than political, a matter of "colourful" heritage, rather than of political and - in the case of the novel - literary heritage. In the mid-1990s the novel was a prescribed text in classrooms in the Western Cape Province; today it is frequently taught in English classes in Afrikaans-medium high schools.[215] This ambivalent pedagogical incorporation signals the extent to which the novel's value is understood to be local, perhaps specifically Coloured, and not properly literary.

The central section of this chapter is a comparative consideration of the ways in which *Buckingham Palace, District Six* and "Riva" evoke apartheid violence and thus bear distinct relationships to contemporary national discourses about the apartheid past. *Buckingham Palace* shares traits of the post-apartheid memory discourse with which the TRC is inextricably associated: foremost among them a privileging of the narrative form of testimony and the construction of analogical relationships between different historical forms of oppression. "Riva," on the other hand, contains an alternate model, what I refer to as the "skew parallel." Skew parallels are not analogical relationships; they are not proper parallels. While ordinary parallels posit equivalence between distinct locations; skew parallels brings seemingly incommensurable places, times, and subject positions almost together; they create unexpected proximities between historical situations and positions as divergent as "perpetrator" and "victim." Through the skew parallel, one can glimpse the structural violence of apartheid, a violence not captured by the dichotomous logics of perpetrator and victim, past and present. The post-apartheid, and primarily local, attention to *Buckingham Palace* speaks both to the ways that the novel aligns with a national non-racial discourse of memory and reconciliation; and to the marginal position of Cape Town and its District Six, imagined as "Coloured" and queer, within the dominant nationalist conception of the black South African (ANC-led) nation.

Although the primary narratives of *Buckingham Palace, District Six* and "Riva" are largely set in the 1950s, the texts were published during the period of intense resistance and repression that followed the uprisings of 1976, a period which also saw efforts to simultaneously commemorate District Six and resist plans for the land's redevelopment. Cape Town's District Six - the multi-racial, working-class, central city area destroyed by the apartheid regime - is important to both texts. Both begin with a first-person narrator from District Six who presents the subsequent narrative as an act of recollection. Yet the two texts reckon differently with the impulse to narrate the District and the system that destroyed it. *Buckingham Palace* functions, in part, as a literary commemoration of the District, and concludes with a parallel between the Holocaust and apartheid, and with a clear

---

214 Shaun Viljoen, *Richard Rive: A Partial Biography* (Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2013); Brenna Munro, *South Africa and the Dream of Love to Come: Queer Sexuality and the Struggle for Freedom* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012).

215 Fazeela Haffejee, English Senior Curriculum Planner (Western Cape Education Department), in discussion with the author, November 13, 2012, Cape Town.

division between apartheid's victims and perpetrators. A Jewish character's speech testifies to the parallel and commemorates the District on the eve of its destruction. "Riva" betrays no such memorial impulse towards District Six. The story neither resembles nor contains testimonial narrative, nor does it clearly identify the victims and perpetrators of either Nazism or apartheid. Instead, in large part through the protagonist's nightmare of the Jewish Riva, the story suggests that victim and perpetrator may not be discreet, static, and mutually exclusive subject positions. "Riva" implies that apartheid violence, and structural violence more broadly, occurs through complicit positions and relations.

Buckingham Palace, District Six and "Riva" can be read as literary responses to the challenge of writing about life within a structure of violence that is commonly conceptualized as a drama played by two actors, perpetrator and victim. In relation to this conception, the white South African Jew appears exceptional, even contradictory: racial victims in Europe, they are racial beneficiaries in South Africa. Socially not quite white, they are white under apartheid. In *Buckingham Palace* and "Riva," The Jew stands in for a largely unarticulated area in which racial classification does not correspond neatly to class position, nor to political good and evil, oppressed and oppressor. To differing extents, *Buckingham Palace* and "Riva" suggest that two opposed positions can coexist in a single subject; that one cannot be easily distinguished from the other; and that victim and perpetrator could be, however surreally or momentarily, interchangeable. In large part through a Jewish character in each - Katzen and Riva, respectively - they evoke structural complicity. *Buckingham Palace* represents the destruction of District Six and explains apartheid through an explicit parallel with Nazism. "Riva," on the other hand, never represents apartheid violence; but only evokes it - through a "skew parallel" which joins the ravines of Cape Town's mountain with the ravines of Babi Yar, the Ukrainian site of an infamous 1943 massacre of Jews. While "Riva" is structured by a skew parallel, and is saturated with suggestions of complicity, the conclusion of *Buckingham Palace* is dominated by a dichotomous logic of victims and perpetrators, oppression and resistance.

In "Riva," and to a lesser extent in *Buckingham Palace*, "skew" temporal and spatial parallels produce intimacies between radically different subject positions: victim and perpetrator. Ambiguous and uncomfortable relations result, between characters, between parts of the text, between reader and text. The *skew parallel* gestures uncomfortably towards complicity: both to historical positions of structural complicity and to the complicities of the present - such as those which implicate post-apartheid readers in the structural violence of the past and present. Skew parallels thus ask readers to think about positions of structural complicity and therefore about the structural character of regimes of violence such as apartheid. If perpetrator and victim are not clearly opposed positions, and if the distinction between past and present is permeable or absent, how do we articulate the violence of apartheid and how do we reckon with its continuities in a structurally violent present?

The two texts offer different models for understanding and narrating apartheid violence; and they have experienced divergent post-apartheid fates. The novel has become a canonical text of the District, "Riva" has been largely overlooked in the post-apartheid literary landscape.[216] *Buckingham Palace* centers on a fictional version of District Six and largely perpetuates the iconic tropes of

[216] Since 1994, *Buckingham Palac*e has received particular attention, whereas Rive's other work, which had received critical attention during apartheid, is comparatively neglected. See Shaun Viljoen's dissertation: "Richard Rive: A Skewed Biography" (Ph.D. Diss., University of the Witwatersrand, 2006), 8-10.

resistant solidarity and apartheid injustice; and primarily articulates apartheid within the testimonial model that the Commission helped to produce. *Buckingham Palace* is widely read, particularly locally, as a form of fictional testimony to the historical existence of the District, and to its apartheid destruction. Since 1994, the novel has been taught in the province's high school classrooms; its appearance in the curriculum provoked a "Buckingham Palace, District Six" exhibit in Cape Town's District Six Museum.[217] "Riva," on the other hand, poses a stark contrast to that discursive framing of apartheid violence: the past is not securely past; Cape Town is not located firmly within the borders of South Africa, perpetrator and victim are difficult to identify, and testimony is absent.

Buckingham Palace centers on the life of a community, that of the residents of "Buckingham Palace." This third-person narration is divided into three, chronologically defined, sections: Part I takes place in 1950, Part II in 1960, and Part III in 1970, when the "Palace" is destroyed. A brief section of first-person recollection precedes each of the novel's parts This first-person voice thus introduces the novel and frames the subsequent narrative as a product of recollection; the book's first words are "I remember." In this sense, the novel positions itself as a work of fictionalized testimony: the never-identified first-person narrator "remembers" the life of this allegorical District Six. *Buckingham Palace* also allots a central place to an act of testimony within the primary narrative: a Jewish character's oral testimony is crucial to the novel's production of an internationally recognizable narrative of racial oppression and resistant solidarity. The novel's political message thus depends upon the Jewish character, who articulates the political significance of the destruction of the District by positing a crucial parallel between the Nazi Holocaust and apartheid South Africa. The Jew, Katzen, marginal to the fictionalized District but central to the novel's political message, condemns apartheid by equating its racial logic with that of the Nazism he fled.

Katzen, shopkeeper and proprietor of the five houses known as "Buckingham Palace," feels a profound affinity for the British monarchy. He makes his first appearance in the novel indirectly, through a description of his merchandise: "His shop windows were cluttered with bric-a-brac such as celluloid dolls, huge glass tankards still celebrating the Coronation, rolls of crepe-de-chine, gramophones and framed and mounted prints of a violently pink-faced King George VI and Queen Elizabeth" (2). It is as if the objects are still readying themselves for the celebration of a British coronation of decades previous. The presence of these British objects and names, to which Katzen is often connected, suggests his location outside the South African nation and outside the present. Katzen, with his perpetual portraits and royalist tendencies, also functions to suggest that District Six is itself a place and time apart. The District could be a quasi-independent polity, or a stray anachronistic outpost of empire. Residents have their own palace, the palace has its mock-king, Katzen, who liberally donates images of his own English King.

Katzen's appearances in the novel are frequently oblique: another character will mention him, or – more often – an object functions to represent him. The Jew's penultimate appearance in the novel is by proxy; in the form of his donation to a church function. The highlight of the event is the annual Miss District Six beauty competition, for which prizes are necessary: "The first princess was given a tea-service generously donated by Katzen, and the second princess free hair shampoo for six

[217] As I discuss in Chapter Two, the Museum's conjoined political and curatorial practice is founded upon the words of former residents: in Museum exhibits, but also in its publications and discursive productions, first-person testimony is valorized as the foundational mode of narrating the District.

months by Mr. Henry Knight, who was also chief convener of the beauty competition" (107). Mr. Knight's position, in relation to both the event and his donation, is clear: he is a church member, chief convener and, by profession, a barber. Katzen's position, however, is not self-evident. He is not Christian, he holds no formal position at the event, nor does he actually attend. Katzen – messy, Semitic, perpetually out-of-place – appears even more incongruous in light of his donation. A tea service appears of a piece with Katzen's penchant for British royalty: an addition to his royal portraits and his ownership of a tenement "palace." A "princess tea set," delicate and English, intensifies the contrast between Katzen's jumbled emporium, on the one hand, and the empire to which he does not belong and the "palace" he does not inhabit, on the other. Like the strange selection of objects in his shop windows, Katzen is absurd, almost grotesque beside the delicacy of his donation.

Throughout most of the novel, Katzen is a peripheral and ambivalent figure in the fictionalized District Six: incongruous outsider; greedy but generous Jew; object of mockery, resentment, and affection; and frequently represented by (English) objects. As landlord and merchant, his presence is necessary to the collective life of the "Palace," but his social position and his literal residence are located on the District's periphery. In the novel's final pages, however, when the District's destruction is imminent and Katzen himself gravely ill, he briefly becomes crucial and unambiguous - for the novel and for the fictionalized District Six - when he testifies to the parallels between Nazi Germany and apartheid South Africa, and explains his refusal to collaborate with the apartheid government by recounting his experience as a Jew in Nazi Germany.

The novel's final section focuses on the District's impending destruction. As a property owner in an area now declared white, Katzen is subject to mounting governmental pressure to identify his tenants and to sell. Residents invite him to an emergency community meeting. He arrives late, visibly ill, and begins an unsolicited monologue. That speech is the closest that the novel comes to reproducing testimony; over an almost uninterrupted four-page span, Katzen recounts his early life through to the ethical conflict of the present. He begins by moving from the stereotyped figure of *Jew Katzen* to the singularity of his name:

> Well then, where must I begin?
> You all know me simply as Katzen, that stingy Jew Katzen who has a shop in Hanover Street and is always wanting rent from you. But my full name is Solomon Katzen. (149)

The narrator intervenes only a few times, and only to relay the speech's reception. The lengthiest of these interventions makes explicit both Katzen's social position and the transformational force of his testimony upon the assembled collective:

> It had never struck them that Katzen had a past, had any name other than Katzen, was a German and had been a law student at a university. For them he had always been just Katzen, a figure of ridicule in his food-stained black suit which he always wore, his unshapely boots, his thick walrus moustache, his wild white hair and his ragged beard. He had always been considered an anomaly in District Six, someone who was taken for granted but did not really belong. (150)

Katzen's subsequent self-narrative - a German Jewish childhood, discrimination in Hitler's Germany, the murder of family members, flight to Britain - explains his refusal to sell his properties to the apartheid government. It also explains the atrocity of apartheid through a direct comparison between the two systems he has experienced:

> It is very funny for me. In Germany they treated me as an *untermenschen*. Here they force me to be part of the *herrenvolk*. But I cannot forget what they did to us in Germany. So my heart is with the *untermenschen,* whoever and wherever they are. (152)

Katzen articulates a parallel that has been particularly familiar within local anti-apartheid discourses. The manifesto of the Cape Town-based Non-European Unity Movement (NEUM),[218] for example, stated: "If in Nazi Germany it was the Jew who had to distinguish himself as an outcast by wearing a yellow patch, in South Africa a brown or black face makes the patch unnecessary."[219] Just as the Unity Movement had, Katzen draws on the moral force and vocabulary of anti-Nazi resistance, labeling the "herrenvolk" of apartheid and denouncing the "quislings,"[220] the collaborators. Katzen's use of German words thus paradoxically reinforces the notion that his European experience is also a story for, and about, apartheid Cape Town.

The parallel between the Nazi Holocaust and apartheid was foundational to the Unity Movement; its manifesto of 1945 elaborates the same parallel that Katzen constructs, and with a similar vocabulary. It states, for example: "From earliest childhood the poisonous racial arrogance of the Herrenvolk ideology is assiduously injected into the White people of this country by School and Church and State."[221] Not only is the outsider position of the Jew in Nazi Europe exactly analogous to that of the Non-European in South Africa, but Nazism and South African racism share an ideology of racial supremacy. Today, this anti-fascist (and anti-apartheid) lexicon occasionally appears in local Leftist discourse about District Six. Notably, the body that has represented District Six land restitution claimants, the District Six Beneficiary and Redevelopment Trust, employed *Herrenvolk* in the opening sentence of its mission statement: "Notwithstanding the democratisation of South Africa, we, the masses and victims of forced removal, will always remember those who died as a result of the human tragedy of Apartheid and of the forced removals at the hands of the 'Heerenvolk' [sic]

---

218 Founded in Cape Town in 1943, shortly before the election of the Nationalist government in 1948, NEUM was a non-racial Marxist movement, well-known for the participation of Coloured teachers and other intellectuals. From its inception, the Movement's internationalist commitments led it to construct parallels between white supremacy in South Africa and Nazism. The publication of *Buckingham Palace*, in 1986, coincided with the (re)birth of the "New Unity Movement," after decades of little activity. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/apdusa-views-issue-no-6-new-unity-movement-launched-may-1985.

219 "A Declaration to the People of South Africa from the Non-European Unity Movement," April 1951, Cape Town. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/declaration-people-south-africa-non-european-unity-movement-statement-neum-april-1951%C2%A0.

220 The epithet originates in the name of Vidkun Quisling, who led the collaborationist regime that governed Norway during World War II.

221 "A Declaration to the Nations of the World, Statement of the Non-European Unity Movement," July 1945, Cape Town. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/declaration-nations-world-statement-non-european-unity-movement-signed-rev-z-r mahabane-dr-g

Government."[222]

The parallel has become a familiar element of liberation discourses far beyond the context of Cape Town. The form of testimony, and the analogy to Nazism that the Katzen's testimony constructs, are also staples of literary texts that have grappled with racial and political repression and atrocity since the Shoah. It is not surprising to encounter a Jewish character, a refugee from Nazism, who testifies to the atrocity of Nazism, and thus lends to apartheid the broad condemnation that the Nazi Holocaust has received. In *Buckingham Palace*, Katzen's articulation of the parallel between two racial logics reinforces the novel's anti-apartheid, commemorative project. The parallel between Nazism and apartheid also structures the narrative of Katzen's racial trajectory - victim-class in Europe to master-class in South Africa - and it transforms his relationship with District Six, making his individual life inseparable from that of the District. His death will herald the arrival of the bulldozers and the "death" of Buckingham Palace. Through the parallel that his testimony articulates, Katzen's status among District residents is transformed, and the novel's political message becomes unambiguous.

More ambiguous, and less familiar, than the parallel between the Shoah and apartheid, are the slanted connections that the novel constructs between (British) sovereignty and Katzen. Proprietor of Buckingham Palace, Katzen is not regal, even in the alternate and inverted world of *Buckingham Palace, District Six*. He is the landlord of a mock palace, his tenants are far from being his subjects; he is the object of resentment and mockery, as well as of gestures of inclusion and affection. Katzen is not a sovereign; he has a sovereign. He himself articulates the connection between his history as a Jewish refugee and his symbolic forms of allegiance to Britain. After escaping to England, he had worked as an interpreter for British Intelligence during the war: "Maybe that's why I speak English so good and had all those pictures of King George the Sixth, remember?" (152). King George VI, like Katzen himself, belongs to another era, another place, and another imaginary of belonging.

Katzen's ambiguous racial and temporal location, as well as the complexity of his social position within the fictionalized District, becomes newly apparent shortly before his death. Almost immediately after his testimony – to Solomon Katzen's singularity, to the wrong of racial hierarchy and legislation, to political solidarity and human unity - Katzen is hospitalized. One tenant suggests to her neighbor that they visit Katzen: "After all he is our friend." The neighbor initially hesitates: "... remember that he is a white man. So he'll be in a white ward. Will we be allowed to go into a white ward?" (176). Katzen's ambiguous, and perhaps transformed, racial status emerges in their reply to the hospital receptionist: "White or non-white?" she asks, to which they respond, "He's a Jew" (176-177). Once inside the white ward, it is the racism of Katzen's own son - not apartheid policy – which prevents their entry into Katzen's room.

While the novel as a whole seems to follow the blueprint of a text commemorating the District and condemning apartheid, ambiguities remain. Despite the certainties that the novel, in part through Katzen's speech, aims to provide, the notion of complicity and the possibility of collaboration remain attached to him. Before his transformational speech - that is, during most of the novel -

---

[222] District Six Beneficiary and Redevelopment Trust, "Deed of Trust" (October 11, 2001, Cape Town).
.

Katzen is marginal and his most important relationship appears to be with a remembered and imagined British royalty. His roles in the District – oppressive landlord and merchant, fellow victim and would-be savior - make Katzen neither only-victim nor only-master. His complex and complicit position in the District echoes in his ambiguous royal affinities. Skew alignments connect Katzen to both sovereignty and subjecthood: Katzen and his King George; Katzen, himself as king of District Six; District Six as colony and District Six as an independent monarchy; Katzen as [slum] lord; Katzen as a Jewish refugee, who once required the mercy of a British king.

If a primary mode of *Buckingham Palace* is testimony, that of "Riva" is the question and the skew parallel. "Riva" does not stand as testimony to the atrocity of apartheid, nor does it harbor internal testimony. The story does not aspire to represent apartheid violence; it admits its unfulfilled desire to tell what remains un-recounted. "Riva" is a text of non-occurrence, of a friendship that does not develop between Jewish Riva and Paul, classified as Coloured. It also a text of violence that is suggested, dreamt, imagined, but never physically enacted. Disparate times and places are not strategically evoked in a final analogy; instead one kind of historical violence is not easily distinguishable from the other, one figure of complicity is briefly intimate with another. Instead, a skew parallel joins Cape Town's Table Mountain to the massacre of Babi Yar, the wrongly raced narrator to the wrongly raced Riva.

The story begins when Paul recalls their encounter, twenty years prior. Then a student, Paul, with two companions – George and Leonard - was climbing Table Mountain above Cape Town. The three discuss their unsuitability for either of the racially segregated hiking clubs; each club maintains a mountain lodge for its members: a lack of membership means no sure place to spend the night. The friends are not white club material, but neither are they the right kind of "so-called Coloureds." George lists the unwritten requirements for "so-called Coloured" club membership: "the right complexion, the right sort of hair, the right address," as well as the right middle-class English not found in District Six. Paul drily notes: "I was dark, had short, curly hair, came from Caledon Street in District Six but spoke English reasonably well. After all, I was majoring in it at a white university. What more could anyone require?" (60-61).

Lacking other options, that evening, the friends decide to spend the night in the rangers' hut. Paul falls asleep while reading, "a novel about the massacre in the ravines of Babi Yar, gripping and revolting: a bit out of place in the unnatural calm at the top of a cold, wet mountain." The opening door wakes him. He hears a muffled interaction, then "a short snort, followed by peals of loud, uncontrolled laughter." Paul reports that he "found the sound uncanny" (62). When he emerges, George presents him to the newcomer as "Professor Paul." In her turn, the stranger proffers what the narrator describes as "a mock, ludicrous bow," and introduces herself: "Riva Lipschitz. Madame Riva Lipschitz. The greatest Jewish watch-repairer and mountaineer in Cape Town. Display shop, 352 Long Street." Riva again snorts and laughs, then - noting Paul's determined silence - asks: "If the others can treat me with the respect due to me, why can't you? I'm like a queen, am I not, George?" Paul, we learn, does not agree. He describes her as "unattractive," "ridiculous," "flat-chested," "thin," with "skinny legs," and a "little knitted skull cap": inadequately feminine and inescapably Jewish (63).

Riva invites the three young men to her lodge, but Paul declines, telling George that Riva is "playing

the bloody queen." When Paul falls back asleep, his nightmare locates this "queen" in Babi Yar. He dreams of Riva: "[...] striding with heavy, impatient boots and stick-thin legs over mountains of dead bodies in the ravines of Babi Yar. She was snorting and laughing while pushing bodies aside, climbing upwards over dead arms and legs" (65). It is unclear what role in the massacre Paul's nightmare ascribes to Riva: victim, perpetrator, or some more ambiguous position of witness or collaborator? Is she a survivor, whose laughter suggests the psychic, as well as the physical, violence of the massacre? Or does the nightmare cast her as a gleeful perpetrator, a Jew who actively collaborates in the killing of other Jews? In her nightmare iteration, Riva is terrifying and impossible to situate in relation to historic Babi Yar or present Cape Town, in part because neither Paul nor the reader knows why she is striding over Jewish corpses, and why she is laughing. As Paul, when awake, will be unable to interpret Riva's laughter, the reader cannot interpret the laughter of the Riva who figures in Paul's nightmare.

The following morning, George asks Paul to explain his refusal of Riva's invitation: "Why didn't you come and have coffee with the queen of Table Mountain?" Paul's answer - "I can't stand her type" - explains nothing, because it is clear that Paul is disturbed precisely because he cannot identify Riva's type. George challenges him, asking if he is prejudiced against Riva because she is white or Jewish. Paul then invokes a familiar principle of non-racialism to explain his behavior of the previous night: Why would he have accepted an invitation to socialize at a segregated institution? George, unmoved, responds: "She could hardly join the so-called coloured one now, could she? Wrong hair, wrong address, wrong laugh" (66).

The phrase echoes the description of Paul's unsuitability for club membership. "Hair, address, and laugh" would disqualify Riva from the Coloured Club: George's playful response paradoxically draws attention to the actual reason for Riva's lack of membership - her whiteness – while suggesting that Paul and Riva still somehow share a "wrongness." This parallel is skew: Paul and Riva are not equivalently positioned in relation to Coloured mountain club membership. Paul cannot join any mountain club because of his race, color (and hair), as well as class background. Riva, on the other hand, qualifies for the white club, despite her Jewishness and gender presentation. George's words suggest that, nevertheless, Riva shares with Paul a marginal, incorrect location.

The problem of Riva and Paul's respective locations pervades the second half of the story, set several months after the first meeting. Paul decides to find Riva at *Lipschitz - Master Jeweller*: "What was the number she had said? 352 or 325? I peered through the windows of second-hand bookshops without any wish to stay where I was and at the same time did not wish to go home immediately. 352, that was it. Or 325?" (67). Paul is horrified at the inner-city neighborhood where Riva's shop (and bed-sit, he will soon discover) is located, and he compares it to District Six: "Upper Long Street and its surrounding lanes seemed more depressing, more beaten up than the rest of the city. Even more so than District Six." In the same paragraph, District Six appears metonymically as Caledon Street, when Paul contemplates returning home, "to Caledon Street, the noise, the dirt, the squalor" instead of continuing on his way to Riva's shop (67).

Questions accelerate when Paul finds the shop, enters, and asks the man he sees - "shabby, squat and balding" - if he is Mr. Lipschitz. The man responds with questions of his own: "What exactly do you want?" and "What can I do for you?" For the third time in the text, the narrator references Babi

Yar: "His accent was guttural and foreign. I thought of Babi Yar" (67-68). At Paul's interior mention of Babi Yar, Riva intervenes from the depths of the shop and hails the young Paul as "The Professor," asking if he has come to visit "the queen." Watching the man, to whom he is never introduced, another urgent series of questions races through Paul's mind:

> Was this Simon whom George... had met? Simon the mountaineer? He looked most unlike a mountaineer. Who the hell was he then? Her boss? Husband? Lover? Lipschitz – the Master Jeweller? Or was she Lipschitz – the Master Jeweller? That seemed most unlikely. (67)

Two pages later, Paul wordlessly accepts Riva's invitation to tea, and follows her along the sidewalk. More interior questions flow; about Riva's relationship to George, and his own motivation for seeking out Riva, and anyhow: "Who the hell was Lipschitz – Master Jeweller?" (69). Paul struggles to place Riva, but lacks the knowledge of her, and the self-knowledge, to do more than repeat the same titles and questions to himself. Riva is not a queen, not a master, obviously not a man, but clearly not a proper woman. She is not "like a queen" (and nor is Cape Town "like" Babi Yar), yet the title and the place trail after her, as Paul himself does, struggling to keep up with her pace: "The conversation had stopped. She continued the brisk pace, taking her fast incongruous strides. Like stepping from rock to rock up Blinkwater or Babi Yar" (69). Table Mountain and Babi Yar are interchangeable; the ravines of one, or the other, lead to Riva's building. This final evocation of Babi Yar is immediately followed by Riva's voice: "'Here we are.' She stopped abruptly in front of an old triple-storied Victorian building" (69).

While Paul goes on to carefully describe the building's peeling paint, and the overflowing garbage outside the door, it is the interior poverty and clutter which prove unbearable for him. As Paul cannot separate Riva's body from Babi Yar, Babi Yar from Cape Town, Long Street from Blinkwater, he also seems briefly unable to distinguish the unbearable shabbiness of Riva's Long Street home from the unbearable shabbiness of his own District Six. Paul condemns the interior of Riva's home as a feature of her Jewishness, and does so through a neologism, "Jewish-Victorian," that binds their distinct social and urban locations together: "Nothing was modern. Jewish-Victorian or what I imagined Jewish-Victorian to be. Dickensian in a sort of decaying nineteenth century sort of way" (70). "Jewish-Victorian" implicates Paul's own location in apartheid Cape Town; the age and the architecture of the two neighborhoods are similar. If "Jewish-Victorian" characterizes the appearance of Riva's Long Street, it must be equally apt for adjacent dilapidated District Six. "Jewish-Victorian" and "So-called Coloured" acquire a slant symmetry. Briefly, the rocks of Babi Yar (or Blinkwater) stud Cape Town's streets, and Riva's stride from rock to rock leads to multiple places-times: *Jewish-Victorian-Dickensian*.

Once inside, Riva offers Paul tea. Instead of replying, he waits in silence as she prepares their tea tray and then decides to leave: "The surroundings were far too depressing. Riva was far too depressing" (70). "Too depressing" is Paul's explanation for his own response; given how he describes District Six, "depressing" signifies the condition of class-based, ambiguously racialized, entrapment that he and Riva almost-share. On the face of it, however, "depressing" surroundings do not warrant Paul's experience of utter panic. Only a real-life threat of violence seems commensurate with the intensity of his response: such a threat is implied only once, in its negation:

as they enter her room, Riva assures him: "It's quite safe. I won't rape you" (70). Paul's location in race- and caste-conscious Cape Town is not parallel to Riva's location; instead the two locations momentarily – and terrifyingly for Paul – merge. District Six joins Paul to Riva, and to Babi Yar; Riva's stride up Blinkwater (or Babi Yar), has carried them along Cape Town streets "more depressing" than those of District Six, into a room that is "far too depressing." Paul's District address again reverberates with Riva's own Long Street one: Paul has the wrong address for Coloured club membership; and so does Riva.

"Riva" approaches Riva through a series of conflations and disturbing proximities between names and images, none of which are explained: author Rive and Riva; Rive-like narrator and Riva; Riva as "Queen," and Riva as "Master" [Jeweller]. "Riva" might be more appropriately titled "Up Blinkwater or Babi Yar" - its principal preoccupation is with the intrusions of one place and time upon another, of one subject position upon another. The proximity of Blinkwater and Babi Yar, Cape Town and Kiev, Rive's District Six and Riva's Jewish-Victorian alludes to the proximity, and perhaps permeability, of ostensibly discreet subject positions within a single person or single community, such as perpetrator and victim, male and female, the wrong kind of "Coloured" and the wrong kind of white.

While Katzen's testimony secures an allegorical version of District Six to the historical truth of the Nazi Holocaust, "Riva" remains in a slanted region of allusion, preoccupied with the interpenetration and interchangeability of places, times, and subject positions. Babi Yar of the Shoah slips into Blinkwater of the apartheid present; the "Jewish-Victorian" of Riva's Long Street bed-sit slips into the adjacent "Coloured" District Six and into Babi Yar. The novel commemorates District Six as a place apart; "Riva" moves between place-times, and alludes to positions of complicity. Instead of even parallels, it offers skew intimacies: racial perpetrator and racial victim; male and female; Coloured and Jew; master and queen; Rive-like Paul and Rive-like Riva.

In *Buckingham Palace, District Six*, and in "Riva," formal differences have repercussions for the understanding of apartheid which each text produces. Through testimony and the analogical parallel, *Buckingham Palace* suggests that apartheid violence can be productively understood through the dichotomy of perpetrator and victim. The novel opens with a voice of first-person recollection and the form of first-person testimony which such an inception suggests; its first sentence begins, as many subsequent sentences do, with "I remember." Its concluding section privileges the testimonial form when it positions Katzen's speech as an articulation of the novel's own stance towards the shared racial logic of apartheid and Nazism. The narrative form of testimony, and the rhetorical form of analogy central to Katzen's testimony, produces both an equivalence between two systems of racial violence, and the notion that structural violence can be reduced to a dichotomous relationship between perpetrator and victim. In "Riva," the incomplete narration of Paul's interiority, his nightmare of Riva in Babi Yar, and the relaying of brief exchanges between himself and Riva, and himself and George, produce no relationships of equivalence. The unsettling proximities that Paul's subconscious produces, and the playful, incomplete comparison that George articulates between the respective positions of Paul and Riva, allows "Riva" to draw our attention to the ways that apartheid was colonial, and to the ways that a shared colonial and apartheid logic persist in the present. "Riva" asks that, rather than conceptualize apartheid as an atrocity that is firmly located in the past, we consider the continuing afterlife of its violence.

Both Katzen and Riva appear as mock monarchs: Katzen is the disheveled and semitic king of a tenement "Buckingham Palace;" Riva is the Jewish, working-class "Queen of Table Mountain" whom Paul does not conceive of as a proper woman, let alone a queen. Both characters are absurdly, one might say queerly, inadequate monarchs within a polity still ruled by an actual queen, Elizabeth II. ("Riva" appears set in the late 1950s and the primary narrative of *Buckingham Palace* begins in 1955.) Katzen and Riva do not only share a racial and spatially liminal status which makes them unfit contenders for the throne - each is Jewish, of somewhat doubtful whiteness, and lives in a modest room adjacent to District Six - they are both also incorrectly gendered.

Paul perceives Riva as the antithesis of a queen ("I could not imagine anything less regal, more incongruous"). The reader too would be hard-pressed to identify a queenly trait, except perhaps in Riva's (verbal) domination of Paul, who retreats, speechless, from her presence on both of the occasions that they meet: when he first encounters her on the mountain, and then, at the end of the story, when he flees her flat. Riva's witty repartee repeatedly silences Paul; this performance culminates when, observing his discomfort in her flat, she tells him, (in "a coarse remark," according to Paul) that she will not rape him. While Riva was not threatening to assault him, Paul's response to her appears commensurate with such a physical threat. Paul does not explain, nor does he appear to himself understand, either his fascination with Riva or his fear of her. While the reader may, as Shaun Viljoen does, understand Riva's verbal self-performance as a kind of camp "queenliness," the significance of Riva for Paul appears outside of Paul's own vocabulary of gendered power and desire.

Viljoen, Rive's biographer, is particularly interested in the relationship between Rive's self-fashioning as a racial and sexual subject, and the queer readings one might make of his work.[223] Viljoen's interpretation of "Riva" foregrounds a camp understanding of Riva as a queen, and asserts the possibility of a queerly gendered identificatory relationship between the author and Riva, and thus, implicitly, between Paul and Riva. For Viljoen, the queerness of "Riva" appears to be in the title character's unconventional gender performance and the implied, cross-gender identification of the male author, Rive, with Riva. He suggests that Riva be read as a feminized Rive, and observes that Riva beats Paul, the Rive-like protagonist, on his own terrain of witty banter and performative self-presentation. Viljoen's interpretation attempts to reckon with both the author's homosexuality and the intense, unexamined response of the autobiographical protagonist to Riva. His analysis captures the doubled quality of Riva's self-performance and draws out the gay male cultural connotations of "queen." Riva does camp, he argues, and does it better than Paul, "seeking attention through provocative repartee and insults, indulging in wordplay and exotic self-inflation, exaggeration and ritual, and constantly styling herself as 'a queen.'"[224] Viljoen thus reads Riva's self-identifications as a queen as an aspect of her camp performance; the implication is that Riva is a second, queer, queen, another stand-in for the author himself.

While Viljoen observes ways in which the story disqualifies Riva from queenliness, even in its camp

---

[223] Skewed" defines Viljoen's early understanding of a biographer's never-disinterested relationship to his subject, and implies the askew, "non-straight," sexual orientation of the subject; in its form as a Ph.D. thesis, Viljoen's literary biography was titled "Richard Rive: A Skewed Biography."

[224] Viljoen, *Richard Rive: A Partial Biography*, 171-2.

iteration, his analysis does not consider the consequences of these disjunctures for an understanding of Riva (and "Riva" and Rive) as queer. His analysis is concerned with Rive's biography, but not with the British-South African setting of "Riva," nor with Riva's Jewishness and her social distance from any conception of the British monarch. I suggest that the relationship between Paul and Riva is as much one of unarticulated misgendered desire as it is of unarticulated and transgressively gendered identification. Riva may be a queen, but she is not a woman in any normative sense. The queerness of "Riva" is in the implied, never-named desire between Paul and Riva, and particularly in Paul's experiences of fascination and attraction, repulsion and fear.

It is only her verbal performance which makes Riva a queen, and thus a counterpart to Paul or Rive. Riva's masculinity misaligns her from even the camp femininity of a diva; her class position and Jewishness remove her from the basic contours of female English royalty. Paul, Riva, and Rive may be queens, but they are queer because of the desire between them, and the position of liminal outsider which they share. Riva is almost as distant from queenliness, and from ruling-class Cape Town, as Paul, or as Rive himself. Her self-presentation is not feminine, her social position far from regal. Her white racial classification yields access to the white Mountain Club and its lodge; but she is not ruling class, let alone a ruler. Riva is butch, perhaps more butch than Paul himself, and a working-class Jew, an outsider in an English city, itself located within the British Dominion of the Union of South Africa, at the head of which ruled an actual queen. In a city over which an actual monarchy still formally ruled, in the English-dominated Mother City that was shortly to become an apartheid city of an independent apartheid republic, queenliness was absurd, whether as a characterization of Rive, Riva, or Paul. Real queens are neither Coloured, nor Jewish, not butch nor male, nor do they live in depressing inner-city flats, whether of Long Street or of District Six.

In this chapter's final section, I look to one of Rive's earliest short stories, published over a decade before the declaration of District Six, the fictional confessional narrative "My Sister Was a Playwhite." Narrated in the mode of first-person recollection characteristic of protest fiction, post-apartheid testimony, and contemporary memorial narratives of former District residents, "My Sister" would typically not be considered to belong to any of these categories. Its confessional form and melodramatic tone makes it more reminiscent of Hollywood dramas of race- and class-passing of the period, than of serious - prototypically masculine and overtly political - protest literature. I suggest, however, that we understand "My Sister" as a text of protest and as a foundational "anticipatorily memorial" narrative of District Six. I also argue that viewing the magazine *Africa!* in which it was published as a South African and Pan-African literary space means understanding District Six as African in a way that has likely not been contemplated by the institutional producers of District Six discourse.

AFRICA: JULY 1955 reads the running page header. The last issue of *Africa!* to appear as a stand-alone periodical contains one of Richard Rive's first, and most neglected, short stories. The issue begins with an announcement from the editor: Can Themba[225] presents the end of *Africa!* as a change in format and a bargain for its readers. A cropped photograph of Themba's inclined head, telephone receiver pressed to his ear, is suspended above his text:

[225] Can Themba's story, "The Suit," won *Drum*'s first short story contest in 1953. "The Suit," in its 1993 adaptation for the stage, likely remains his most well-known work. Although he is known as a *Drum* writer, Themba also wrote for, and edited, the *Golden City Post* and *Africa*.

> Your AFRICA will come to you as from next month in the form of a much larger-sized "Africa Home Pages" in our sister-publication, the "Golden City Post," which will of course, expand in size [...] The exciting news is therefore that you will now be getting your AFRICA free of charge, for the "Golden City Post" with its extra pages will still remain at its price of 3d.[226]

In the mid-1950s, *The Golden City Post*, along with the *Cape Herald*, were the two national, English-language papers intended for a black readership. Like the famous *Drum* magazine, and the short-lived *Africa*, the papers were white-owned publications that employed black writers who wrote for a black readership.[227] *Africa!* ceased publication at the same historical juncture, the mid-1950s, that *Drum* ceased to publish culturally and politically challenging material, and ceased to offer a platform for aspiring young black writers. Although *Drum* continued, many of its writers and editors were to leave the magazine, and then the country.

While *Drum* is recognized for its early support of a small group of black writers, its shorter-lived "sister publication," *Africa*, was more unambiguously low-brow, more clearly directed at a readership of women, and has received much less critical attention. However, *Africa*, like *Drum,* constituted one of very few national forums of textual exchange for a black readership, which was also a black "authorship." Black writers wrote for black readers about urban, international - frequently African - places and concerns; readers also became writers. *Africa!* was a heterogeneous and capitalist Pan-African textual space. Unlike contemporary nationalist conceptions of Africa, the magazine *Africa!* features and addresses a broad and multi-racial black public. Its intended readership does not appear limited to Johannesburg nor to African black readers. A single issue brings into close proximity female Mau Mau fighters and the "girls" of Accra nightlife, Rive's story of racial passing and family betrayal in Cape Town and the story of a thwarted marriage between Bindoo and Vinod ("Krishna's Magic"), as well as a multitude of advertisements that testify to a product's value for the modern African consumer. Realistic visual documentation lends additional authority to this heterogeneous mixture of claims and narratives.

This heterogeneity in genre, intended readership, and product is undercut by common thematic preoccupations and formal traits. The final issue of *Africa!* is pervaded by shared concerns about the properly raced and gendered forms (and products) of domestic life; and those concerns are powerfully articulated through the narrative form of the confession. A testimonial voice promises to reveal: it is authoritative, informative, and often confessional in tone. The confessional narrative is itself an ongoing column; in July 1955, Cynthia's winning submission was published ("Cynthia of Evaton wins this month's £1 for the best true confession: My First Love."). Texts of all kinds rely upon the authority of first-person experience and accompanying visual documentation.

Advertisements, like narratives that are not intended to promote a product, are generously illustrated, frequently with photographs, and boast testimonial narratives: Yvonne Medope, Beautiful Cover Girl, attests to the efficacy of Bu-Tone Freckle and Complexion Cream ("Buy Bu-Tone and

---

[226] D. Can Temba, "Some Big News" *Africa* (July 1955), 5.

[227] Founded in 1951, *Drum* magazine is by far the best-known of the four periodicals, and the only one still published.

be Beautiful"), and concludes that, "Yes, if you want a fresh and lighter complexion, a satin-smooth skin, free from pimples and blemishes, take my advice, use only Bu-Tone." Jeanie Rahube, vocalist with the Manhattan Stars, is pictured drinking a cup of Bournville Cocoa; Rahube is not quoted, but the reader is reminded pithily to "Drink it Twice a Day"; "A Cup of Cocoa is a Cup of Food"; and that "Cocoa is not only delicious but keeps you fit." "The extra richness of Gold Cross Full Cream Sweetened Condensed Milk gives me match-winning energy," swears Ishmael Moloi, who plays right back for the Moroko Swallows of Johannesburg, and whose cut-out photographed form is pictured mid-kick above a can of condensed milk.

Similar illustrations, a shared tone of scandal and revelation, and a shared set of thematic preoccupations make it difficult to distinguish narratives intended to be read as fiction from those intended to be read as fact. Advertisements, news reportage, advice columns, and short stories alike are illustrated with comic strips, detailed drawings, and photographs. Titles and subheaders vie for attention with suspense-inducing punctuation. "Money from Moscow!" Arthur Mogale's story is titled .The lead is also urgently engaging: "The last chapter! Remember Joobie Abrahams the sweet jube-jube who has been spinning The Chief round her little finger because she was oh, so pretty? Did you ever stop to think that she might be the brains behind this double-double-crossing outfit? Read how The Chief brings this mystery to a close and saves the world from a possible Third War!" The non-fiction cover story "Women of Mau-Mau!" ("They were by far more relentless and fierce in their adherence to the Mau Mau movement than the men"), like the fictional "Money from Moscow!" is accompanied by photographs and concludes with "The End." The final issue of *Africa* also contains several columns devoted to the missives of readers, as well as the winning submission to the "Confessional" column, and other narratives that appear, with some ambiguity, to be the fictional contributions of professional writers. A text in this last category is one of Rive's earliest, and most neglected, stories: the confessional narrative "My Sister Was a PlayWhite," written under the ostentatiously anonymous pseudonym of "Mary X."

Stories of feminine intrigue - domestic, romantic, familial, racial, anti-colonial - are ubiquitous. The cover story - "Women of The Mau Mau!" - has elements of all of these: Who are the women who keep alive the Mau Mau? The cover suggests a response, and then exhorts potential readers: ("See the full story inside") "READ ABOUT THE FIERCE LADIES OF THE NIGHT!" The article itself begins by narrating the twilight appearance of women sex workers on the streets of Nairobi. The narration is resolutely visual and emphasizes the modernity of both the city and the women who surreally appear on its streets:

> As dusk begins to settle on the bazaars of modern Nairobi, and the brilliant white and yellow lights go up in the streets, flashily-dressed African women suddenly materialize at every street corner. Some linger languidly at each bus stop [...] Others saunter with a leisurely pace before the neon-lit emporiums of the city [...] They are anxious watchful ...
> These are Nairobi's "ladies of the night."
> Some of them are also Mau Mau agents, doing vitally important work for the leaders of the revolt in the city. (13)

The article continues to describe the varied roles of women in the movement: some are prostitutes

who give valuable information, and possibly money and ammunition to the rebels. However, "of course" most women in Mau Mau are "ordinary housewives, who form the foundation of its 'passive' wing"[228] by providing food and shelter to fighters. The message is clear: women are essential to Mau Mau, even if most are not fighters (nor prostitute-spies), but rather "housewives" - a term which evokes consumerist domesticity and relative leisure, rather than the intensive labor of peasant women. As the article proceeds, it continues to refute what it implies are common misconceptions about the role of women in Mau Mau. The tone of confident revelation falters only briefly at the paragraph end, with the mention of weapons:

> Nor indeed has their role always been confined to these "passive" duties in the movement. Several women have held important positions in the Mau Mau hierarchy, and presumably continue to do so to this day. Some have acted as judges in Mau Mau courts, sentencing offenders and "traitors" to fines, tortures, and even death [...] some have even accompanied them [men] on their actual raids on farms and homestead, duly armed with guns though it is doubtful if they ever have used them. (14)

Subsequent paragraphs, however, continue unhindered by expressions of authorial doubt. The central proof of the power of women within Mau Mau follows immediately - Mau Mau has its own queen:

> On Coronation Day, just as Queen Elizabeth the Second was being crowned in England, this young Kikuyu girl was also crowned the Queen of Mau Mau," a coronet of banana leaves ceremoniously placed on her head.
> Nor was it in name only that she was a "queen." She was in effective charge of the Mau Mau parliament in her area, and was vested with every authority she needed. Now she is serving a sentence in one of Kenya's prisons. (14)

The coronation of this queen is not presented as a mock version of the real ritual: the Queen of Mau Mau possesses real authority; neither her title nor the political structure in which she governs are trivialized. Mau Mau women exercise real power: another woman was behind one of "the most sensational" of Mau Mau raids, and [colonial] Government officials are sure that Mau Mau women will have to be imprisoned longer than the men because of the ferocity of their loyalty to the Movement. Why, the article asks rhetorically, does Mau Mau exert "a greater hold" on women than men? It answers that Mau Mau women are "fanatically determined" to retain the new "independence" that the movement offers them, since they have almost no status within "traditional Kikuyu society": "Mau Mau gave these women equality." The gender egalitarianism of Mau Mau is affirmed, even as African culture is condemned through rhetoric familiar from both colonial and nationalist condemnations of "tribal tradition." The article insinuates that Mau Mau excites fanatical loyalty and a perhaps mystical "hold" on women in particular, but it mitigates the suggestion of irrationality by providing the information that Mau Mau is appealing for rational reasons: women want a specifically gendered independence - from the domination of African men. Only in this engagement with gender are "independence" and "equality" actually stated; there is no analogously

[228] Quotation marks enclose "passive" in the original.

explicit discussion of the political motives that propel the Mau Mau movement. Indeed the focus on Mau Mau *women* permits the complete elision of the goals and context of the larger Mau Mau movement.

Over the course of the article, the authorial voice becomes increasingly difficult to place, both spatially and politically, and certainty alternates with unexpected admissions of doubt and ignorance. The article begins as if it were an impressionistic dispatch from the streets of Nairobi, and our reporter a sympathetic onlooker, if not a Mau Mau insider. The article ends in a precisely named, and entirely different, location: the "rehabilitation" camp at Kamiti where Mau Mau women, among them Jomo Kenyatta's wife, are held. On the reader's behalf, the article wonders in vain about the total number of Mau Mau women; and then replies: "But whatever their number in the forests, there are just about 3,000 of them in the special, dusty camp at Kamiti […]" (15). From a beginning evocative of both pulp fiction and ethnographic travelogue, and from expressions of ambivalent respect for the (women's) Mau Mau struggle, the article arrives at a conclusion that seems to almost uncritically report upon the colonial prison camp – relaying the numbers of women being rehabilitated and anecdotes of the most famous among them.

"My Sister Was a PlayWhite" begins on the page opposite an advertisement for Perry Davis Pain Killer ("known to Africans all over Africa") to be drunk for digestive pains or, alternately, rubbed over aching muscles and joints. As "Women of the Mau Mau" betrays uncertainty as to whether the women of Mau Mau belong in the forest or the city streets or in the prison camp, "My Sister" recounts an experience of dislocation, but within the racialized geography of a family and a city. Displaced by the "playwhite" aspirations of her light-complexioned mother and sister, Mary X's narrative is a "confession" of her own struggle rather than one recounted on behalf of her sister.

"Lucille reached out for danger!" reads the subheader beside a large photograph: A pale woman, handbag in hand, straight dark hair in a twist, reaches out and grasps a doorknob. She gazes straight ahead; a sign affixed to the door reads "BLANKES / UROPEANS." The edge of the photograph removes the *E*; the photographer's position to the side and slightly behind the woman means that her facial features are almost entirely obscured. The caption reads, "Lucille used only telephones which had a 'Europeans' sign." A second photograph, two pages later, also illustrates Lucille's life as a playwhite. The same woman, her back and partial profile to the camera, stands beside a movie poster. The enormous poster, also cropped by the photograph, looms above her head: a white woman clad in a bikini top, hips partially draped with scant fabric, leans against a fully-clothed blonde man: "MONDAY / ISLAND OF DESIRE" is legible. "Lucille" looks away from the poster, perhaps to another poster that the viewer of the photograph cannot see: the caption informs us that "Lucille studies posters outside a European bioscope."

The text itself begins in the by-now familiar confessional tone of tabloid realism and puts forth the writer's virtuous intentions. The story to follow has moral value; despite past suffering and betrayal, there remains an enduring sisterly love:

> I hope "AFRICA" will publish my story for two reasons, firstly to prevent other families from suffering the way our family has suffered, and secondly, to prevent fair, young and attractive Coloureds who can pass as white from going through the same

> hardship my sister Lucille has suffered. Although my sister Lucille has suffered much for her foolishness, I still love her as sisters the world over love each other. (27)

The narrative begins by situating the family, socially and geographically: respectable Coloured, living on William Street, District Six. A respectable white family (The Jones) lived next door. During the writer's childhood, the District did not "as now" have "an unsavoury reputation." A short list of street names ("William," "Tennant," "the upper part of Caledon") and reference to the cinema suffice to evoke the District of the time: "... for four pennies, on Saturdays, we could see 'Zorro' or 'Johnny Mack Brown' at the 'Metro,' as the 'Star' Cinema was then called, or at the 'National,' a stone's throw away from the 'Metro'" (27). The shorthand reliance on local detail grounds the sentimental, and largely generic, narrative to come.

Younger sister Lucille was a blonde child with blue eyes who took after her mother in looks, whereas the writer was a "dark girl," possessed of a "mop of hair, which all the brushing on earth could not untangle," who took after her father in complexion and disposition (morose, a tendency towards long periods of silence). Blue eyes are a chief sign of Lucille's difference: "I remember mother showing her to me with pride and how those blue eyes stared back at me!" Mother's cousin is married to a white man. While the writer is instructed to address her uncle formally as "Mr. Powell," he is made godfather to the new blue-eyed baby sister. Lucille's christening, which neither "Mary" nor her father are permitted to attend, is held in the Powell home in the primarily white Salt River neighborhood.

The remainder of the narrative is divided into short sections, each of which center on a different incident in which the writer is betrayed because of the special treatment that Lucille receives. Mother beats Mary for spilling water on one of Lucille's dresses; Lucille's teacher mistakes Mary for a strange brown child harassing one of her (white) charges; eventually, Lucille's white beau takes Mary for a family servant. Lucille attends a white school, goes to Cape Town's white cinemas ("bioscopes"), and eventually acquires a white boyfriend who believes that Lucille too is white. It is a story of a family separated by color and, more ambiguously, by gender: while the mother and Lucille can pass as white, the father, brother, and Mary herself are left behind in District Six. Following the short sections devoted to the betrayals of early childhood, the reader is informed of the sisters' increasingly divergent fates: the writer leaves school after Standard Six (eighth grade) to work: she must support Lucille's well-dressed attendance of (white) Cape Town bioscopes. Mary, meanwhile, loses herself in the bioscopes of the District, "in the exploits of Errol Flynn or my then favorite Edward G. Robinson."

In the penultimate section, "Driven Out," the mother does not want her husband or other children to be home on the night of Lucille's sixteenth birthday party. To help her mother's avoid the embarrassment of making the request explicit, the writer preemptively offers to stay at the Powell home while the Powells are attending the party in her own house. Her brother does not come home for two days; her father hides himself out of sight of the guests.

When Lucille's boyfriend (his whiteness signaled by his Vredehoek residence) makes his appearance in the story, the narrative accelerates towards its foregone conclusion:

> The party, I believe was a roaring success and mother had the opportunity of meeting Lucille's boy friend, Arthur, who lived in Vredehoek and was an accountant in town. **It was my first meeting with Arthur which started the chain of events which were to expose the whole set-up. (29)** [229]

One day the author answers the door and finds a blonde, grey-eyed young man who asks for Lucille. Mary shouts upstairs to her sister, and then overhears Arthur reprove Lucille for allowing a servant to "take such liberties" with her. Lucille defends herself by explaining that Mary has been in the family's service for a long time. The writer rushes to her room and weeps "hot tears."

The final and most lengthy section is titled "New Bond." Mary and brother Jamesy decide to unite with their father; the section begins with bolded text: "**A new bond grew up between us and we decided to stand together and leave with daddy. It was useless staying in a house so divided. Poor daddy, he was the saddest of all...**" (29). The three go to the mother (Lucille is out on a drive with Arthur), and Mary tells her "the truth" about the "the whole insane arrangement." The mother preempts their announcement of departure by "hysterically" ordering them to leave. The next morning, having recalled her reliance on their earnings, she asks them to stay; they refuse. We learn then that they do not intend to leave permanently ("I made arrangements with a Malay friend of mine, Gadijah, to sleep at her place in case matters did not turn out favourably."). Their ploy is successful: Lucille leaves to stay with the Powells, and the others return home. Lucille and Arthur become engaged - "the event of the year" - and Mother's attitude towards her other two children marginally improves:

> […] Mother had thawed somewhat and now and again threw me tidbits of news [of Lucille]. However, she still treated Jamesy with cool indifference and constantly reminded him to go to his skolly friends in District Six... She even jokingly remarked that I could come and peep at the [wedding] proceedings. I was cynically amused at her remark. (28)

The tragic denouement begins with a final reference to Saturday bioscope outings: "Coming home from the bioscope that fateful Saturday evening, I saw Arthur's car parked outside the house." The two dark siblings wait in the kitchen to hear what has happened. Weeping mother enters and announces that Lucille is pregnant and therefore she and Arthur must marry. The problem is explained to readers for whom it would have been obvious: "[...] birth certificates had to be produced before marriage licenses could be issued and the snag was that ours were unmistakeably stamped, 'MIXED.' There was also the Immorality Act which could be inforced and could become quite nasty" (31). The family tells Arthur the truth before identity papers would reveal it: he leaves in his car, never to reappear. Lucille moves back to the District, "a sadder and perhaps wiser girl," and the family is finally united. Lucille has been transformed by motherhood as well as by racist betrayal; she is now a "loving girl" and very fond of little Jimmy (who has both blue eyes and a "nut-brown" complexion). Mary X's conclusion reminds the reader of the moral impetus that inspired her "confession":

---

[229] Bold in the original, as is the case with the subsequent cited and bolded phrases.

> I fear even to think what would have happened had Lucille married Arthur. Young Jimmy would have probably ended up in a home or some other place... Arthur has never been seen or heard of since, and I am writing this confession, distasteful as it is, because Lucille has asked me to do it to sound a word of warning to all Coloured persons who entertain a desire to "cross the line'" and pass for White. **THE END** (31)

"My Sister was a Playwhite" uncannily implicates the post-apartheid reader, even as it evokes pre-apartheid discourses of miscegenation and tragic Coloured existence. Questions of racial parentage and passing permeated both colonial and apartheid discourses about Coloured people and their relationship to the South African nation (and the real races within it). Sarah Millin's 1924 novel, *God's Stepchildren*, remains intimately associated with this discourse: Coloured people were the product of incorrect relations, perpetual step-children all, doomed to lead lives shaped by flawed racial and gendered bonds. The preoccupation with racial passing and racial mixing that is so evident in "My Sister" participates in a discourse about Colouredness and racial-passing which characterized the preceding colonial period as much as it did the apartheid period, and which is also not entirely absent from contemporary South African discourses about race and Colouredness.

Despite our distance from both the events of the text and the political regime in which it was published, and from much of the tone and content of the narrative, "My Sister" should feel not only anachronistic, but also contemporary to post-apartheid readers. My Sister" shares characteristics with the narratives that would follow the District's destruction, despite the story's publication prior even to the District's declaration. Its treatment of life in the District resonates with pervasive ways in which the District is evoked today. Both the synecdochal characterizations of the District and the narrative's testimonial form evoke contemporary memory discourse. Like the frequently excerpted and reproduced "memories" of former residents, the mid-century story is ostensibly produced through an act of recollection. Like the literary texts and oral histories produced decades later, "My Sister" evokes the District as a distinct, and lost, location in time and space. As former residents frequently do today, Mary X conjures the District of her childhood into being by a selective naming of its places and people - particularly its cinemas and streets. While "My Sister" does not testify to a community destroyed by apartheid, it does testify to racialized destruction: to the betrayals and pain that racial passing and racial discrimination wreak upon families.

To read "My Sister" as an anticipatorily memorial text is to consider that important elements of the District Six memory discourse predated the District's destruction, and that the longevity of that discourse is due not only to its congruence with post-apartheid discourses of memory, but also to its resemblance with colonial modes of articulating Colouredness, Cape Town, and the District. " Contemporary memory discourse and many individual post-apartheid narratives portray the District as a place of street interaction and social connection across boundaries of religion and race; "My Sister" similarly portrays a District that is not white, and that includes people of different races and religions (including white people). While "My Sister" does not describe the District in the late twentieth-century lexicon of cosmopolitanism, it does portray the District's distinct multiracial character. The District Six of "My Sister" like the "District Six" of contemporary memory discourse, does not appear as a a specifically Coloured or black space; instead, the District Six of Rive's story appears apart from the racial logic of the rest of Cape Town. The District is mixed: there are white

neighbors, the Muslim friend Gadija, and family members of a range of compexions.

Grief for the District does not dominate Mary X's tale, as today it permeates both the memory discourse of District Six and many narratives of individual former District residents. However, the "telling" of "My Sister" is provoked by Lucille's experience of loss, and the narrative recounts many other losses: the loss of the District's respectable character, the loss of proper family bonds, and the narrator's loss of her place within her family and home. Lucille undergoes a sequence of losses before the return and reunion of the story's conclusion: a loss of her (true) place within the family and the District, followed by the loss of her white beau, and with him the play-hope of gendered and racial legitimacy (and supremacy). And, like the dominant contemporary memory discourse - although unlike many individual narratives - Mary X's account concludes with a return to the District and a family reunion.

Other aspects of "My Sister," while they depart from the general narrative of District Six discourse, resonate with former resident narratives. The memory discourse emphasizes that the District was destroyed by apartheid. Most former resident narratives, however, unlike the dominant discourse in which they are produced and to which they are frequently reduced, do not name "apartheid." They do not describe the destruction of the District, nor their own forcible dislocation. Rather than articulate an explicit critique of apartheid violence, these narratives focus upon the place which was destroyed, often in great and visceral detail. Similarly, "My Sister" emphasizes the beliefs and interpersonal betrayals that adhere to play-white the aspirations; the apartheid context that makes color distinctions legally and socially significant receives little direct attention.

To think about *Africa!* as a Pan-African textual space demands a critical reflection upon the notion of Africa and upon Pan-Africanism. The magazine does not present a black resistant continent; its continental imaginary is both more capacious, and more circumscribed. On the one hand, to position *Africa!* as Pan-African is to position "My Sister," the District, and Cape Town within Africa, and to cast both Rive and Mary X as African writers. The Africa produced by this iteration of Pan-Africanism accommodates racial, gendered, and religious heterogeneity, as well as the complexity of a "playwhite" position and of a writer who is both Richard and Mary. On the other hand, the critical potential of this Africa (and *Africa!)* is circumscribed: by the exigencies of white capital; the limited access of its black writers to other parts of Africa; the predominant low literacy level of its intended readership; and by a political sensibility that appears either conservative or so coded as to be difficult to interpret as "resistant." I suggest that these strictures are similar to those that constrain the continent and its Pan-African imaginaries today. Relative to the circumscribed scope of contemporary African nationalisms, the breadth of *Africa!* is striking, yet it is fraught with the familiar limitations of both pan-continental resistant imaginaries and contemporary political and economic conditions.

Chapter 4 Siggi

As I described in the Introduction, within Senegal, the Thiaroye Massacre has occupied a distinct place in debates about decolonization: under Senghor's administration, to evoke Thiaroye was to evoke the neocolonialism of his regime. For Leftist opposition, during Senghor's presidency in particular, Thiaroye signaled a specifically Senegalese neocolonial injustice: the domestic suppression of attention to colonial violence represented the absence of genuine sovereignty and democracy. After the beginning of democratic reforms in 1974, an independent press and new Leftist cultural associations became important producers of political critique. They employed notions of indigenous resistance to articulate a critique of Senghor's state and its Negritude. Warriors of late nineteenth-century and Muslim religious leaders were referenced as indigenous anti-colonial heroes. In the new opposition periodicals, *Kaddu* and *And Soppi,* the Thiaroye Massacre was occasionally referenced (*Kaddu*)[230] and dramatized (Faty Faye's play *Aube de Sang* was published in *And Soppi*),[231] in an implicit indictment of Senegalese state silence about the Massacre. In these texts, the murdered colonial soldiers appear as remembered figures of anti-colonial resistance - as, in effect, *ceddo.*

Ceddo and *siggi* were watchwords of the oppositional nationalist landscape of the period. Historically, *ceddo* were a caste of warriors in the Wolof kingdoms. In state and non-state nationalist imaginaries, the *ceddo* is an imagined national father. Nationalist employments of *ceddo* suggest a traditional indigenous resistance to external oppression. *Ceddo* implies both an ideal black, resistant, and male national subject and a dichotomous understanding of colonial violence. *Siggi,* literally*,* means "to raise one's head"; figuratively, it means "to gain dignity," "to be[come] proud." In the act of *siggi*, oppositional nationalisms have equated the singular bodily gesture of raising one's head with the unbowed carriage and collective pride of the national collective. *Ceddo* and *siggi* can work together in a single imaginary of anti-colonial resistance: the Senegalese nation, coded as Wolof and masculine, stands straight-backed with national pride. However, the symbolism of *ceddo* and *siggi* also diverges. While *siggi* implies an act of resistant self-assertion, the character of the self that is being asserted is not necessarily *ceddo* or even national. The act of *siggi* implies no particular national paternity. Attention to evocations of *ceddo* and *siggi* can allow us to consider a multiplicity of nationalist understandings of colonial violence, anti-colonial resistance, and the identity of the postcolonial national subject.

"Ceddo" and "siggi" appear in the titles of the first and last texts I examine in this chapter. Both these texts, Sembène's film *Ceddo* and Diagne's "Siggi Nag Faf," also featured in an important political controversy of the 1970s that surrounded the writing of the two words themselves. In the 1970s, repressive legislation regarding the transcription of "national languages" appeared simultaneously with the democratic reforms that permitted the reemergence of public critique. A 1975 law did not recognize strong consonants as an inherent feature of Wolof, and made imprisonment a penalty for spelling a national language in a manner other than that prescribed by law. This meant that the transcription of geminate consonants, such as the doubled "d" of *ceddo* and

---

230 *Kaddu* was founded by Ousmane Sembène and Pathé Diagne in 1972. In the journal's twenty-three issues, the Massacre is mentioned twice: once in a 1972 special issue, and a second time in an issue in which the year of publication is not apparent, likely 1974 or 1975. I discuss both references in this chapter.

231 As I noted in the Introduction, Faty Faye's *Aube de Sang* was published serially in *And Soppi* in 1977 and 1978.

the doubled "g" of *siggi,* became criminal offenses.[232] The primary function of these pieces of legislation was to repress challenging cultural production, rather than to create the basis for a future language policy that would permit meaningful roles for languages other than French. The implications extended beyond the place of Wolof in national life, to notions of democracy and Senegalese nationhood itself. The legislation was selectively applied. First, Sembène's film *Ceddo*, and then two new opposition periodicals - *Siggi*, followed by *And Soppi* - became subject to the same article that legislated the non-existence of strong consonants and the consequent prohibition upon writing geminate consonants. *Ceddo* - when Sembène refused to change either the film's title or its spelling - was banned.[233] The periodicals continued: *And Soppi* ("Let Us Make Change Together") was transcribed *Ànde Sopë*; *Siggi* became *Taxaw* ("Stand").[234]

In this chapter, I first discuss the *ceddo* as both an historical actor and a figure within nationalist imaginaries. I argue that the nationalist evocation of the *ceddo* disavows the complicity of the historical *ceddo*. That disavowal facilitates the elision of the structural violence of the present and constricts the postcolonial national imagination: the contemporary nation appears as a *ceddo* collective. The conceptions of a *ceddo* national paternity and an unambiguous *ceddo* resistance do not permit the full entrance of another historical subject: the structurally complicit colonial soldier. I introduce Sembène through the idiom of national *ceddo* fatherhood and examine how the Thiaroye Massacre is evoked as a memory of *ceddo* resistance in the periodical he co-founded and -edited, *Kaddu*.

The remainder of the chapter compares the articulations of *ceddo* present in Sembène's films *Ceddo* and *Camp de Thiaroye* with the more oblique conceptions of *siggi* resistance that emerge in two other texts of the period: Boubacar Boris Diop's play *Thiaroye terre rouge* and Pathe Diagne's text "Siggi nag fa!" I argue that the concept of *ceddo* dominates the understanding of the massacre produced in *Camp* and in *Kaddu.* These texts are preoccupied with a largely dichotomous relationship of oppression and resistance between France and Africa; and they imagine the unified black masculine resistance of the *ceddo.* By contrast, Diop's play and Diagne's genre-confounding text are rooted in questions regarding the posture of successful resistance and the identity of the national subject who must *siggi.* Diop's play is concerned with varied forms of African resistance and collaboration, and with challenging Senghor's Senegal on intertwining literary and political terms. The play both celebrates and questions the upright posture of resistance, and it provokes questions about how

---

[232] In 1971, the first law on the transcription of "national languages" was passed (six national languages had been recognized in 1968). French was Senegal's sole official language, as it has remained. Cultural production about, and in, languages other than French potentially threated both the imagined notion of a Francophone Senegal and the continued monopoly of public discourse by a French-educated elite. Spelling can also be viewed as a pretext for the intimidation (and distraction) of political opposition; a means to muffle, if not directly censor, the articulation of alternate political visions.

[233] *Ceddo* was first screened in Senegal five years later, in 1981. In Mamadou Diouf's analysis, the censorship of the film was provoked by the pointed relevance of its historical engagement for the political present: the true source of the objection was Sembène's rendition of Senegalese history and its implied critique of the Senghorian national present. See "Histoire et actualités dans CEDDO d'Ousmane Sembène et *HYENES* de Djibril Diop Mambéty" in *Littérature et cinéma en Afrique francophone : Ousmane Sembène et Assia Djebar,* ed. Sada Niang (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996), 15-34.

[234] For more information about the history of language policy in Senegal, including the language legislation of the 1970s, see Mamadou Cissé, "Langue, Etat et société au Sénégal" *REVUE ELECTRONIQUE INTERNATIONALE DE SCIENCES DU LANGAGE SUDLANGUES*, no. 5 (2006): 99-133. http://www.au-senegal.com/IMG/pdf/doc-109pdf-33f96.pdf.

Africans, present and past, are differently implicated in enduring colonial oppression. Diagne's "Siggi Nag Fa!" evokes a sense of nationhood that depends upon *siggi* yet neglects the *ceddo* and the neat dichotomies of external oppression and indigenous resistance that the nationalist deployments of *ceddo* have signaled.

In service of the alternate national futures which postcolonial oppositional nationalisms sought to craft, *ceddo* has been refashioned to signify an exemplary honorable and resistant national subject. However, *ceddo* were not only of slave descent; they were significant players in the Atlantic Slave Trade. Through participation in the Trade, Wolof kingdoms became increasingly militarized and undemocratic, and *ceddo* became increasingly powerful within regimes that enriched themselves through war, raids, and the consequent sale of people: the kingdoms of the nineteenth-century are known as *ceddo* kingdoms and the era as that of the ceddo. *Ceddo*, as nationalist narrative recalls, resisted both conversion to Islam and French conquest; yet, that resistance was not an attempt to preserve a relatively egalitarian indigenous social and political order. Rather, it was an effort to preserve the relative autonomy of the radically violent and unequal political and social structure that the Atlantic Slave Trade had powerfully shaped. Nor was the anti-colonial resistance of *ceddo* uniform. In the nineteenth-century, as France began to conquer the territory that would become the colony of Senegal, *ceddo* armies collaborated with the French against other *ceddo* powers. Historically a slave army that played an essential role in the Atlantic Slave Trade, *ceddo* are called upon to epitomize a free people in the present.

Nationalisms recuperated a powerful actor from within profoundly non-democratic and violent historical systems, in service of a democratic vision of the national future. Yet, in doing so, they obscured, or rendered irrelevant, the complicit position of the *ceddo* and the violent structures in which he existed. The nationalist notion that the *ceddo* is the exemplary democratic subject neglects the role of *ceddo* in the profoundly non-democratic dynamics of the Atlantic Trade and colonial conquest. The idea that the *ceddo* is the iconic honorable subject also obscures the fact that, historically and today, honor is not equally available to all. Honor depends upon social status, including the inherited statuses of free and slave, high-caste and low-caste.

Senegalese national narratives have struggled, or refused, to accommodate the potentially complicit figure of the *tirailleur* and the complexity of the Thiaroye Massacre. Nationalist narratives, both state and non-state, have frequently been structured by the dualities of Africa and Europe, resistance and domination, indigenous tradition and external influence. The Senegalese national narrative of the early independence period was also structured by dualities, albeit ones that were to resolve themselves in the synthesis of universality. As Mamadou Diouf argues, this state-supported notion of Senegalese nationhood was produced by Negritude dualities of *enracinement* and *ouverture*, "rootedness" and "opening [out]," in which Senegal was the fruit of a marriage between Negritude and Francophonie. In the national historical narrative, these dualities were personified by two historical figures. The Wolof *ceddo* warrior epitomized tradition, and one particular *ceddo*, Lat Dior, embodied the resistant Senegalese nation. The French Governor and General Faidherbe appeared as a force of "ouverture."[235] He is the European counterpart to Lat Dior; and the two are characterized by the same ostensibly universal [masculine] values of warrior courage and leadership.

---

[235] Mamadou Diouf, *Le Kajoor au XIXe siècle: pouvoir ceddo et conquête coloniale* (Paris: Karthala, 1990).

Diouf's history of the Kajoor kingdom, over which Lat Dior had ruled, challenges the centrality of the Kajoor as the site of proto-national resistance, and the primacy of Dior as the foundational resistor. In doing so, it also challenges the historiographical production of colonialism as a dichotomous encounter between African resistance and European aggression, and the way this understanding of the colonial past has been mobilized by the postcolonial state**.** Diouf sees this mythologized national past as a product of "enforced" memory, and argues that a constructed realm of "the memorable" has served as a method of postcolonial social control under L.S. Senghor's presidency (1960-1980) and beyond. This "memorable" constitutes a "double solicitation" at once towards both "traditional" and European sources of legitimacy.[236]

In performing that double gesture, this imagined national genealogy, I argue, carefully excludes a third term: the African colonial soldier, who fought for Faidherbe and made possible the French conquest of the territories that became French West Africa. Figure of neither African tradition nor French civilization, the *tirailleur* has little place in a vision of colonial conquest as cultural synthesis: Senegal produced by the dialectical relation between Europe and Africa. Under the administration of Senghor's successor, Abdou Diouf, Faidherbe's paternity was quietly neglected in favor of a single resistant national father; the 1986 centenary of Lat Dior's death became a state occasion and an important way in which Diouf sought to legitimize his authority. While the historical narrative of Diouf's state did not dwell on Faidherbe's imagined paternity, it shared with that of Senghor's state the emphasis upon Lat Dior. In celebrating Dior as the figure of national resistance, the narrative of Diouf's state also elided the complicity that the figure of the *tirailleur* can epitomize.

Like Senegalese state narratives, Senegalese oppositional national narratives have not accommodated the colonial soldier, or have done so only selectively. Under Senghor's government, oppositional nationalists explicitly rejected Faidherbe's parentage in favor of a clear opposition between European and African; they celebrated Lat Dior, and broadened the pantheon of national resistance heroes.[237] As the *tirailleur* could not figure in the dialectic of France and Senegal, he also had no place in a story of a unified African resistance confronting white oppression. Thus, like state nationalisms, oppositional nationalisms have not permitted the complicity of his position to intrude upon a dichotomous conception of national history. The position of a black colonial soldier is, in the terms of this project, "structurally complicit" - he fought for the empire under which he lived. The complicity of this position finds an explicit articulation in the Thiaroye Massacre: black colonial soldiers were among the French forces that surrounded the *Camp de Thiaroy*e.

As the structural complicity of the *tirailleur* has been elided in postcolonial national discourses, so has the structural complicity of the French black citizen been elided. The dual regime that governed black people under colonial rule has little importance for the way colonial history is popularly understood today. One indication of this is that for post-independence generations, it seems, *tirailleur* means simply "colonial soldier." Textbooks present the phenomenon of colonial military participation, but do not reflect on the dual regime of citizen and subject, and the corresponding forms of military participation. Historical narratives laud the role of Africans in liberating France, but do not dwell on their role in maintaining French empire. These elisions do not constitute

---

236 Ibid.

237 This expansion of a pantheon of resistant heroes is evident in the excerpts of *Kaddu* that I cite in this chapter.

omissions: no one denies the historical roles of *tirailleurs* or the existence of the citizen *originaires,* or the fact that the French colonial army killed *tirailleurs* at Thiaroye. Rather, these facts are relatively neglected; they are mentioned in passing, but their possible implications for the past and the present are not explored. They are incompatible with a dualistic story of the nation: they fit neither the doubled character of the Senghorian state narrative, nor the opposition between indigenous resistance and European oppression that structures Leftist nationalist histories.

"Thiaroye" has been incorporated into Senegalese oppositional and, more recently, State, discourses, but the historical facts of the event continue to challenge nationalist understandings of colonial violence. A binary understanding of resistance and oppression does not account for the historical positions and context of the Thiaroye Massacre. With careful crafting, the Thiaroye Massacre can be made to illustrate a dichotomous version of the French colonial project. However, the historical facts of the Massacre allude to complicit positions that characterized not only the Massacre but the French colonial project in Africa more broadly: the position of Senegal within French West Africa, the position of the black colonial soldier in the violent creation and maintenance of Empire; and the position of the black French *originaires* of the Four Communes. The historical facts of the Massacre, and some of its postcolonial narratives, uncomfortably allude to the complexity of the positions that colonial rule demanded. In the killings themselves, and in their larger political context, race does not neatly correlate with victimhood or perpetration, nor with the political identity of metropolitan citizen and colonial subject.

The historical imaginary of the Senghorian state cast Senegal as a free, unified, masculine nation, born of two nineteenth-century fathers, one African and one European, Lat Dior and Faidherbe. From the vantage point of the early twenty-first century, Senegal can appear as a nation of competing twentieth-century fathers. Senghor was *père-de-la-nation* and poet-president; among the men who contested his rule and his cultural ideology were Cheikh Anta Diop, Africanist scholar and political opponent, and Ousmane Sembène, who articulated his opposition to Senghor through his cultural production. All three men are referred to as fathers. Internationally, C.A. Diop is known as a father of Pan-Africanism; within Senegal he is perhaps best known as Senghor's political opponent, as an advocate and scholar of African languages, and as a founder of opposition political parties and of the opposition journal *Siggi.* Sembène, director and novelist, is known internationally as "the father of African Cinema." Among Senegalese intellectuals, he is known for his opposition to Senghor's language politics and his founding of the opposition periodical, *Kaddu.* Sembène is also known as a *ceddo,* a way in which he also referred to himself. *Ceddo* casts Sembène as a particular kind of rebel: African, black, male, and masculine, and it implies the paternity inherent in the notion of Lat Dior as the national father.

"Father of African Cinema" and *ceddo*, the figure of Sembène, as well as his his cinematic articulations of *ceddo* resistance, overshadow other Senegalese cultural producers and their articulations of resistance and nationhood. One of these less-lauded cultural producers is Pathé Diagne, the scholar and linguist with whom Sembène founded *Kaddu*. Like Sembène, and like many intellectuals of his generation, Diagne was a cultural nationalist, an advocate of Senegalese languages, and an opponent of Senghor's authoritarian rule. Unlike Senghor, C.A. Diop, and Sembène, Diagne is not referenced as a "father." His 1977 text allows a glimpse of a nationalism that does not celebrate a *ceddo* nation in the posture of *siggi*, and that offers no national paternity.

In 1972, Diagne and Sembène co-founded the Wolof-language cultural nationalist journal that posed an implicit challenge to the historiography and language policies of Senghor's government. *Kaddu* means "an act of speech," similar to *la parole*. In its twenty-three issues, Thiaroye appears twice, both times on memorial occasions. In a journal of oppositional cultural nationalism, in which historical consciousness and historical narrative hold a privileged place, Thiaroye never appears as the primary subject of a text, and it is nowhere mentioned in the issue specifically dedicated to history. On the first occasion, Thiaroye is referenced almost in passing, as if it were a landmark the significance of which is assumed to be already known and shared. The second reference explains the significance of the massacre in the nationalist and Pan-Africanist terms that were to become famous in Sembène's film. Thiaroye thus appears as mnemonic device rather than historical object: one referent within a shared memorial repertoire that signifies to the reader the necessity for a transformed national consciousness.

Both mentions occur within brief texts that remind the reader of an anniversary: Senegalese Independence (a special issue for April 1972) and the end of the Second World War [in Europe] (for the May 1974 issue). The anniversary of national independence emerges as an occasion to place the soldiers of Thiaroye among national resistance heroes; V-Day becomes an occasion to recall French atrocities against colonized peoples that occurred with the end of World War II. In the Independence issue, the reader is exhorted to remember the struggles of the past. The writer explains whom readers should recall and why recollection is important for the national present. The anonymous soldiers of Thiaroye conclude the list of individual Islamic and *ceddo* nineteenth-century resistance heroes:

> Ci weer wii ñu tudde weeru indepandaas, war nañu dawal xalaat ca la ñu taxoon jóg demb ngir xam fu ñu ci tollu. Fu ñu tollu ci jot dëgg dëgg réem mi ? Fu ñu tollu ci jot alalu réew mi ? Luy wallu waa Senegaal ci ekonomi wi ag réew mi ? Fu ñu tollu ci li taxoon jóg takku niti cosaan ya fi woon : na Sheyxu Umar, Lat Joor, Samba Laobe, Muusa Molo Balde, Sëriñ Bamba, Alaaji Maalig, ag ña ñu mar fa Caaroy.
>
> Lu di bilañu endepandaans bi ? Lu mu soppi ci réew mi ? Lu mu fi dellosi ? Na ñu seetaat suñu bopp.
>
> [In this month we call the independence month, we must, in order to know where we stand today, direct our thoughts to the reasons that we rose up. Where do we really stand in terms of the possession of our country? Where do we stand in terms of ownership of the national wealth? What share do the people of Senegal have in the country's economy? Where do we stand in relation to the reasons that the people of our *cosaan* revolted: people such as Cheikh Oumar, Lat Dior, Samba Laobé, Moussa Molo Baldé, Serigne Bamba, El Haj Malick, and those who were wiped out in Thiaroye.
>
> What is the record of this independence? What has changed in this country? What has regressed? Let us look hard at ourselves.][238]

[238] Ceddo [pseudonym, likely of Ousmane Sembène], "Moom Sa Reew," in "Independans," [unnumbered] special issue,

The final sentences associate the present national situation with the false paternity asserted in the state historical narrative:

> Fukki at ag ñaari yi, ku seetlu xam ni mettina ci waa réew mi, na fekk mu neex lool ci doxandeem yi fii teew.
> Endependaasu Senegaal nag, sëti Sheyxu Umar yi, doomu Lat Joor yi ag Foode Kaba ñoo ñu tax ñu di ko maggal ndu du Faidherbe ag ñoom seen.
>
> [Twelve years – anyone who has observed carefully knows that they have been difficult for the nation, yet have been very agreeable for the foreigners here. Senegalese independence – it is because of the grandchildren of Sheikh Umar, the children of Lat Dior and Fodé Kaba, that we celebrate it, and not because of Faidherbe and those like him.][239]

Faidherbe's paternity is explicitly rejected; the article is signed "Ceddo."

In the May 1974 issue of *Kaddu*, Thiaroye appears again: as a place among other places of French colonial massacre. The text implies a parallel between Thiaroye and other massacres in African colonies in the wake of World War II. The reference exemplifies the significance that a Pan-African nationalism typically assigns Thiaroye: the French killed African soldiers because the war had awakened a pan-national consciousness, and the colonial power was afraid of that consciousness and its consequences. On this occasion Thiaroye precedes, rather than concludes the litany:

> Ca biir geer ba la ci am ñu ñibbisi ñu fetal leen ci Caaroy ci 1944 ngir ragal yee gu leen geer ba yee ! Ñu naan geer ba jeex na sunu mbugël door a feeñ.
> Rey ba woon ca Seetif ca Alsééri
> Rey ba woon ca Madagaskaar
> Rey ba woon ca Dimbokoro ca Kodiwaar !
> Sunu waa réew door a xam ne li nu wara xeex moo di moom sunu bopp, moom sunu réew.
>
> [During the war, there were among those who returned those who they [the French] killed in Thiaroye in 1944, because they were afraid of the consciousness that the war had awakened in them [the soldiers]. They [the soldiers] said, the war is over, we should see our pay.
> Killing that was in Sétif in Algérie
> Killing that was in Madagascar
> Killing that was in Dimbokoro in Côte d'Ivoire!
> Our fellow countrymen began to understand what we must struggle for - to possess

---

Kaddu (1972) [unnumbered page]. In my English translation, I have spelled names according to French (not Wolof) orthographic convention so that they would be more easily recognizable to readers. I do the same in my other translations of Wolof text.

[239] Ibid.

ourselves, to possess our own country.][240]

The Thiaroye Massacre is cast as a foundational, unambiguous, act of anti-colonial resistance that prefigures national independence.

In Sembène's eponymous film, *Ceddo* (1976), *ceddo* signifies the indigenous resistor: uncolonized, unislamicized, African and unsubdued. That notion of *ceddo* is produced through a retelling of history in which *ceddo* embodies the power of indigenous, traditional resistance to multiple predatory forces: Islam, European (Christian) imperialism, and the tyrannical Wolof aristocracy, all of which participate in the Atlantic Trade.

Ceddo is set in an unidentified, and unidentifiable, historical Wolof kingdom; the aspiration was not to achieve historical fidelity, but to narrate an allegorical past that could represent the postcolonial present, and therefore allow the film to condemn Senghor's Senegal and celebrate the *ceddo* of an egalitarian and resistant Senegalese nation. [241] The characterization of the three forces and the drama which unfolds between them does not reflect the historical dynamics of Wolof kingdoms; rather, it allows the film to function as an ahistorical allegory that condemns both Islamic and European power in the Senegal of its present, and suggests the tyrannical character of the contemporary Senegalese "king." The *ceddo* of the film - ordinary animist peasants, dignified and free, who honor African tradition and refuse to submit to domination - are the Senegalese nation. While the film clearly departs from history, it does not turn to an idiom of memory: it does not position itself as an act of memory, portray sequences of recollection, nor position the viewer as a remembering subject.

The film's setting blends elements of different centuries and locations to create a proto-national Senegalese kingdom in which peasant *ceddo* resist multiple oppressors. Christianity and Islam are racially coded as foreign: embodied, respectively, by a white slave trading missionary and a light-complexioned North African (or Hal-Pulaar) Muslim leader. The competition for power within the kingdom pits the supporters of the Wolof aristocracy against the supporters of Islamic rule. Resistant (non-Islamic and "non-aristocratic") *ceddo* forces capture the king's daughter, the Princess Dior, whose name evokes the primary national *ceddo* resistor, Lat Dior. At first, it appears that Islam might be victorious; the Muslim leader becomes increasingly powerful and, upon the king's death, usurps the throne. Many *ceddo* resist the new theocracy and refuse to convert; as a consequence, some are sold into the Atlantic Trade. At the film's conclusion, a free resistant *ceddo* liberates the Princess Dior. During her captivity, she has come to ally herself with the *ceddo*; once freed, it is she who assassinates the Muslim tyrant. In the future, it is clear, the male and female embodiments of resistance – the *ceddo*-liberator and the *ceddo*-queen - will together rule the kingdom, justly.

The film's social world elides both the multiple complex positions of Wolof timocracy and the significant role of *ceddo* within the Trade. There are only two indigenous groups: the free resistant "*ceddo*" peasantry and the corrupt monarchy. No characters resemble the historical *ceddo* - the slave-descended warriors who fought for the crown and became important participants in the Trade.

---

240 Boroom Jamono Yi, "Xewoonu Mee" *Kaddu,* no. 20, 9. [publication year unknown, likely 1974 or 1975]

241 Mamadou Diouf, "Histoire et actualités dans CEDDO d'Ousmane Sembène et *HYENES* de Djibril Diop Mambéty" in *Littérature et cinéma en Afrique francophone : Ousmane Sembène et Assia Djebar,* ed. Sada Niang (Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996), 15-34.

Some of the film's *ceddo* become victims of the Atlantic Trade; none of them are the facilitators and beneficiaries of the Trade.

Like *Ceddo*, *Camp de Thiaroye* celebrates an uncomplicated figure of indigenous resistance. The *tirailleurs* of *Camp* appear as the twentieth-century, Pan-African counterparts to the *ceddo* in Sembène's earlier film. Like the *ceddo* of *Ceddo*, the *tirailleurs* of *Camp* exist within a dichotomous logic of indigenous affirmation and external oppression that elides structural complicity and constructs that ideal national subject as black, male, and resistant. Within the respective films, *ceddo* and *tirailleurs* - historically, both structurally complicit - appear as figures of unambiguous resistance within a society divided only between tyrants and the people, oppressors and oppressed. The historical slave-descended warrior is reimagined as the resisting peasant; the colonial soldier appears as the peaceful indigenous resistor. *Camp*, like *Ceddo,* elides historical complicity in its creation of a peaceful, egalitarian, and heroic collective of African peasants - *ceddo* as Sembène's eponymous film imagined them to be. Unlike *Ceddo* however, *Camp* does evoke complicity - only to disavow its own oblique suggestions.

Camp de Thiaroye is a primarily realist film that portrays an historically identifiable past through the idiom of memory. It aims to commemorate the Thiaroye Massacre as an act of racist European violence and African suffering and resistance: its explicitly identified spatial and historical setting and its primarily realist formal conventions signal the intention to be received as a "transparent" representation of the past. However, the film's employment of memory allows it to position itself not simply as a representation, but as a form of resistant memory that can be assimilated into the viewer's own consciousness. The positioning of the film as "memory" and evocations of remembrance within the film faciliatate the film's disavowal of structural complicity and of the specific context of French colonial rule in the Cap Vert peninsula.

Camp tells the story of the developing "*ceddo* consciousness" of Thiaroye's *tirailleurs* in the face of colonial oppression. It condemns colonial rule in Africa by equating it with Nazi rule in Europe and it celebrates the Pan-African, proto-national solidarity of the soldiers. A black, masculine resistant collective presages and represents a national and pan-national resistant unity, in which sex and gender, like continental origin and race, are implicitly equated. A resistant African manhood is implicitly opposed to the never-portrayed realm of home and women. The most significant female figure, the protagonist's French wife, is absent: female characters are few and peripheral.[242]

The film has both a collective protagonist, the returned *tirailleurs*, and an individual protagonist, the NCO Sergent Diatta who is exceptional among the tirailleurs. He is the only African NCO and the film's only intellectual; both his education and his ease within French and Black Atlantic cultural landscapes signal a level of access far beyond what is available to the other *tirailleurs*. His French is flawless, unlike that of the other Africans; and he speaks impeccable English, unlike the French men. His (private) quarters contain his books and his phonograph, on which he listens to European classical music and Black American jazz. He plans to return to France to rejoin his French wife and their child, and to finish his studies and take his degree in law. Diatta's intellectual persona is also

[242] One of these is Diatta's cousin Bintoum, whom Diatta's uncle wants him to marry. Bintoum is Joola-speaking and almost silent; the most important of the few peripheral female characters, she is merely a foil to Diatta's far-away wife.

uniquely gendered amid the unambiguously heteronormative masculinity of the *tirailleurs*. Other soldiers perform heterosexuality when they hire a sex worker, recall a wife and children in the village, or compare the French language to a woman; Diatta does none of these things. Yet Diatta's gender and sexuality shed any suggestion of the complicity that often attaches to male femininity. The camera returns repeatedly to the portrait of his wife and daughter, as does the attention of a succession of characters who enter his quarters. He emerges fully as heteronormative subject during the scene in which he writes a letter to his wife. Thus a gender presentation that is exceptional within the world of the film is secured within the heterosexual family and the presentation of an almost chivalric French literary persona.

While, as a group, the film's *tirailleurs* occupy the position of an oppressed and resistant masculine African collective, Diatta occupies an intermediary position within the colonial military hierarchy and a potentially ambiguous position between the poles of Europe and Africa, oppression and resistance, and masculine and feminine. By virtue of his location within that hierarchy, he might embody structural complicity within the film. Yet despite his high military rank and access to high-status cultural knowledge, he is not an *originaire;* thus he does not occupy that particular structurally complicit position within colonial Senegal or within the colonial military hierarchy.[243] No suggestion of complicity adheres to Diatta either because of his structural position or his exceptional qualities. He commands the loyalty of his men, as well as the, often grudging, respect of French superior officers. As a figure of resistance, Diatta analogously commands the viewer's admiration: he embodies a specifically African resistant dignity and a black cosmopolitanism. He is an intellectual *résistant*, equally at ease amidst the cultural referents of France, Senegal, and Black America. Diatta's exceptionality receives a great deal of attention - only to be rendered political insignificant; it is never permitted to clearly evoke the complicity that would complicate the narrative colonial violence and black collective resistance. Ultimately, the massacre itself renders Diatta's potentially complicit exceptionality irrelevant: he dies in the same way as the other *tirailleurs*.

The film begins with the disembarking of the *tirailleurs* on November 21, 1944, in the port of Dakar. They march to the Thiaroye Camp, with the exception of those visibly injured soldiers who cannot, and who are transported by truck. Over the course of the film, as they wait to be paid and then to return to their homes, the *tirailleurs* become increasingly angry at the French military authorities. Because they do not receive the pay that they are owed and they are subject to demeaning day-to-day treatment,[244] they decide to organize collectively in order to effectively articulate their demands. When the General, who has been summoned to restore order, refuses to agree to their demands, the *tirailleurs* briefly take him hostage; they release him when he relents and promises that their metropolitan French francs will be exchanged at the correct rate, and implies that they will be paid the money that they are owed. They are never paid and their francs never exchanged; the following dawn, tanks surround the camp and kill the *tirailleurs*. The drama ends in a final wordless scene that follows the December 1 Massacre, in which *tirailleurs* are seen burying their massacred comrades in a

---

243 Within the film, this intermediary status is overtly racialized - beneath white French officers of the colonial army, but above African *tirailleurs*. Historically, almost all officers of the French colonial army were white.

244 The rations are poor and the *tirailleurs* are forced to exchange the uniforms that the U.S. army had provided (prior to their arrival in Dakar) for the racially marked uniform of the *tirailleur*. In a culminating act of injustice, the military insists that the *tirailleurs*' metropolitan French francs be exchanged for French African francs at a rate far below the actual rate.

mass grave. In this concluding memorial montage, scenes of a ship's departure for France on the morning of December 1st alternate with very short sequences from the film, each intratextually "recalling" a particular *tirailleur*.

Camp positions itself as memory in that silent montage that follows the scenes of massacre and burial. The montage implicates the viewer as a remembering subject and functions to help dissipate questions and hints of complicity that the scenes of massacre and burial might have provoked for the viewer ("Who killed the *tirailleurs*? Who are the men, seemingly *tirailleurs* as well, who are burying them?"). In this sentimental departure from the primarily realist mode of the film, the viewer is invited to recall the characters whom she has come "to know" over the course of the film. An entirely silent sequence of very short excerpts portrays *tirailleurs* in portrait-like close-ups: one speaks animatedly and soundlessly to the viewer, the portrait of Diatta's wife and child clearly visible behind him; in another, Diatta holds his cousin's small child. This silent sequence suggests a memorial after-life for the dead tirailleurs: "silenced" by death, they live on in memory. The version of the past that the film has "recalled" - and the *ceddo-tirailleurs* who populated that past - is to become part of the viewer's own memory.

This memory of colonial oppression and anti-colonial resistance is set in a narrowly circumscribed iteration of time and space. As the film's title suggests, it takes place almost entirely inside the camp, and on its (apparently uninhabited) outskirts. An long initial sequence of marching scenes, from port to camp, provides glimpses of the colonial city, but little of the route between the colonial city and the camp. The film's action takes place primarily within this small area surrounded by barbed wire: guard tower, outdoor space, and rows of newly-erected, windowless barracks. The barbed wire fence and the guard towers evoke Nazi concentration camps. While the architecture of the Thiaroye Camp connects it to Nazi camps, and the film will explicitly pursue this resemblance, the same architecture intensifies the impression of the camp's isolation from its African surroundings. The film represents little of the world beyond the camp and evokes little of the histories of the spaces that it does portray. The transit camp's apparently recent construction elide's the *Camp de Thiaroye*'s historical role as a transit camp for generations of *tirailleurs*. The film never depicts the village of Thiaroyes that, historically, existed in close proximity to the camp; nor are people from those villages portrayed.[245] There is no sense of the distances that separate an occasionally referenced "village"and the camp, between Dakar and the camp, or between the well-appointed rooms where French officers confer and the transit camp.

The film's depiction of an isolated camp faciliates the connections it makes between Nazism and colonialism and simultaneously disconnects the camp from the African space-times that surround it. As an abstracted space, rather than a situated place, the Camp facilitates the construction of dualistic notion of colonial rule. French, white, and citizen are equated, as are African, black, and subject. Nazism is parallel to colonialism; Buchenwald is identified with Thiaroye. Within the bounded world of the camp, meaningful differences between Africans are not represented: there is only a brotherhood of black African men (subject soldiers all), who, awakened to the consciousness of their common racial position, will struggle non-violently for their rights. *Originaire* colonial soldiers

[245] Two "Thiaroyes" historically existed in close proximity to the camp. "Thiaroye Gare" by the train station, immediately adjacent to the camp, and Thiaroye-Sur-Mer just to the south, beside the sea. The French military camp was constructed on land that had belonged to Thiaroye-Sur-Mer (in Wolof, "Caaroy Geej").

are not represented, and differences among the *tirailleurs* are ultimately unimportant. The returned soldiers reach a resistant consensus; and there appears to be little difference between their interests and those of the *tirailleurs* based in Thiaroye. The few *tirailleurs* who appear to be permanently based in Thiaroye, who ensure the camp's operation, warrant little attention; what attention they do receive does not detract from the portrayal of an ultimately unified resistance. In one scene, *tirailleurs* point their rifles at Diatta, as they are ordered to do, without firing. Near the conclusion of the film, when the struggle of the returned *tirailleurs* reaches its climax, and they briefly take over the camp, a *tirailleur* is easily and persuaded to abandon his post in a guard tower.[246]

Ironically, in light of the film's obvious Pan-Africanist commitments, the specificity of the African context, including the complicity of that context, is almost entirely elided. African complicity in colonial violence is most clearly obscured in the scene of the massacre itself, in which tanks fire upon the soldiers in the dark. While the viewer can recognize certain victims, the perpetrators of the massacre are entirely hidden from view: the scene entirely elides the historical role of *tirailleurs* in carrying out the massacre.[247] However, the film also elides the complicity that inhered in the structure of colonial rule, a complicity defined by position rather than act.

On several occasions the film almost-attends to the particular complicity that inhered in the position of the black colonial soldier. In these scenes, structural complicity is "almost-present," only to be disavowed. These disavowed suggestions of African complicity attach to the protagonist Diatta, as we have seen, as well as to the mute soldier, Pays. These suggestions (and their disavowals) appear most clearly when the film exits the spatial and temporal confines in which most of the drama takes place, whether through remembrance or through a physical departure from the Camp. In the first scene I analyze, Diatta leaves the Camp to go to Dakar; in the second scene, on the "uninhabited" margins of the camp, Diatta recalls a colonial massacre, and in the final scene I examine, Pays, and the film with him, "remember" Buchenwald.

Structural complicity is evoked, only to vanish just as quickly, when Diatta, and the film with him, leaves the camp and goes to Dakar. There he is assaulted and captured by four American soldiers, led by a Black American, who mistake him for a delinquent fellow American soldier. They beat him and take him by force to an their base.[248] The scene of Diatta's "kidnapping" produces the film's only suggestion that black people might have genuinely different interests because they occupy different positions within white-dominated structures. However, the suggestion of difference and inequality is mitigated by the viewer's knowledge that their encounter is the result of the American soldiers' genuine mistake, and by the fact that the positions of the two black soldiers are more analogous than divergent. They are not black soldiers occupying different positions within a single racialized hierarchy – rather, each is a black ranking soldier within a white supremacist military. The

---

246 My interpretation of the significance of these scenes for the film's political vision differs markedly from that of Sabrina Parent, who interprets them as evidence of a nuanced vision of oppression and resistance: See Parent, *Cultural Representations of Massacre*, 104-7.

247 Kenneth Harrow and Debarati Sanyal have discussed this point. See Kenneth Harrow, "*Camp de Thiaroye*: Who's That Hiding in those Tanks and How Come We Can't See Their Faces?" *IRIS,* no. 18 (1995): 147-52; and Debarati Sanyal, *Memory and Complicity*, 141-142.

248 On the second occasion that the drama exits the camp, a spontaneous "commando" of loyal *tirailleurs* goes to Dakar to avenge Diatta's "kidnapping" and to compel his return by taking a white American soldier hostage.

violence of the Black American soldier towards Diatta thus functions to disavow the violence inherent to the complicit position of a black soldier within the French colonial army. The only scene of violence between black people is not the violence that a structurally complicit position demands. There is no scene in which a black colonial soldier, *originaire* or *tirailleur*, harms another black soldier because he is obligated to carry out the orders of the colonial army. Rather, Diatta is briefly subject to the violence of a black soldier who is not West African; and that violence is a result of misrecognition.

Any lingering suggestion of structural complicity vanishes when the Black American soldier comes personally to the Camp to apologize to Diatta; their conversation renders inconsequential the violence of their previous encounter and the difference in their respective positions. Diatta welcomes the American into his private quarters, accepts his apology, and impresses the American soldier with his English and his easy familiarity with Diasporic black culture. "Langston Hughes, Paul Lawrence Dunbar, Marcus Garvey," Diatta recites as proof of his knowledge. When he learns that the American is from Detroit, he plays him a Charlie Parker song on his phonograph. A recognition of their shared position as black soldiers in white-dominated armies establishes their bond; but that bond is solidified through Diatta's allusion to a series of shared black cultural referents from the U.S. and the Caribbean. Diatta's cultural fluency and the quick ease of the rapport between them suggests more than a contingent shared racialized position; rather, Diatta's knowledge of New World black cultural expression confirms the common experience of blackness that the two men have established.

The film's dichotomous vision of colonial violence, as well as Diatta's own resistant stance, emerge clearly in the parallel that Diatta makes between Nazi (SS) violence and the violence of the French colonial army in Senegal. In his last substantive conversation before his death, Diatta speaks with his friend, the white French Captain Raymond, in the uninhabited space, dotted with baobabs, that surrounds the transit camp. Raymond asks Diatta why he does not acquire French nationality, since after all he is educated, to which Diatta replies: "La nationalité française, non merci. Je reste africain et je garde mon instruction" (French nationality - no, thank you. I will remain African and I will keep my education). To be an African French citizen, Diatta implies, is to be not-African. Diatta's statement of his African identity, and the implicit denial of African structural complicity in colonial rule, precedes the parallel he makes between a Nazi massacre and a colonial massacre. In response to Raymond's subsequent question about his future plans, Diatta explains that the colonial army destroyed his village, Effok, when the village women opposed the colonial army's requisition of rice for the war effort; he will visit the ruins of the village before returning to France. Raymond offers his condolences for the deaths of Diatta's parents, and then distances the French colonial army of the present from the Vichyste army that destroyed Effok, suggesting with a reference to the Conference of Brazzaville[249] that Free France is just:

---

[249] The Conference of Brazzaville (February, 1944) was convened by the French Committee of National Liberation to determine the future of the colonies within the post-war Empire. In the opening speech, De Gaulle declared that it was the role of France to help the people of all the territories become capable of participating in the management of their own affairs ("jusqu'au niveau où ils seront capables de participer chez eux à la gestion de leurs propres affaires. C'est le devoir de la France de faire en sorte qu'il en soit ainsi"). Although autonomous self-governance was never alluded to, the Conference was seen by some as a sign of progress. Raymond seems to be evoking the Conference in this spirit of Republican optimisim.

> Raymond : 1942 - C'était encore les vichystes. Les temps changent, les mentalités également. Vous avez suivi la conférence de Brazzaville?
> Diatta : Il me sera difficile d'oublier. Voyez vous, je fais un parallel entre Effok et Oradour-Sur-Glane.
> Raymond: Ah, vous ne pouvez pas faire une telle comparaison. On ne peut pas comparer la barbarie Nazi aux exactions de l'armée française. Ce n'est pas possible.
>
> Raymond: 1942 - It was still the Vichystes then. Times change, attitudes also change. You followed the Conference of Brazzaville?
> Diatta: It will be difficult for me to forget. You see, I see a parallel between Effok and Oradour-Sur-Glane.
> Raymond: Oh, you cannot make that kind of comparison. You cannot compare Nazi barbarity with the exactions of the French Army. It's not possible.

Diatta's memory leads him to produces the parallel between the colonial atrocity of Effok and the Nazi atrocity of Oradour-Sur-Glane, which also functions as one of the film's clearest verbal indictments of colonialism. The massacre of the French villagers of Oradour in June 1944, by the Waffen SS, is equivalent to the massacre of the African villagers of Effok in 1942, by the French colonial army; Nazism and colonialism are analogous. With his reference to Brazzaville, Raymond means to draw Diatta into an optimistic view of an egalitarian French African future. However, Diatta does not recall Brazzaville, symbol of reformulated French Empire, but instead the massacre of Effok. Recall produces a parallel between Nazi violence and French colonial violence that voids both forms of violence of the complicities that were intrinsic to them. In the final act of remembrance and disavowal of complicity that I will examine, a memory of Nazi genocide and Buchenwald leads the film to exit not only the camp but also the African continent, the temporal frame of the film's primary drama, and the realist mode that otherwise governs the film. On this occasion, Pays' traumatic memories of internment in Nazi concentration camps function to visually merge the *Camp de Thiaroye* with a Nazi concentration camp.

Pays' name refers to the "country" or homeland of Africa; and, in his mute and traumatized condition, he appears as an African victim, not only of French colonial conscription, but of the German camps where many of these former POWs had been interned. Yet, complicity adheres to Pays because he will not part with his SS helmet and coat. The helmet and coat are presumably artifacts of his experience in Nazi concentration camps, but the viewer learns nothing of how Pays came to possess these objects nor of the source of his intense attachment to them. His memory of Nazi violence dissipates the complicity that his attachment to the SS helmet evokes, and that complicity vanishes completely when the viewer comes to understand that his traumatized recollection was provoked by present-day fact: the real equivalence of Thiaroye and Buchenwald.

Early on in the film, an hallucinatory remembrance is initiated with Pays' gaze, and that of the camera, at a guard tower of the Thiaroye Camp. Pays appears to believe, at this moment, that he is interned again in a Nazi camp; in the subsequent shot, the camera makes the same identification

---

For the text of De Gaulle's speech, see http://mjp.univperp.fr/textes/degaulle30011944.htm.

between the French colonial military camp and the Nazi concentration camp, as the guard tower of one merges into the guard tower of the other. The complete intrusion of the Nazi camp into the film, and of the memory of the camp into Pays' consciousness, begins in the subsequent shot: a profile of Pays' helmeted head and in the background, the guard tower. This image merges with an image of the head of a helmeted white soldier, with a guard tower behind him. Three stills follow in sequence, accompanied by the sounds of automatic rifle fire. The first and second depict a corpse splayed against a barbed wire fence. The last image portrays two corpses on the ground beside a barbed wire fence.[250]

In one of the film's very final scenes, immediately before the massacre itself, Pays' seeming delusions are proven to be a premonition grounded in an accurate grasp of historical connections. With the massacre of the *tirailleurs*, Pays' understanding of the connection between colonial transit camp and concentration camp is the understanding of the film itself. As Pays stands self-appointed night watch in a guard tower, an image of a concentration camp at night briefly fills the screen; one can make out a guard tower and a barbed wire fence below. From the tower, Pays is the only soldier to witness the arrival of the French tanks in the dark. He rushes down, wakes the others, and gesticulates and makes his wordless sounds in an effort to communicate the imminent danger. Diatta is the last to wake and join those who have gathered outside around the frantic Pays. In his efforts to mime and narrate that the French/Nazis are coming to kills them, Pays takes off his helmet and seems to mime the arrival of the French tanks, using his SS helmet to represent the tanks. Pays and the previously ambiguous SS helmet have become univocal symbols: Pays is an African victim with an almost prophetic grasp of history and racial oppression, and the SS helmet represents fascist perpetratrators, be they French or German.

Pays' efforts are to no avail; his comrades understand that he is referring to Germans, but there are no Germans present: they return to their barracks. The music of Buchenwald is the same as the music of the colonial camp massacre; the film seems to concur with Pays: the guard towers of one may as well be the guard towers of the other, the barbed wire fence of one camp is the barbed wire fence of another. Through the visual merging of Buchenwald and the Thiaroye Camp, and the verbal parallel between Effok and Oradour-Sur-Glane, the film suggests a parallel between two racist systems and reinforces its condemnation of colonial racism. It evacuates structural complicity from its portrayal of colonial oppression and negates whatever suggestion of complicity had hovered around the wordless Pays wearing his SS helmet.[251]

While the film brings colonial violence into close, even identificatory, proximity with Nazism in Europe, it portrays the massacre in isolation from important elements of its African colonial context. Unlike other African texts that have brought together Nazism and colonialism,[252] *Camp*

---

[250] All three documentary images are stills from Alain Resnais' documentary film, *Night and Fog* (1955). The first two photographs are in Mauthausen; the third is from Buchenwald. See Sanyal, *Memory and Complicity*, 137-9.

[251] In Sanyal's analysis, Pays' complicity complicates the dichomotomy of perpetration and victimhood that is epitomized by the elision of African perpetrators in the scenes of massacre: "such polarities are complicated by the very figure of Pays, who is at once witness, victim, and embodiment of the kind of complicity I have sought to trace in its various post-war articulations." *Memory and Complicity*, 175-6. While I read the "accuracy" of Pays' memory as the final disavowal of the the complicity that has unstably adhered to him, Sanyal understands Pays to remain a figure of complicity.

[252] Among these texts I would include Sembène's own earlier film *Emitaï* (Senegal, Filmi Doomi Reew, 1971) that

suggests an equivalence between the logic and methods of two discreet European projects.[253] By centering its narrative upon the Camp, and representing the Camp as disconnected from surrounding African communities (but closely associated with the death camps of Nazi Europe), the film easily elides the structural complicities that characterized colonial Senegal. By never entering Thiaroye village, the film need not reckon with the possibility of politically significant differences between subject *tiralleurs* and the French citizens of the Cap Vert peninsula.[254] When the film does exit the Camp - in Diatta's ill-fated outing to Dakar, in his verbal recollection of Effok and Oradour-sur-Glane, and in the portrayal of Pays' memory of Buchenwald - complicity is evoked only to be disavowed. These "excursions" do not locate the film within a complex colonial context in which Africans occupy distinct political positions, include those of complicity. Rather, Pays' hallucinatory memories equate one European racist evil with another; Diatta constructs a verbal parallel between them; and the violent encounter between the American soldier and Diatta signifies a shared resistant Pan-African position.

Complex moments, in which complicity is clearly evoked, are made to signify unitary meanings. Pays' memory is accurate - one form of racial oppression is another - and Pays himself is the *pays* of Africa itself, a figure of suffering and resistance rather than the figure of complicity that his SS helmet so vividly evoked. *Camp de Thiaroye* produces a vision of Pan-African unity and external oppression that obscures the complexity of a colonial situation, and elides and disavows the complicit positions that were inherent to the Massacre and to the African colonial context that produced it. Through the verbal parallel that Diatta constructs, and through Pays' identification of the camps of Buchenwald and Thiaroye, *Camp* "remembers" the Massacre as an event of French colonialism, produced through the same methods and racial logic as the Nazi genocide. The parallel with the Holocaust also simplifies the violence of the Holocaust; as if Nazi occupation and genocide involved only two kinds of actors: perpetrators and victims.

Rather than celebrate a foundational act of anti-colonial resistance from within the idiom of memory, Boubacar Boris Diop's play provokes questions about the form of resistance appropriate to colonial and neocolonial oppression.[255] The *tirailleurs* of *Thiaroye terre rouge* do not resemble Sembène's "*ceddo tirailleurs*." The play neither portrays a unified African collective nor unequivocally celebrates resistance; there are no unambiguous heroes, and the past is not securely past. Rather than celebrate the posture of *siggi*, the play provokes questions about resistance and African complicity.

Naman, the revolutionary protagonist, is *debout*. He repeatedly stands up to oppression, and verbally asserts that he is *debout*. He also identifies the Thiaroye Camp with multiple places of oppression and resistance. However, the play celebrates neither Naman's *siggi* stance nor his revolutionary metaphors and metonyms without ambivalence. The Thiaroye revolt that Naman leads appears more supported

---

focuses on the events in Effok; Césaire's *Discours sur le colonialisme* (1950); as well as Richard Rive's "Riva" (1983), a story that, as I have argued, suggests more oblique connections between two systems and histories.

253 AOF was under Vichy rule between 1940 and 1942. The French colonial project in West Africa during that period was itself a Nazi project; and, in 1944, important figures still remained in power from the time of Vichy rule.

254 The film briefly acknowledges the different status of *tirailleurs* and *originaire* colonial soldiers, but no *originaire* soldiers seem to be represented.

255 Boubacar Boris Diop, *Thiaroye terre rouge* in *Le temps de Tamango, suivi de "Thiaroye terre rouge"* (Paris: Harmattan, 1981), 147-203. The play has not been published with subsequent editions of the novel, nor has it been published elsewhere to my knowledge.

by mystical rhetoric than by strategic planning; its failures are, the play implies, due not only to the brutal colonial repression that African collaboration made possible, but also to Naman's flawed vision.

The central figure of African complicity, on the other hand, appears lucid and makes no equations between disparate times and places. Bachir, occupies the same position within the colonial military structure as Sembène's Diatta. Bachir is an NCO; he ranks above the other *tirailleurs* of the film and below the white French military personnel. Whereas Diatta's exceptionality is exclusively positive and does not originate in his structural location, Bachir's intermediary position within the colonial military hierarchy makes him the primary figure of African complicity. Bachir does not perform the literal or figurative posture of *siggi*. His bodily expression is very different from that of masculine resistance; he rushes, faints, falls, and gestures "burlesquely." Unlike Naman, Bachir is neither *debout* nor a poet, but he exhibits an accurate and pragmatic understanding of the colonial situation and his position within it.

Thiaroye terre rouge protrays the Massacre as an event of African complicity that is not securely contained in the colonial past. In Diop's rendition of the massacre, the *tirailleurs* plan a revolt together with the villagers of Thiaroye; their armed uprising is violently repressed by the *tirailleurs* whom Bachir has recruited beforehand for specifically that role.[256] While Naman identifies colonized Africa with Nazi camps, the play itself most consistently draws together an African colonial past with a Senegalese postcolonial present. Through the surreal collapsing of times and subject positions one upon another, the play suggests that Senghorian Negritude and colonialism are politically and historically indistinguishable; as if Negritude had been an integral element of French hegemony since the colonial period. *Thiaroye terre rouge* merges the ostensibly distinct spaces of military and civilian life, and the ostensibly separate time periods of colonial racial ideology and postcolonial Negritude. It thus diverges from both the conventions of realism and the notion that colonial violence can be narrated as a story of perpetrators and resistors that is located firmly in the past.

The first and longest "tableau" of *Thiaroye terre rouge* is set in an African village in 1940. Resistance to colonial conscription and a retaliatory massacre, carried out by Africans in service of colonial interests, presage the unsuccesful resistance and subsequent massacre of Thiaroye. In both massacres, Diop's play makes clear, structurally complicit Africans played essential roles. The play begins with an exchange in the village meeting-place that establishes two of the play's central concerns: ambivalence regarding the form and possibility of anti-colonial resistance and an unambivalent critique of Senghorian Negritude. In the first line, an anonymous villager announces: "Rien à manger et cette pluie qui ne vient jamais !" (Nothing to eat, and then there is this rain that never comes). A second villager says that it has always been so, but the third villager disagrees; hunger is a colonial phenomenon: "Non, seulement depuis que les Européens sont venu dans notre pays..." (No, it's only been this way since the Europeans have come to our country...) (147). One views suffering as eternal and to be endured; the other sees it as historically produced - and history must be changed. The anonymity of village and villagers, and the conflict between two conceptions

[256] In Sembène's film, the *tirailleurs* peacefully organize to advocate for their rights, and while they spontaneously and briefly take hostage the French general, they do not harm him. They are not organizing armed resistance. They are killed at night, as they sleep in their barracks or are attempting to flee.

of oppression, suggest we read this as allegory: this is any African village, and the debate one which precedes resistance anywhere.

The critique of Senghorian Negritude first emerges when the villagers complain that the local colonial *Commandant*, Palissot, adores *la musique nègre*. He forces villagers to sing and dance for him; and then writes successful books about it. Colonial ethnography, and a discourse of cultural difference (and convergence) were central to Senghor's Negritude. The conjuncture of Palissot's administrative role and his ethnographic sideline implies a parallel between Palissot and Senghor, and initiates the play's critique of Senghor's intertwined political and cultural projects. The critique becomes explicit when the fatalistic villager begins, "Nous, les Nègres …," (We *Nègres*...) but another interrupts:

> Nous ne sommes pas des Nègres ! Qu'est-ce qu'un Nègre ? Où rencontre-t-on cet animal? Vous savez : nous sommes des esclaves [...] Nous sommes de la race mauvaise des esclaves qui, le soir, au sortir des champs du maitre, va hurler au son du tam-tam au lieu de conspirer contre le maitre !
>
> [We are not *Nègres*! What is a *Nègre*? Where would one encounter such a creature? You know it - we are slaves [...] We are of the damned race of slaves who, at night, having left the master's fields, instead of conspiring against the master, goes to shout to the beat of the *tam-tam*!] (148)

The play exits the historical, allegorical village in order to echo contemporary Senegalese Leftist critiques of Negritude and to identify enslavement with African identity, as Senghorian Negritude conceives it. In making that identification, it equates very different conditions – enslavement, a lack of dignity, and the absence of national liberation. It thus suggests both that an Africa free of colonial oppression should be figured as a *gor* collective and that slaves (*jaam*) lack the dignity of authentic resistant subjects.

When Naman enters the scene, he provokes the villagers' commitment to anti-colonial resistance, and makes the play's critique of the postcolonial poet-president more explicit. He announces the death of his son from starvation; resistance is necessary. Galvanized by Naman, the three other men commit themselves to anti-colonial struggle. That commitment is immediately tested when the griot announces the imminent arrival of the chief, Makhary, who enters in the company of Dièye - a caricature of an aspiring member of the colonial elite. Makhary announces the German invasion of France in terms so faithful to propaganda that they are farcical:

> Vous savez tous que notre chère Patrie, la France, est en guerre [...] L'Allemagne a violé nos frontières et sur notre territoire, à Paris et à Strasbourg, ses hordes barbares pillent, volent et tuent! Qui n'a senti son coeur serrer içi, parmi les habitants de Sanankoro ? Est-il une nouvelle plus boulversante ? Non seulement parce que Strasbourg et Paris sont une partie de nous-mêmes, de notre âme, mais parce que nous devons notre magnifique prosperité à ce pays qui nous a adoptés et qui maintenant se confond absolument avec nous dans la plus absolue fraternité.

> [You all know that our precious Patria, France, is at war [...] Germany has violated our borders and our territory, in Paris and in Strasbourg, its barbarian hordes are looting, stealing, and killing. Who among the inhabitants of Sanankoro has not felt his heart contract? Could any news be more disturbing? Not only because Strasbourg and Paris are a part of ourselves, a part of our very soul, but because we owe our wonderful prosperity to the country that has adopted us and now intermingles so absolutely with us in the most absolute brotherhood.] (152)

The ventriloquy of French propaganda exposes the contradictory metaphors of the imperial French family: Africa is a part of France despite its distance from it; Africa is both inferior and equal to France, both the grateful adopted child of the *Patrie* and the sibling who enjoys egalitarian bonds of brotherhood with France. When the order is given that men should report for duty the following day, Naman rejects the notion that France and Africa are one and emerges clearly as the upright resistant protagonist by asking Makhary about the exact location of "Strasbourg, that part of ourselves." On the chief's behalf, Dièye begins a rote recital of textbook facts: "Strasbourg capitale de l'Alsace, chef-lieu du Département du Bas-Rhin, port fluvial et centre industriel [...]" (Strasbourg, captial of Alsace, administrative center of the Department of Bas-Rhin, a river port and industrial center [...]) Naman interrupts to provide a different definition of Strasbourg: "un tombeau, un vaste tombeau et nous tous dedans" (a tomb, a vast tomb and we are all inside it) (153). When the chief, in response, orders him to fall to the ground: "Fils d'esclave" (Son of a slave), Naman replies, "Je suis debout. Pour toujours" (I am upright. For always). The Second Villager echoes Naman's self-assertion in the same terms of *siggi*: "Moi aussi. Me voilà debout" (So am I. Here I am, standing upright) (153). The Third Villager declares that "we" will never again submit to a foreigner's laws. As a collective, the villagers begin to shout at Makhary and Dièye - "death to the traitors" - and chase the two men from the village meeting place (154).

In the subsequent scene, Makhary and Dièye attempt to convince the colonial Commandant Palissot that the village is not genuinely resisting conscription; solely Naman is to blame (157). Palissot's response furthers the identifications that the play has initiated between French colonial violence and Senghorian Negritude, and between colonial and postcolonial regimes. As if referring to the notion of African tradition so present in Senghor's poetry, Palissot dismisses yet another "couplet about the ancestors," and in the next breath, praises French efforts to civilize Africans. Makhary and Dièye repeatedly attempt to suggest that they try again to verbally persuade the villagers of the importance of the war effort, but Palissot continues with his rendition of the virtues of African conscription, a rendition that culminates in his order to kill all the villagers who will not be conscripted:

> PALISSOT. — (Qui ne les écoute pas.) Sans compter qu'ils pourront voir du pays... C'est ça le métissage culturel... L'important c'est qu'ils prennent contact avec une vraie civilisation...
> MAKHARY. — Pourquoi ne pas expliquer...
> PALISSOT. — II n'y a rien à expliquer! J'ai decidé : 1) que demain, à l'aube, tous les hommes valides de Sanankoro seront au point de ramassage qui leur avait été fixé; 2) que tous les moyens seront mis en ceuvre à cette fin; 3) Exécution immédiate.
> *(Ils s'en vont. Le sergent Palissot les rappelle; Ils se retournent.)* Tuez seulement les femmes, les enfants et les vieillards. La France immortelle a besoin des soldats. *(Ils font signe que oui,*

puis disparaissent.)

> [Palissot: And that's without even considering that they will be able to see the country... That is true cultural *métissage* ... The important thing is that they would have contact with a genuine civilization ...
> Makhary: Why not explain ...
> Palissot: There's nothing to explain! I have decided: one, that at dawn tomorrow all able-bodied men will be at the assembly point that has been established; two, that all resources will be mobilized to this end; and three, immediate exection [of this order]. *(They* [Makhary and Dièye] *leave. Sergent Palissot recalls them; they turn.)* Kill only the women, children and elderly people. Immortal France needs soldiers. *(They indicate their agreement, and depart).*] (158-159)

From the rhetoric of African particularity, with special praise reserved for cultural *métissage*, Palissot proceeds seamlessly to his orders to kill. Stage directions indicate that sounds of shooting begin immediately after Palissot's declaration. The sequence suggests that the forms and concepts dear to Senghor's Negritude - poems and ancestors, *métissage* and *civilisation* - are implicated in almost genocidal violence. The final scene is a silent still-life of massacre, into which a bloodied elder enters, and explains to the audience that Sanankoro no longer exists because Palissot turned another African people against it. Directed by Dièye and Makhary, other Africans took away Sanankoro's men in chains and then killed the remaining villagers. As Africans carried out the massacre of Sanankoro, they will carry out the massacre of Thiaroye.

The remainder of the play is set in November 1944, in the camp and village of Thiaroye. As he had done four years before, Naman will articulate a clear stance of anti-colonial resistance and lead an unsuccessful resistance effort. The structural complicity of Africans will again prove crucial to colonial repression: as Makhary and Dièye managed the massacre of Sanankoro for Palissot, Bachir will organize the massacre of Thiaroye for the General Modisano. Sanankoro and Thiaroye are parallel locations of anti-colonial resistance, African complicity, and colonial massacre. Yet that parallel also partially collapses in the complete identifications that Naman makes between Sanankoro and Thiaroye, colonial camp and Nazi camp, African village and Nazi camp. While African complicity is key in the two African locations in which the play is actually set, a dichotomous vision of pure racialized oppression and pure racial resistance emerges in the identifications of Nazism and colonialism. The play does not evoke the Nazi camp as a space of complicity in the way that it portrays complicity as endemic to the life of the African camp (and the African village).

In a partial echo of the inception of the first tableau, the second tableau opens with an exchange about oppression and the possibility of resistance. It is now 1944, and three *tirailleurs* are talking in the outdoor space of the *Camp de Thiaroye*. One *tirailleur* pursues the comparison between colonial oppression and slavery:"Jamais tant d'esclaves ne sont morts au service de leur maitre..."(Never have so many slaves died in service of their master) (163). Another is less convinced that successful resistance is possible. As in Sanankoro, once Naman enters the scene, his revolutionary determination pushes the others towards a commitment to struggle.

Stage directions make clear the racial logic that governs the camp and suggest the proximity of the

colonial transit camp to the concentration camp: "Au fond, on aperçoit des barbelés. Un soldat est en faction sous l'écriteau : « Nul n'entre içi s'il n'est Blanc.»" (In the background, barbed wire fence is visible. A soldier is manacled beneath the sign: "No entrance to non-whites") (161). With Naman's arrival, a relationship between Nazi camp and colonial camp becomes explicit; he introduces himself: he is from Sanankoro, he spent three years in Dachau and Buchenwald - and now it is Thiaroye, "another concentration camp." His statement is no exaggeration, he says: a concentration camp is anywhere that more than two whites gather. A favorite pastime of the white military personnel, it emerges, is to order the villagers of Thiaroye to sing and dance. This piece of information echoes the ethnographic proclivities of Palissot, and the figure of Senghor that Palissot is to evoke; but it also evokes the coerced performances of music and dance by Nazi concentration camp inmates.

The four soon agree to armed struggle; having fought for whites, they are now ready to fight the "true war," the struggle for their own freedom. In response to the reluctance of one, who says he himself is not from Thiaroye but from a village in Côte d'Ivoire, Naman interrupts that such a distinction does not matter: "Nous sommes tous de tous les villages suppliciés d'Afrique" (We are all from all the tortured villages of Africa) (162). At the end of the scene, Naman puts together two places - space-times - of resistance. He declares that he is, while in Thiaroye in the present, "upright" in Sanakoro: "Je suis debout au centre de Sanankoro qui n'existe plus mais qui se reinstalle dans les plus profondes fibres du plus profond de mon corps" (I am standing upright in the center of Sanankoro, which no longer exists but which has again occupied the deepest fibres of my body) (164). The themes of the conversation resemble those of the play's opening exchange, but the spaces and temporalities have multiplied and merged into one another: pasts and presents, African village, African camp, Naman's body, Senghor's Senegal, and Nazi camp.

A conversation between Naman and a Thiaroye village elder will further the revolutionary identifications that Naman has established between seemingly distant situations and places: between Sanankoro and Thiaroye; between one African village and all African villages; and between the ostensibly discreet spaces of village, camp, and cemetery. The elder asks Naman where the children of Thiaroye are; Naman replies, in apparent reference to African soldiers awaiting repatriation, that they are imprisoned in camps where they do nothing: "Ils meurent chaque jour" (Each day they die) (172). When the elder says that Thiaroye, each day, dies a little more, Naman concludes: "Tous les villages d'Afrique... Un immense cimetière" (All the villages of Africa ... an immense cemetery) (172). Village and camp are indistinguishable - both are equally places of racialized imprisonment and death. African sons die daily in camps in Europe; African villages are also camps; Africa is one vast cemetery. The exchange between the two men - one a *tirailleur*, one the elder who will soon become his Naman's in-law - makes clear the equation between camp and continent that will produce revolutionary unity. The villagers of Thiaroye will join with the *tirailleurs* of the camp in an armed uprising. The uprising will fail, and thus perhaps confirm Naman's notion that all the villages (and camps) are a single immense cemetery. The failure, however, also might suggest that Naman's notion of "debout" resistance and the identification he makes between camp and village are inadequate to the complexity of colonial oppression.

The entrance of Bachir, "an African non-commissioned officer in the pay of the colonizer" who announces the soldiers' scheduled departure from the camp, allows the *tirailleurs* to articulate a stance

of *siggi* resistance, but it also complicates the resistant equation between Nazi camp and colonial camp. In a barely veiled threat, one of the men warns Bachir about the barbed wire that separates them; Bachir has, he says, the thin skin of traitors. Bachir appears astonished: he has no idea what barbed wire is being referred to, it seems. His response seems to suggest that either he does not see the barbed wire fence, or he has a very different understanding of its significance: while the *tirailleurs* understand Thiaroye to be a concentration camp, and understand Bachir to be an enemy, Bachir seems to see only a colonial transit camp and the relative importance of his position within it. In response to the increasingly overt rebelliousness of the tirailleurs, Bachir orders them to stand at attention: "Debout." No one moves; the same *tirailleur* threatens Bachir: "Gare à toi et à ceux de ton espèce si nous nous levons !" (You and your kind: Beware when we do rise!) (165). Finally, Naman orders Bachir, his superior, to relay a message to his own (white) superiors: the *tirailleurs* will not leave before receiving the money that they are owed (170).

Naman understands colonialism through a series of equations between radically different things and places, and between the singularity of the particular and the totality of all. His metaphors collapse space and time, and render particularity irrelevant. Strasbourg is a tomb; Sanankoro is Thiaroye; the *Camp de Thiaroye* is a concentration camp; African village and camp are one and the same; Africa is a cemetery. The complicit Bachir, on the other hand, demonstrates a pragmatic grasp of one particular colonial situation and his place within it. On one occaison in which Bachir parrots French propaganda, the General tells him that he is a piece of garbage; no, he is a garbage bin which has been given arms and legs. Bachir responds that he is a garbage bin who eats well (181). When the General dismisses him from his office, Bachir turns in the doorway to add that, while he may be garbage, he is garbage that is essential to the colonial project: "Je suis une ordure nécessaire à la colonisation, mon Général !" (181). This appears to be a messages of the play itself: African collaboration is essential to colonial (and neocolonial) projects. Bachir's articulation of a crucial piece of the play's own critique of colonialism casts him as a figure, who, unlike Naman, possesses an accurate awareness of his own position within a colonial situation.

On one of the few occasions in which memory appears explicitly, it echoes the ways in which competing nationalisms constructed collective memory in Senghor's Senegal: Naman and Bachir each invoke African resistance in service of different political purposes. When the *tirailleurs* again demand their pay from the colonial army, Bachir suggests that their material greed is a betrayal of their ancestors. Like Senghor's state and the colonial state before it, Bachir evokes a lineage of African warrior-resistors: "Vous allez me faire croire que vous êtes sans idéal, que seul l'argent vous intéresse. Pourtant vos ancêtres, Samory, Lat-Dior, Béhanzin ont toujours fait preuve du plus total esprit de sacrifice" (It would seem that you are without ideals, that only money interests you. But your ancestors, Samory, Lat-Dior, Béhanzin always demonstrated the greatest possible spirit of sacrifice) (183). Naman, in turn, warns Bachir not to "remind" them of Samory's spirit of sacrifice; not to remind them that struggle is possible. He calls upon the "memory" of the same figures to summon the possibility of armed resistance in the present:

> Mes frères, souvenez vous de Béhanzin, de Samory, de Lat-Dior... Le temps est venu de l'amour, celui de la mort enfin des oppresseurs... Les fusils éclatent. Mille soleils. Et soudain un éclat de rire infini dans toutes les cases de l'Afrique.

> [My brothers, remember Béhanzin, Samory, Lat Dior ... The time of love has arrived, at last - the time of death to the oppressors ... Guns fire. A thousand suns. And suddenly the ringing out of infinite laughter in all the huts of Africa.] (185)

Bachir dismisses Naman as insane; his "beau discours" (artful speech) is removed from reality (185). The reader, too, might doubt Naman's leadership and wonder about the relationship between reality and his surreal vision of future liberation. The series of images appears closer to mystical prophecy than to political program: love flows into death; there are one thousand suns. Naman's political commitment is beyond reproach, but his vision may be that of the mystic-poet, who heralds a time of "one thousand suns," rather than that of an astute political actor. While the play condemns Bachir's enthusiastic collaboration, it does not dismiss Bachir's assessment of the colonial project, and of his and Naman's respective positions within it.

Thiaroye terre rouge indicts Senghor's political leadership and Negritude philosophy by associating them with the colonial regime which produced not only the Thiaroye Massacre, but also untold other African massacres, like that of "Sanankoro." The play is more ambivalent, however, in its assessment of resistance. While it clearly condemns the colonial and neo-colonial, it does so in part through the assessments and experiences of the unreliable poet-mystic Naman. It is the complicit Bachir who produces some of the most accurate statements about the present. The play might celebrate resistance; but it depicts two failed acts of resistance, and nowhere suggests that the *tirailleurs* of Thiaroye present a model of revolutionary action. Naman is a visionary, but perhaps also deluded. Bachir's understanding of the violence of the colonial project, and his role within it, is accurate; his lucidity is, at moments, the lucidity of the play itself.

It is an unidentified *tirailleur* "Traitor," and not the structurally complicit African intermediary, Bachir, who receives the full weight of the play's unambivalent condemnation. Senghor is the allegorical counterpart to the unnamed "Traitor;" his state and his Negritude are the primary objects of the play's critique. In the scene that precedes the Thiaroye massacre itself, the "Traitor" enters the General's office; we cannot see his face because he wears a mask, "the kind sold to tourists"(192). The Traitor reports in detail upon the resistance meeting held in Thiaroye village the previous night. When the General hears that the rebels had said nothing about the money that they are owed, he tells the Traitor to lift his mask, saying, "We need men like you": unlike the principled rebels for whom money is not a motive, the Traitor can be bought. Turning his back to the audience, the Traitor raises his mask as instructed. The General slaps his face; then asks if he likes to be slapped. The Traitor replies that he is "a man of dialogue." The General explains that such a man of dialogue is exactly what the French need, and that, with luck, the Traitor will one day be head of state. The General slaps him a final time, and orders him to leave (193). When the traitor lowers his mask and turns to go, the General stops him in the doorway to offer advice: "Tu sais, mon garçon, il ne faut jamaias enlever ton masque. Il symbolise les valeurs de civilisation négro-africaines. Nous en aurons peut-être besoin un jour pour régner" (You know, my boy, you must never lift your mask. It symbolizes the values of negro-african civilization. One day, perhaps, we will need them to rule) (193). The General has identified the traitor for possible future employment: like colonial France, postcolonial France will need its puppets and their masks. The traitor exits; the General shouts for Bachir, demanding that he immediately find a pretext to justify shooting all the *tirailleurs*.

The structurally complicit Bachir is not *debout*, like Naman, nor does he embody the submissive masochism of the Traitor. The overwrought, obsequious, and effeminite quality of Bachir's bodily and verbal performance signals his complicit stance. He races to his master's office in his enthusiasm to report on the *tirailleurs*; he looks for the General "de façon burlesque," subsequently he cries out for the General "burlesquement." Once, in his excitement, he falls onto his General's table. When he and the General hear a commotion outside, Bachir faints from fear: perhaps it is the *tirailleurs* attacking. Upon hearing from the General that the twenty-three *tirailleurs* he has recruited will carry out the massacre, Bachir thanks the Lord and asks for permission to personally, very slowly, strangle Naman (196-197). When the General elaborates the massacre plan with "European" precision (everyone will be dead by thirty two minutes after midnight), Bachir is beside himself: "Magistral! Génial! Vive la France! Minuit dix-sept, minuit trente-deux ! Nous les Nègres, avec notre intuition nous n'aurions jamais trouvé ça ! Vive Descartes !" (Fantastic! Great! Long Live France! Twelve seventeen, Twelve thirty-two! We *Nègres*, with our intuition, would never have thought of that! Long Live Descartes!) (197). That articulation of a racialized separation of intellect and emotion serves to parody one of Senghor's most polarizing, and perhaps most misunderstood, statements of civilizational difference: "L'émotion est nègre, comme la raison est hellène" (Emotion is *Nègre*, as reason is Hellenic).[257]

While the play's concluding scenes will put the form and possibility of resistance into question, the equations between masculinity and resistance, and between non-slave status and dignity, remain intact. The play's penultimate scene brings together the present and colonial past in the figure of masculine *siggi* resistance; the concluding scene, however, undermines that equation between upright posture and anti-colonial resistance, and the implicit parallel between the resistance of the *tirailleurs* and the resistance of the present. In this "epilogue," an upright stance does not signify the revolutionary posture of *siggi*; the audience members are not implicated as remembering subjects; and an act of verbal recollection produces neither a resistant vision, nor positions the viewers as the inheritors of an unambiguously signifying anti-colonial resistance.

In the penultimate scene, an unnamed "Young Man" embodies the upright male revolutionary of the present. He joins Kadia, Naman's wife, who is kneeling among the corpses of the Thiaroye Massacre, and speak as Africa: "Je suis peuple en haillons ! Je veux être un homme / car l'ennemi a saccagé mes entrailles [...] Mais voici / Desormais fermes en mes mains / Les resolutions nouvelles !" (I am a people dressed in rags! I want to be a man / because the enemy has pillaged my guts [...] But here / once again firmly gripped in my hands / new promises) (200-201). Kadia then connects Thiaroye, past and present, to the ongoing anti-colonial struggle elsewhere on the continent:

> Patience! Vous de Thiaroye et d'ailleurs les fils / avancent sans vacillement. / A

[257] Souleymane Bachir Diagne describes this much-cited sentence as an immature and partial formulation of Negritude. He refers to the source essay, "Ce que l'homme noir apporte" (1939), as Senghor's first theoretical formulation of Negritude, and argues that his conception of Negritude would transform, as it matured: from a pre-War essentialist vision in which racially distinct peoples offer equal yet distinct cultural contributions, to a dialectical notion in which Negritude is also humanism. Rather than only an assertion of particularity (let alone intellectual inferiority), Diagne argues that, for Senghor, Negritude was one facet of an already single humanity and universal culture. See, for example, Souleymane Bachir Diagne, interview by Nadia Yala Kisukidi, "Senghor et la question qui se pose toujours" *ThéoRèmes* 4 (Nov. 2013). http://theoremes.revues.org/430.

> l'avant-garde du ghetto desormais fermes en leurs / mains les resolutions nouvelles. Les fils sont debout sans cesse plus haut que Kilimanjaro / Le cri des fils Indivisible Et unique O / notre haine unanime / sera bourrasque sur Cabora Bassa /Arrière barbares dessus notre Mozambique alors / le fleuve sera libre / Et l'enfant caressera les crêtes du soleil
>
> [Patience! You of Thiaroye and elsewhere the sons / are advancing without hesitation. At the avant-guard of the ghetto new promises are once again / held firmly in their hands. / The sons are rising up, higher than Kilimanjaro / The cry of the sons Indivisible and unique O / our unanimous hatred / will gust over the Cabora Bassa[258] Backward barbarians upon our Mozambique / the river will be free / And the child will caress the craters of the sun] (201)

As the stage is illuminated for the play's epilogue, unidentified voices repeat the Young Man's last lines of revolutionary poetry ("Et voici / Desormais fermes en nos mains / Les resolutions nouvelles") and wake Naman and his comrade Moctar from death. Naman speaks first and refuses the notion that he and his comrades are dead: "We are not dead, we will never die !" He references the play's audience when he declares that the youth of the present will fight the true struggle: "Ils sont venus ! Les fils ont prêté serment [...] Oui, le vrai combat contre les vrais ennemis" (They have arrived! The sons have taken heed [...] Yes, a true struggle against true enemies) (202). Naman appears oblivious to the failure of the revolt, to the incontrovertible fact of death, and to the fury of his comrade, Moctar, whose words compose the final speech of the play. Moctar begins by dismissing "a poem," in disgust. It is unclear whether he references Naman's words or the lines of revolutionary resolve that had brought them both briefly to life. In either case, Moctar seems to dismiss the revolutionary images, as well as the metaphors that have equated different subjects, spaces, and times of oppression and resistance, that animated the revolt and might propel future resistance.

Moctar's articulations of anger and remembrance also prevent any positioning of the play as a form of memory that might belong to the viewer. He addresses the audience and tells them that they have come to a performance to find beauty in his death; and that they have no right to be alive while "we" rot underground. In a series of a fragmented series of images, he recalls the life and rural home that he has lost: "... Pendant la saison des pluies tout est vert... Je vois la rosée sur le vert des feuilles... " (... During the rainy season everything is green... I see the dew on the green of the leaves ....") (203). The sequence of remembrance ends in a renewed expression of rage; in the play's final lines, Moctar again addresses the audience and asks them to avenge his death, even as he, again, indicts them for their witnessing: "Et vous mes frères, qui me regardez pourir au fond de ma fosse, vengez la mort d'un homme qui ne voulait pas mourir!" (And you, my brothers, who are watching me rot at the bottom of my pit, avenge the death of a man who did not want to die!) (203). Then Moctar, who has literally risen from the dead, collapses, and the play ends.[259]

---

[258] The reference is to the armed anti-colonial struggle in what is now Mozambique. Cabora Bassa was a major dam project of the Portuguese colonial administration in then Portuguese East Africa; it was a repeated target of independence fighters (Frelimo) in the early 1970s. Mozambique became independent in 1975.

[259] These physical actions are expressed concisely in the stage directions: "*Il se lève, étonné, regarde partout" (Surprised, he rises, and looks all around)* (202); and *"Il s'écroule - Chant" (He collapses – Chant)* (203).

It is unclear who is not within the scope of this fury, and what form of political resistance it might produce. Neither the dead Moctar's upright stance nor his act of recollection signify a unified resistance; what is more, both undermine the revolutionary posture and poem of the preceding scene. While the penultimate scene implies that masculine resistance will continue in the revolutionary present, the epilogue questions the role of the contemporary audience, the notion of a real enemy and a real war, and the revolutionary metonomy and metaphor that had animated the Thiaroye revolt.

The play appears ambivalent about the stance of *siggi* resistance, but unambivalent in its equations of complicity with physical postures that radically depart from an upright masculine bodily posture. Naman epitomizes the stance of *siggi*, yet he appears not only courageous, but dangerously unaware of the actual conditions in which he lives, and in which he is dead. Bachir's complicity is signaled by his bodily performance of falling, fainting, and obsequious haste. Yet Bachir seems to have a clearer grasp of the colonial world and his position within it than does Naman. No resistant hero, the structurally complicit Bachir is also not the object of the play's unambiguous indictment. It is only the Traitor, the allegorical counterpart to Senghor, who is unequivocally condemned.

Like *Thiaroye terre rouge*, the final text I examine in this chapter - Pathé Diagne's "Siggi Nag Faf" - reflects upon the resistant posture of *siggi* and poses a critique, albeit oblique, of the Senghorian state. While both texts implicitly extend the status of the masculine (free) *gor* to the imagined Senegalese national subject, neither celebrates a particular form of resistance nor suggests that Senegal is a unified *ceddo* nation. Neither text positions itself as "memory," let alone as the memory of an indigenous anticolonial resistance from which complicity is absent.

"Siggi Nag Faf," an interview with Diagne, appears in the third issue of *Siggi,*[260] the last issue of the journal to appear under that name. *Siggi* presents Diagne as an expert on the linguistic facts, who can therefore judge the validity of the legislation on the transcription of national languages, and its recent application to *Siggi* itself. Diagne's response, however, elides explicit judgment and ranges beyond the form and content of both scholarship and interview. Despite his initial disavowal - "On peut, sans introduire paradox ou provocation, dire au plan de la realité de la langue...." (One can, without introducing either paradox or provocation, speak about the reality of the language ...) - the text is itself a provocation, composed of paradox. Diagne asserts his commitment to an objective response; yet he offers an oblique critique of both the state and of the model of resistance with which *Siggi* is associated. Despite the ostensible topic, form, and title of Diagne's text, and the title of C.A. Diop's journal in which it appeared, this is an oblique reflection upon memory, cemeteries, and democracy, rather than an explanation of consonant gemination or a manifesto of resistance.

Diagne's response to the interviewer's opening question is the object of this analysis; it fills almost half the interview's pages. While the text begins with linguistic explanation and political comment,

---

[260] Cheikh Anta Diop founded *Siggi,* a journal of dissenting political opinion, in 1976, shortly after Senghor's regime began instituting reforms. Although its name is Wolof, the journal was written in French. *Siggi* was closely aligned with C.A. Diop's Pan-Africanist political vision and with the program of his then-illegal political party, the *Rassemblement national démocratique* (RND). The first issue of *Siggi* was numbered zero; thus Diagne's interview, in issue number two, is located in the journal's third issue: *Siggi,* no 2. (Feb. 1977): 17-21.

the central component is an imagined dialogue with an invented Wolof speaker. Diagne starts by diplomatically condemning recent state repression, and continues in the register of his disciplinary expertise.[261] Wolof, like related African languages, is structured by phonological oppositions which create semantic oppositions.[262] If one ignores this central characteristic of the language, one risks provoking inextricable confusion. Diagne then turns to the particular object of controversy, *siggi*: "La forme provient comme derivéé à sens inversif de sëgg : se pencher. Si vous ne redoublez pas en transcrivant sëgg, vous écrivez sëg / sëk ou cimitière, ce qui est tout de même autre chose" (The form derives from *sëgg*, its meaning is the inverse of *sëgg*: to bow. If you do not double the consonant, transcribing *sëgg*, you would instead write *sëg* / *sëk* or cemetery, which is something else entirely) (17). Diagne holds apart the opposed pair - *siggi* and *sëgg* - and insists upon the difference between them. His comment however addresses the word that falls outside of the opposition: *sëg* the cemetery, that *autre chose*.

A comparison between French and Wolof transcription suggests an oblique parallel between the arbitrariness of French orthography and the arbitrary exercise of Senegalese state power that appears to conflate French and Wolof. The arbitrariness of French transcription is present in the very words for names and naming: "Accepter par ailleurs de distinguer sëgg et sëg, et proscrire siggi au profit de sigi ; c'est naturaliser l'incohérence : comme en français où l'on écrit nommer et nomination" (To accept the distinction between sëgg and sëg, but to prohibit siggi in favor of sigi; this would be to naturalize incoherence, as in French when one writes nommer and nomination) (17). Only convention has naturalized this situation: the doubled "m" of *nommer* and the single "m" of *nomination* signify an identical sound. It must be that Senegalese politicians mistakenly identify Wolof with French, or they are unable to hear the difference between the types of consonant. This second possibility occasions more commentary: "Le locuteur qui parle la langue ne s'y trompe pas" (The speaker who speaks the language would not make such a mistake) (17). The politicians concerned appear not to be fluent Wolof speakers; a reference, perhaps, to Senghor, whose lack of mastery of Wolof was almost as well-known as his love of French.

A [fluent] Wolof speaker would naturally take care to textually signal the audible difference in consonant length - to avoid provoking either amusement or "terreur dans les esprits." The tone is almost flippant; the humor and the hint of violence echoes the earlier aside - *sëg* (cemetery), *ce qui est tout de même autre chose,* that is something else altogether. Diagne may not have imparted new linguistic information to *Siggi*'s largely intellectual, Wolofone readership; he has, however, imparted political commentary, and insistently, if obliquely, drawn the reader's attention to cemeteries.

At this point, Diagne summons an imagined *locuteur* to demonstrate the sensibilities of a Wolof

---

261 "On ne saurait dire, sur la base des faits, qu'elles soient disons 'encourageantes' pour continuer à raisonner volontairement en des terms les moins polémiques possibles... On ne peut, ne pas être frappé, par toute une manoplie [sic] de mesures repressives, qui ont pour conséquence de limiter de fait, la maitrise écrite rapide et le développement de l'usage des langues du pays" (One would not say, in reference to the facts, that they are "encouraging" - in order to voluntarily continue to reason in terms that are the least polemical possible... One cannot help but be struck by the full panopoly of repressive measures which result in the limiting of the rapid written mastery, and development, of the country's languages) (17).

262 Phonological oppositions, between strong (doubled) consonants and weak consonants (or long vowels), create antonym pairs.

speaker, and instructs the reader to address him. Our speaker is the Seereer[263] and the Senegalese "every man." His Seereer name is followed by an appellation that emphasizes his allegorical and representative function, in addition to his Sereer heritage:[264]

> "Dites à Abdu Së - Ngoor Seen, Sereer wolofisé et bon sportif : *sëg wi yagg na."*
>
> ["Say to Abdu Së - Ngoor Seen, a wolofized Sereer and a good sport: *the cemetery is old*.] (17)

Abdu Së is as real as the reader who addresses him, and as allegorical as Ngoor Seen within the conceit of this dialogue and linguistic proof. His two names signal his doubled function in Diagne's text: a non-nationalist national exemplar; an allegorical figure who provides real evidence; a fictional *gor* who will himself imagine another fictional *gor*. Ngoor Seen will indeed demonstrate Wolof phonology, but, as he does so, he will recall a griot's poem and the cemetery within it, and provide commentary on the inadequacy of *siggi* as a metaphor for national resistance. He responds to the statement about "the" old cemetery by thinking of two particular old cemeteries:

> Il pensera volontiers à l'ancienneté d'un cimitière. Il profilera dans son esprit, l'image de "Bettuwaar" comme disent les lebus de Mbot, parlant du cimitière de Soubédioune ; ou "Marmuya" comme dit un vieux poète doomu ndar anonyme.[265]
>
> [His mind will turn to the great age of a cemetery. He will picture "Bettuwar," as the Lebu of Mbot call the cemetery of Soubédioune; or "Marmuya," as an old anonymous poet of Saint Louis says.] (18)

Bettuwaar is, people say, is the oldest cemetery in Dakar. It is located today between the Corniche and the sea; Omar Blondin Diop is buried there. "Marmuya" is a very old cemetery located in St. Louis. As the reference to the poet's origins suggests, he is a *doomu Ndar* - literally, a "child" of St. Louis:

> Masire së jéey Fatim penda -
> Yaasin coro Joop ma des Njunoob !
> Mari kura Saar mi ci sëgu Marmiyaal
> Faraag Ancumaan ! Yaw Yaa
> Siggil ña sëggoon !
>
> [Masire Isa Jéey Fatim Penda -
> Yaasin Coro Diop who remained in Njunoob!
> Mari Kura Saar in Marmiyaal cemetery

---

[263] The contemporary Wolof spelling is "Seereer" or "Séeréer"; the more familiar, French, spelling is "Sérère."

[264] *Seen* is the archetypical Seereer family name; Ngoor Seen might be translated as "That Fellow Seen." Seen, written according to French convention, is *Sène*. In "Siggi Nag Faf," the word is written as "ngoor"; current spelling convention, according to Jean-Léopold Diouf's *Dictionnaire wolof-francais et francais-wolof* (Paris: Karthala, 2003), would transcribe it as "ngóor."

[265] In Wolof, only the *originaires* of Ndar are referred to in this way; one would not refer to the "child" of any other city or region: there is no *doomu Ndakaaru* or *doomu Rufisque*.

> Fara and Ancumaan ! You [sing. Masire Isa]
> Are the pride of those who have been bowed!] (18)

The poem demonstrates that Wolof is a literary language with an autonomous internal logic. It is evidence of the linguistic (and literary) reality of geminate consonants; meaning depends upon the difference between a weak and a strong consonant, between *sëg* (cemetery) and *sëgg[oon]* (bowing). The poem thus depends not only upon the phonological and semantic opposition that produces *siggi* and *sëgg,* but also upon the linguistically incidental resemblance between *sëg* (cemetery) and *sëgg* (bow). Like the poem, Diagne's text depends as much upon the resemblance between *sëg* and *sëgg,* cemetery and bowing, as it does upon the relationship of opposition in which *siggi* figures.

The poem addresses the person whose name constitutes the first line and praises him as the pride of two foremothers, and then two forefathers. Masire Ise is an honorable subject because of his ancestors whom he, in turn, should honor.[266] Each woman is defined by a location, and an implied journey from Njunoob to St. Louis: Joop remained behind in Njunoob in the Jolof [kingdom]; Saar is buried in the cemetery in St. Louis. The aristocratic names, the preoccupation with genealogy, and the laudatory intent signal the poem's genre and anonymous author: a griot's praise of nobility. The lines do not reference a national(ist) memorial repertoire of resistance. Unless the reader of *Siggi* were unusually well-versed in the aristocratic lineages of Ndar or the geography of the Jolof, she would recognize only the genre of the poem and its memorial impulse. Despite the fact that Bettuwar and Marmiyaal are the least obscure of the poem's referents, they are the sole subject of Diagne's brief explanation; against the obscurity of the rest of the poem, *sëg,* cemetery, appears insistently in the foreground. Masire Isa must remember his forbearers; but should *Siggi*'s readers also remember the dead? Which dead should they recall, and why?

Siggi's reader is obliquely interpellated as a remembering subject when he reads a poem addressed to a "you," but the objects of this relayed remembrance are unclear. Diagne's text cites poetic lines of remembrance, but it does not do so in service of a memorial project: the objects of remembrance are not explained and thus the reader is not invited to remember them. The text persistently pulls the reader's attention to *sëg* (cemetery), and to specific locations of burial - Bettuwar, Marmiya, a burial place in Njunoob - but the reasons for this attention are not made explicit. Oblique resemblances and spatial specificity have pervaded Diagne's text. Little attention has been paid to the opposition between *siggi* resistance and the bowing of oppression (*sëgg),* let alone to a national landscape of resistant memory.

Diagne's second locution provokes not a poem, but the image of the resistant Senegalese subject who is already standing tall. He tells the reader to formulate another sentence for Ngoor Seen's ears, identical to the first except that it contains *sëgg* (bowing) rather than *sëg* (cemetery):

> Dites au même Ngoor, chevronné de gymnastique : *Sëgg, wi yagg na.*
> Il comprendra la trop longue durée d'une genuflexion imposée par une figure, dans un gymnase. Mais il pourrait évidemment penser l'énoncé en termes plus symboliques, et

[266] Joop is a typically Wolof name (in French transcription, "Diop"), and Saar (in French transcription, "Sarr"), a typically Seereer name. Fara and Ancumaan are men's names.

> y voir, qui sait une sorte de protestation proférée par quelque gor fatigué de courber l'échine ; et qui aurait décidé d'en finir.
> *SIGGI nag Faf !*
> Et puis ce Ngoor Seen qui est politisé, sinon politicien pourrait même en servir à clamer que n'ayant jamais courbé l'échine, point ne lui est besoin de la redresser :
> *Ku suggoon ay siggi.*
>
> [Say to that same Ngoor, an expert gymnast: This bending/bowing has gone on for [too] long.
> He will think of a figure bent too long in a gymnasium; but he might also consider the pronouncement in more symbolic terms, and see in it a sort of protest enacted by some *gor* who is tired of bending his back, and who has decided to be done with it.
> *RAISE ONE'S HEAD [high] at last!*
> And this Ngoor Seen, who is politicized if not a politician, takes the opportunity to declare that, having never been bowed, there is no need for him to straighten:
> *Whoever has been bowed is now rising [up].*] (18)

While Ngoor's first thought is of a gymnast, a person practiced at contortions, his second is of the quintessential *gor* whose contemplation of revolt implies the potential revolt of the national collective. The politicized *gor,* Ngoor Seen, understands the final locution, "Siggi nag faf," to be directed at him. He protests that only those whose spines have been bent need straighten; he refuses to rise and stand straight because he is already doing so. If Ngoor Seen stands in for Senegal broadly, and thus for *Siggi*'s readers, then the national public may be in less need of resistant pride and political instruction than the journal name would suggest. *Siggi* - as a journal title and as a term within opposition discourse - suggests that the unified people should hold high their collective heads. Ngoor's response that *siggi* is not necessary - because he is already standing straight - might suggest that other postures and conceptions of resistance are necessary.

Diagne calls upon the oral literature of an inegalitarian social structure in order to produce an egalitarian conception of individual and national dignity. The *siggi* of the poem alludes to the dignity that an aristocratic subject should embody because of the dignity of his forbearers; in Diagne's text, the resistant dignity of *siggi* is available to any Senegalese person. A single *gor,* Ngoor Seen, stands in for the nation; and within Ngoor's own imagination, the Senegalese national subject already possesses *gor* dignity.

In reality, however, *gor* status, and the dignity that it implies, is not available to all: slave descendants and casted people do not have the same access to what remains a hierarchical conception of social honor and dignity. Ngoor Seen, the quintessential national subject whose recollection of a griot's poem brings it to the pages of *Siggi*, can speak a griot's words, but himself is not a griot. While the nation encompasses a plurality of ethnic subjects (such as the Seereer Ngoor), a casted or *jaam* subject does not epitomize the nation. Nor does a female or homosexual subject embody the Senegalese people. The extension of *gor* status to all speaks to a democratic vision in which such hierarchies would be irrelevant. However, in constructing the imagined nation through a social concept that is still embedded in relations of inequality, the structural violence of the present is elided. The formulation of a political desire as a reality disavows the actual existence of the

hierarchies within which *gor* is embedded.

Siggi has belonged to a Pan-African imaginary that often equated holding one's head high with collective racial and continental assertion.[267] *Siggi* can recall an identitarian pride, yet it also alludes to the ongoing struggle for democracy, the same struggle that undergirded the response to the outlawing of geminate consonants. In a way that *ceddo* has not, s*iggi* has remained available to articulate not only a specifically black resistance, but also a desire for democracy in which the Wolof language has retained a key place.[268]

The prefacing note on Wolof transcription and pronunciation to Mamadou Diouf's *Kajoor au XIXe siècle* suggests the extent to which *siggi,* and the consonant gemination controversy, have remained powerful referents for challenges to nationalism, as well as for articulations of it. As I suggested early in this chapter, Diouf's volume constitutes both an investigation of the past and a commentary upon the postcolonial present; its account of the nineteenth century Kajoor kingdom challenges the postcolonial nationalist mythology and historiography of unambiguous *ceddo* resistance. At the time of the book's publication in 1990, a single party had ruled Senegal for three decades; in challenging the centrality of Lat Dior and the Kajoor in nationalist narrative, Diouf's *Kajoor* challenged that party and that state. In the prefacing note, the first example (to illustrate the vowel "i") is *siggi*. The concluding sentences concern consonant gemination specifically: "La gémination des consonnes transcrit des fortes ; siggi : se relever ; soppi : changer" (Consonant gemination transcribes strong consonants: *siggi*; to rise up; *soppi*; to change). [269]

When *Siggi* became *Taxaw*, one Dakar vendor composed a new call of advertisement: *Ku siggi ba yaag nga taxaw léegi ngay naaw (Those who long held their heads high, now stand tall, and will soon fly).*[270] His words offer a critical comment on the absurdity of the state edict and an admiring nod to the creativity of the response. One might also hear his playful prediction as an ironic comment upon *siggi* as a metaphor of national resistance. If its logical extension is literal flight, then the metaphor of resistance itself might be lacking. *Léegi ngay ñaaw*: in my text, these words suggest both the limitations of and the necessity of national resistance, its absurdity and its sometime radical hope.

---

267 In an example from a different kind of text, in July 2014, on the site senegal-histoire.com, the historical figure of the month is Battling Sikkil, an early twentieth-century "franco-senegalese" boxer, and the first African World Champion. According to the article, the latter half of this *nom de guerre* is a deformation of *Siggil*.

268 *Siggi* has remained a touchstone in Senegalese political life. In 2000, the first change of ruling party was brought about by the coalition, *Sopi*, with the slogan, *Sopi,* and the journal of the major party in the coalition was titled *Sopi*. In 2009, the opposition coalition *Bennoo Siggil Senegaal* (BSS) brought victories to its [non-PDS] candidates in local elections.

269 Diouf, *Le Kajoor au XIXe siècle*, 9-10.

270 I am grateful to Souleymane Bachir Diagne who recounted the anecdote of the vendor during our discussions of *Siggi* and "Siggi Nag Faf."

Conclusion

Imagined as sites of memory, District Six and Thiaroye appear as abstract spaces that contain the shared memory of an imagined collective. Elements of the physical landscapes and imagined figures of the past recall historical violence and lost resistant community. The contemporary subject is invited to understand spaces and cultural representations as forms of memory, and to assimilate a particular version of the past into her own memory. Paradoxically, structural complicity can almost-appear - only to be as quickly disavowed – in narratives that "remember" Thiaroye and District Six as sites of unambiguous oppression and resistance. Analysis of acts of remembrance within narratives of memory, and attention to the moments in which the reader or viewer is interpellated as a remembering subject, can thus expose the work of disavowal that the notion of collective memory performs.

Reading with attention to structural complicity allows us to think critically about the notion of collective memory. It also allows us to attend to the complexity of historical experience that dichotomous discourses of memory often elide. Attention to the structural complicity of District Six and Thiaroye necessarily foregrounds the structural character of colonial and apartheid violence. Renewed attention to structural violence can provoke reflection on the ways in which colonial structural violence continues in the present, and upon the forms of political resistance - whether in social movements or cultural production – that might be commensurate with it. Thus a notion of complicity from which individual agency is absent foregrounds questions of violence and political responsibility in the present.

As places of complicity, District Six and Thiaroye can emerge as sites of multiple pasts and multiple presents; places that are imagined and experienced, remembered and narrated from multiple subject positions. Attention to structural position produces a plural and dynamic notion of place; inversely, a relational conception of place allows African subjects, colonial and postcolonial, to emerge as wholly neither victims nor perpetrators; resistors nor collaborators; figures neither of tradition nor of cosmopolitanism. African spaces, produced rather than recalled, can appear as complex and contested places in the present: shaped by multiple histories, constructed from multiple subject positions, and connected to multiple sites on and beyond the continent.

The African places of District Six and Thiaroye are subject to very different claims in the present, some made in the name of memory and others not. The land and the memory of District Six have been intertwined for decades: in popular associations, individual memorial practices, and in the public discourses and performances of the District Six Museum. As I discuss in the Introduction and in Chapter Two, the Museum makes a symbolic claim to the land as the site of return, restitution, and memory. Ciraj Rassool, among others, has articulated the Museum's claim to the land - as a site of return, restitution, and memory - by endowing "recall" with dual meanings: "[recall] refers both to the Museum's memory work on District Six and its desire to see the community of District Six restored and called back to resettle, redevelop and heal the scarred landscape at the foot of the mountain."[271] In addition, a variety of other actors continue to make

[271] Rassool, "Introduction," *Recalling Community*, xi.

competing claims to the physical space of District Six. Among them are former resident groups; the state entity responsible for restitution; the City of Cape Town, property developers and other business interests, and the expanding Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT).

While the undeveloped, high market-value land of District Six is claimed by different and competing actors, much less public attention is paid to the peripheral *banlieue* of Thiaroye. The official attention Thiaroye does glean is focused upon the Military Cemetery. The contestation over the potential mass grave site was relatively short-lived; the tollway was built. There are many contestations over land in contemporary Thiaroye, but they receive little official attention. There are conflicts between the state and residents whose land was expropriated without compensation; between individual owners and those who illegally occupied or sold their land; and between residents and adjacent polluting factories. These actors, however, make no claim to "memory," rarely receive public attention, and have no relationship to the massacre that has resulted in the particular memorial recognition of "Thiaroye."

As I conclude, I would like look at how these two particular places have been contested or recalled on a recent anniversary: respectively, on February 11, 2015, the forty-ninth anniversary of the declaration of District Six for white occupation, and on November 30, 2014, the eve of the seventieh anniversary of the massacre. Each February 11, the Museum leads a pilgrimage of former residents to a site on the former Hanover Street, once the main drag of District Six. Each year they add stones to a memorial cairn. The CPUT, despite protests, is constructing new student residences on the site; on February 11, 2015, the cairn - as was widely reported in local media - was located within a building site.[272] The developer agreed to pause construction to permit former residents to walk to the place, although they could not linger there. In place of the music and story-telling that would ordinarily take place at the cairn, the Museum organized a letter-writing campaign that was intended to evoke the barrage of letters that the apartheid-era Community Development Board had once sent to residents to inform them of their dispossession. Former residents wrote to the CPUT on "love letter" stationery designed for the occasion. One photograph, circulated on Twitter and reproduced on an online news site, shows a letter that begins: "You are on stolen land!!! We want it back!! It does not belong to you" - the elderly writer's hand obscures two words which must be "people" and "Six" - "It belongs to the people of District Six."[273] Other protests were not articulated within the idiom of memory. On the same day, a group of former residents protested outside of the Palestine Museum - because Anwah Nagia, the founder of that Museum is also the chairperson of the District Six Beneficiary Trust, the body which has represented District Six claimants, but which has been increasingly contested by claimants and other former residents.[274] While future restitution

---

[272] Mubeen Banderker, "District Six Residents Recall Evictions." *Voice of the Cape*, Feburary 11, 2015. http://www.vocfm.co.za/d6-residents-recall-evictions/

[273] Leslie Kiewit, "'You are on stolen land' - District Six claimant." *ENCA,* February 11, 2015. http://www.enca.com/south africa/you-are-stolen-land-district-6-claimant.

[274] The current status of the Trust is unclear, but it seems that the Trust will not continue to play a role in the restitution process. An undated, likely 2013, District Six Reference Group document states that in the future claimants will not need to be affiliated with any representative bodies in order to settle a restitution claim with the state. It also explains that the Trust will not play a role in the settling of fugure claims; according to the statements of the The Minister of Rural Development and Land Reform in a November 2012 meeting, the Trust will only be involved with "finalizing outstanding issues pertaining to Pilot Phases 1 and 2 (houses and units currently completed)." See "District Six Reference Group Chairperson's Communiqué: An Overview of District Six Reference Group."

homes in District Six, the state has recently announced, will be available at no cost to claimants, current occupants paid the Trust. Some are being reimbursed for the payments that they have made towards their homes; others are not. A local radio station and online news site, *Voice of the Cape*, quotes Asa Salie, the District Six Community Forum chairperson: "We are asking, whose houses are free and whose aren't. This is a divide and rule strategy, but from whom we don't know."[275] The article, published on February 11th and itself a form of acknowledgement of the anniversary date, concludes with the description of another recent contestation - of a site within or adjacent to the District, depending on one's understanding of its boundaries: the City has announced a plan to privatize a municipal venue, the Good Hope Centre, and "convert it into a film studio." The District Six Forum has launched a petition in protest; the land could instead house returnees, as Salie explains: "That Good Hope Centre is the site where the first market was, and now it is not going to be used anymore. 150 hectares was District Six, of which 42 hectares have been given back. At present there are only 18 hectares for the development of thousands of people still to come back."[276]

In Cape Town, on the anniversary of the District's declaration, a variety of local actors made claims to District Six based upon the past; and they did so both within and outside of the idiom of memory. In Dakar, on the eve of the anniversary of the Thiaroye Massacre, the loudest public claim to "Thiaroye" was articulated by the French president; for Hollande, the cemetery of Thiaroye constituted a site of memory. The past and present of Thiaroye, the place in which people live, was not relevant. On his visit to Senegal in 2012, the French President had spoken before the National Assembly and committed to "returning the archives" of the "bloody repression" of Thiaroye. He had repeatedly referenced a shared, French and African history founded upon the French "blood debt" to Africa - a debt incurred by the "sacrifice" of African colonial soldiers in defense of France. From this glorious aspect of a shared history, Hollande had turned to "la part d'ombre de notre histoire" (the dark part of our history), and referenced two sites: Thiaroye and Gorée. The mention of the Island occasioned the speech's sole mention of *mémoire*; that afternoon, Hollande declared, he would go to Gorée and "bow before the memory of the victims of the slave trade."[277] Victims, rather than perpetrators, facilitators, beneficiaries, or the predatory political economy of the Trade itself, would be the objects of recollection.

At the end of November 2014, the French president again traveled to Dakar, on the occasion of the Fifteenth Summit of *la Francophonie*. He gave three speeches; two took place "on the margins" of the Summit - one beside Senghor's grave in the Bel-Air Cemetery of Dakar and the other in the Military Cemetery of Thiaroye.[278] Yet all three celebrated the unique mission of a global French community; *la Francophonie* appeared not merely as a product of linguistic cohesion, but as a community of values

---

http://www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/phocadownload/District/2013/d6_reference_group_chairpersons_communique.pdf.

[275] Mubeen Banderker,"Tensions Increase Amongst D6 Groups," *Voice of the Cape,* February 11, 2015. http://www.vocfm.co.za/tensions-increase-amongst-d6-groups/

[276] Ibid.

[277] François Hollande, "Discours de M. le president," October 12, 2012, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-de-m-le-president-de-la-republique-devant-l-assemblee-nationale-de-la-republique-du-senegal/

[278] A fourth presidential speech, not referred to in the media as occuring "en marges du Sommet," was addressed to Dakar's French expatriate community.

possessed of a unique mission, as force that combats disorder, and as "a demand."[279] And, while *la Francophonie* owes its existence to a specific colonial history, that history is nowhere conceived in terms of the violent relationships of domination. Instead, a "shared" past has produced the "community," "space," and "memory" of a unified *Francophonie*.

Unlike the 2012 speech before the National Assembly, Hollande's 2014 speech in the Military Cemetery of Thiaroye mentions "memory" no less than eight times, as I indicated at the beginning of this study. One reference is to Thiaroye as a "site of memory": Thiaroye has joined Gorée as an official *lieu de mémoire*.[280] The memory is not of historical violence, let alone of massacre, but of Francophone unity. The speech begins with an invocation of that memory:

> La Francophonie est aussi au service de la mémoire. Elle porte bien sûr des valeurs, une exigence mais elle se réfère aussi à ce qui a fait notre histoire. C'est notre histoire qui a provoqué la prise de conscience que nous avions besoin de nous retrouver dans un ensemble plus grand que nous, unis par la langue et la culture.
>
> [*La Francophonie* also serves memory. Of course, it signifies [particular] values, an obligation, but it also refers to what our history has produced. It is our history that made us realize that we needed to gather together in an entity greater than ourselves, united by language and culture.][281]

Hollande goes on to affirm the French blood debt to Africa because of the sacrifices of African soldiers in World I and World War II; he also reiterates his commitment to creating a museum within this "site of memory," and announces his intention to give, that very day, the Senegalese President Macky Sall a copy of the relevant archival files, "sur cette affreuse tragédie de Thiaroye" (regarding this horrible tragedy of Thiaroye).[282] "Tragedy" suggests an unfortunate conjuncture of circumstance; indeed, Hollande repeatedly elides the problem of historical responsibility by turning to "mémoire." Although the speech repeatedly references a shared Franco-African memory, the past to be remembered does not emerge with specificity and clarity: "Je voulais réparer une injustice et saluer la mémoire d'hommes qui portaient l'uniforme français et sur lesquels les Français avaient retourné leur fusil... Car c'est ce qui s'est produit. Ce fut la répression sanglante de Thiaroye" (I intended to remedy an injustice and to honor the memory of men who wore the French uniform and upon whom the French returned fire ... Because that is what happened. That was the bloody repression of Thiaroye). Expressions of uncertainty surround much of what he goes on to relay, in an account devoid of names and definite numbers. The French president, in possession of copies of the relevant archival material, implies that the information he relays is dubious: they are the numbers of the official record, but the historical facts remain a mystery.[283]

---

279 François Hollande, "Discours à l'occasion de l'ouverture du XVème Sommet de la Francophonie à Dakar," November 29, 2014. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-a-l-occasion-de-l-ouverture-du-xveme-sommet-de-la-*francophonie*-a-dakar/.

280 By contrast, "history" is referenced only three times and always in close proximity to remembrance; at the beginning of the speech, in conjunction with "memory" and, in the concluding sentence, as a part of a promise to "not forget."

281 Hollande, "Discours au cimitière," November 30, 2014, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-au-cimetiere-de-thiaroye/.

282 Ibid.

283 "Aujourd'hui les interrogations demeurent : celles des historiens, celles des familles, celles finalement de tous ceux qui

Instead of clarifying what actually occured on December 1, 1944 in the Thiaroye Military Camp, the speech subsumes the "repression of Thiaroye" into a discourse of enduring Francophone unity and enduring French obligation to Africa. The familial bonds of the Francophonie are constituted by French blood debt to Africa. Thus the killings of Thiaroye are subsumed into a Franco-African "memory" of Francophone values and French "blood debt": a debt that originates not in the killing of African soldiers in Thiaroye, nor in the deaths of Africans under colonial conquest and rule, but in the "sacrifice" of African colonial soldiers for French military victories in the World Wars.

The "remembrance" of Thiaroye becomes an occasion for France to reaffirm the universality of the Francophone values that are an important part of the ideological basis of French engagements on the African continent. Echoing the assertions of French blood debt with which it began, the conclusion of the speech begins with a promise: France will not forget what she owes to Africa; it is because of a debt that France is present in Africa to fight against the terrorist menace,[284] as well as against other sources of African suffering - among them poverty, environmental degradation, and the inequalities that themselves produce violence.[285] The "memory" of the Thiaroye Massacre thus functions to justify continuing French military and political intervention in Africa.

The speech's final sentences allude once more to the lesson of Francophone unity to be drawn from the French colonial army's killing of its African soldiers:

> C'est au nom de cette fraternité et de cette solidarité que la France et l'Afrique sont içi rassemblées à l'occasion de ce sommet de la Francophonie, mais aussi dans ce cimetière, pour ne rien oublier, pour tirer une nouvelle fois les leçons de l'histoire et être à la hauteur des valeurs que nous proclamons.
>
> [It is in the name of this brotherhood and this solidarity that France and Africa have gathered here, on the occasion of the Summit of the Francophonie, but also in this cemetery, so as to forget nothing, so as to draw once again upon the lessons of history and to rise to the height of the values that we proclaim.]

Places of Complicity is a step towards a form of grief that is not solely directed towards (certain) victims

---

veulent comprendre. D'abord sur le nombre exact de victimes, mais aussi sur l'endroit où ils furent inhumés qui reste encore mystérieux" (Today questions remain: those of historians, those of families, and, finally, those of all who seek to understand. First of all, regarding the exact number of victims, but also regarding the place where they were buried, which still remains mysterious).

[284] "La France n'a pas oublié et n'oubliera jamais ce qu'elle doit à l'Afrique. C'est pourquoi elle est présente aujourd'hui pour lutter contre le terrorisme, partout où il sévit, où il menace des peuples libres" (France has not forgotten, nor will she ever forget, what she owes to Africa. That is why is present today in the fight against terrorism, wherever it strikes, wherever it threatens free peoples).

[285] "C'est au nom de cette solidarité, c'est pour la jeunesse d'Afrique, que la France veut bâtir un monde plus juste, que la France regarde son passé et est mobilisée pour que l'avenir soit meilleur, pour prévenir les guerres, pour lutter contre les sources mêmes des violences, c'est-à-dire les inégalités, pour que nous puissions préserver la planète..." (It is in the name of this solidarity, it is for the youth of Africa, that France wants to build a more just world, that France looks at her own past and is provoked into action for a better future, to prevent wars, to fight against the sources of violence themselves, that is inequality, so that we might preserve the planet…).

of the past, as I suggest at the end of Chapter One. This grief would not demand that the historical subject be only a victim or only a hero – defined as a target of violence or by an unerring resistant stance towards it. This grief would account not only for death and bodily violation, but also for the less visible losses that structural violence inflicts as well. It is grief that would attend to "the space between words and things," and make political demands upon the African present.

This study provokes renewed attention to the production of place and the production of the past, as I seek to do in the second chapter, in my analyses of the curation of District Six. It invites an embrace of complicit subjects and skew relationships, as I begin to do in my readings of Rive's work in Chapter Three. *Places of Complicity* also invites a self-reflective notion of political resistance - *léegi ngay ñaaw* – as I suggest at the end of Chapter Four. It asks us to wonder about the identity of that resistant subject, who, possessed of dignity, desires a different future.

Bibliography

Adanson, Michel. "Mémoire d'Adanson sur le Sénégal et l'île de Gorée." Edited by Charles Becker and Victor Martin. *Bulletin de l'Institut de l'Afrique noire*, Series B, 42, no. 4 (1980): 722-779. http://ucadao.s3.amazonaws.com/agorae/200931418139/C.Becker-V.Martin_V1.pdf.

Banderker, Mubeen. "Tensions Increase Amongst D6 Groups." *Voice of the Cape,* February 11, 2015. http://www.vocfm.co.za/tensions-increase-amongst-d6-groups.

---. "District Six Residents Recall Evictions." *Voice of the Cape*, Feburary 11, 2015. http://www.vocfm.co.za/d6-residents-recall-evictions/.

Bathily, Abdoulaye. Interview by Falilou Ndiaye, Manfred Prinz, and Alioune Tine. In Ndiaye, Prinz, and Tine*, Visages publics du Sénégal,* 113-131.

Bennett, Bonita and Chrischené Julius, "Where is District Six? Between landscape, site and museum." In Bennett, Julius, and Soudien, *City, Site, Museum*, 52-67.

Bennett, Bonita, Chrischené Julius, and Crain Soudien, eds. *City, Site, Museum: Reviewing Memory Practices at the District Six Museum.* Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2008.

Bernard, Philippe. "Les Sénégalais retrouvent la mémoire." *Le Monde*, February 23, 2006.

Bèye, Alioune Badara. *Nder en flammes*. Dakar: Nouvelle Éditions Africaines du Sénégal, 1990.

Bèye, Ben Diogaye and Boubacar Boris Diop. "Thiaroye-44." Senegal, 1984.

Bickford-Smith, Vivian. "The Origins and Early History of District Six to 1910." In Jeppie and Soudien, *The Struggle For District Six*, 35-43.

Bickford-Smith Vivian, Elizabeth van Heyningen, and Nigel Worden. *Cape Town in the Twentieth Century: An Illustrated Social History*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1999.

Bickford-Smith, Vivian, Sean Field and Clive Glaser. "The Western Cape Oral History Project: The 1990s." *African Studies* 60, no. 1 (2001): 5-23.

Boubacar Barry. *Le royaume du Waalo : Le Sénégal avant la conquête*. Paris: Karthala, 1985.

Bocoum, Hamady and Bernard Toulier. "La fabrication du Patrimoine : l'exemple de Gorée (Sénégal)." *In Situ* 20 (2013). http://insitu.revues.org/10303.

Boroom Jamono Yi [pseudonym]. "Xewoonu Mee." *Kaddu* no. 20 [1974?]: 9.

Bottaro, Jean, Pippa Visser, and Nigel Worden. *In Search of the Past: Grade 11, Learner's Book*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press Southern Africa, 2006.

Camara, Abdoulaye and Joseph-Roger de Benoist. *Gorée : Guide de l'île et du Musée historique*. Dakar: IFAN-Cheikh Anta Diop, 1993.

Ceddo [pseudonym, likely Ousmane Sembène]. "Moom Sa Reew" in "Independans," [unnumbered] special issue, *Kaddu* (1972).

Césaire, Aimé. *Discours sur le colonialisme*. 1950. Paris: Présence africaine, 2004. Page references are to the 2004 edition.

Cissé, Mamadou. "Langue, Etat et société au Sénégal." *REVUE ELECTRONIQUE INTERNATIONALE DE SCIENCES DU LANGAGE SUDLANGUES* no. 5 (2006): 99-133. http://www.au-senegal.com/IMG/pdf/doc-109pdf-33f96.pdf.

Chapman, Michael. "More than Telling a Story: *Drum* and its Significance in Black South African Writing." In *The Drum Decade: Stories from the 1950s*, edited by Michael Chapman, 183-227. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1989.

Cruise O'Brien, Donal, Momar-Coumba Diop, and Mamadou Diouf, eds. *La construction de l'Etat au Sénégal*. Paris: Karthala, 2002.

Davie, Lucille. "District Six lives again, thirty five years later." *Media Club South Africa*, May 28, 2014. http://www.mediaclubsouthafrica.com/culture/3852-district-six-lives-again-35-years-later.
Department of Education, Republic of South Africa. *National Curriculum Statement, Grades 10-12 (General) History*. Pretoria: Department of Education, 2003.
Diagne, Pathé. "Siggi Nag Faf." *Siggi*, no. 2 (Feb. 1977): 17-21.
Diagne, Souleymane Bachir. "Senghor et la question qui se pose toujours." Interview by Nadia Yala Kisukidi. *ThéoRèmes*, 4 (November 2013). http://theoremes.revues.org/430.
Diop, Abdoulaye Bara. *La société wolof: les systemes d'inégalité et de domination*. Paris: Karthala, 1981.
Diop, Boubacar Boris. *Le temps de Tamango suivi de Thiaroye terre rouge*. Paris: Harmattan, 1981.
---. *Doomi Golo*. Dakar: Éditions Papyrus, 2003.
Diop, Madia. Interview by Falilou Ndiaye and Manfred Prinz. In Ndiaye, Prinz, and Tine, *Visages publiques du Sénégal*, 192-205.
Diop, Momar-Coumba and Mamadou Diouf, eds. *Le Sénégal sous Abdou Diouf : Etat et Société*. Paris: Karthala, 1990.
Diouf, Mamadou. *Le Kajoor au XIXe siècle : pouvoir ceddo et conquête coloniale*. Paris: Karthala, 1990.
---. "Histoire et actualités dans CEDDO d'Ousmane Sembène et *HYENES* de Djibril Diop Mambéty." In *Littérature et cinéma en Afrique francophone : Ousmane Sembène et Assia Djebar,* edited by Sada Niang, 15-34. Paris: L'Harmattan, 1996.
"District Six Claimants urged to approach Justice Department." *SABC*, March 8, 2014. http//www.sabc.co.za/news/a/ 4f98ee00433133fc92e89a45a23ba143/District-Six-land-claimants-urged-to-approach-Justice-Dept.
"District Six Reference Group Chairperson's Communiqué: An Overview of District Six Reference Group." http//www.ruraldevelopment.gov.za/phocadownload/District/2013/d6_ reference_group_chairpersons_communique.pdf.
Dlamini, Jacob. *Native Nostalgia*. Johannesburg: Jacana, 2009.
Echenberg, Myron. "Tragedy at Thiaroye: The Senegalese Soldiers' Uprising of 1944." In *African Labor History*, edited by Peter Gutkind, Robin Cohen, and Jean Copans, 109-128. Beverley Hills: Sage Publications, 1978.
Echenberg, Myron. *Colonial Conscripts: The Tirailleurs Senegalais in French West Africa, 1857-1960*. Portsmouth: Heinemann, 1991.
Erasmus, Zmitri, ed. *Coloured by History, Shaped by Place: New Perspectives on Coloured identities in Cape Town*. Cape Town: Kwela Books, 2001.
Faye, Cheikh Faty. *Aube de sang*. Paris: Harmattan, 2005.
Field, Sean, ed. *Lost Communities, Living Memories: Remembering Forced Removals in Cape Town*. Cape Town: David Philip, 2001.
---. *Oral History, Community, and Displacement: Imagining Memories in Post-Apartheid South Africa*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012.
Godard, Jean-Luc. *La Chinoise*. France, Productions de la Guéville, 1967.
---. *Sympathy for the Devil*. Great Britain, Cupid Productions, 1968.
Graham, Shane and John Walters, eds. *Langston Hughes and the South African Drum Generation: The Correspondence*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Grunebaum, Heidi. *Memorializing The Past: Everyday Life in South Africa after the Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2011.

Hall, Martin. "Subaltern voices? Finding the spaces between things and words." In *Historical Archaeology: Back from the Edge*, edited by Pedro Paulo A. Funari, Martin Hall, and Sîan Jones, 193-203. London: Routledge, 1999.

Harrow, Kenneth. "*Camp de Thiaroye*: Who's That Hiding in those Tanks and How Come We Can't See Their Faces?" *IRIS*, 18 (1995): 147-52.

Hart, Deborah M. "Political Manipulation of Urban Space: The Razing of District Six, Cape Town." In Jeppie and Soudien, *The Struggle for District Six*, 117-142.

Hart, Gillian. *Rethinking the South African Crisis: Nationalism, Populism, Hegemony*. Scottsville (South Africa): University of Kwa-Zulu Natal Press, 2012.

Hertzberger-Fofana, Pierrette. "Joseph Ndiaye (1922-2009), la voix de la maison des esclaves de Gorée s'est éteinte," *Grioo.com*, October 2, 2009. http://mobile.grioo.com/article.php?id=16316.

Hollande, François. "Discours de M. le Président de la République devant l'Assemblée nationale de la République du Sénégal." October 12, 2012, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-de-m-le-president-de-la-republique-devant-l-assemblee-nationale-de-la-republique-du-senegal.

Hollande, François. "Discours à l'occasion de l'ouverture du XVème Sommet de la Francophonie à Dakar." November 29, 2014. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-a-l-occasion-de-l-ouverture-du-xveme-sommet-de-la-francophonie-a-dakar.

Hollande, François. "Discours au cimitière de Thiaroye." November 30, 2014, Dakar. http://www.elysee.fr/declarations/article/discours-au-cimetiere-de-thiaroye.

Hughes, Langston, ed. *An African Treasury: Articles, Essays, Stories, Poems, by Black Africans*. New York: Crown Publishers, 1960.

Jeppie, Shamil and Crain Soudien, eds. *The Struggle For District Six: Past and Present.* Cape Town: Buchu Books, 1990.

Julius, Chrischené. "'Digging Deeper Than the Eye Approves': Oral Histories and Their Use in the Digging Deeper Exhibit of the District Six Museum." *Kronos* 34, no. 1 (2008): 106-138. http://www.scielo.org.za/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0259-01902008000100005

---. "Oral History in the Exhibitionary Strategy of the District Six Museum, Cape Town." Master's Thesis, University of the Western Cape, 2007.

Kael, Pauline. "A Minority Movie." Review of Jean-Luc Godard's film *La Chinoise*. *The New Yorker,* April 6, 1968.

Keïta, Fodeba. *Aube africaine*. Paris: P. Seghers, 1965.

Kiewit, Leslie. "'You are on stolen land' - District Six claimant." *ENCA,* February 11, 2015. http://www.enca.com/south africa/you-are-stolen-land-district-6-claimant.

Klein, Martin A. *Slavery and Colonial Rule in West Africa.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Kramer, David and Taliep Petersen. "The District Six Musical." South Africa, 1988.

Krouse, Matthew, ed., assisted by Kim Berman. *Invisible Ghetto: Lesbian and Gay Writing from South Africa*. Johannesburg: Congress of South African Writers, 1993.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space.* Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.

Legassick, Martin and Gary Minkley. "Current Trends in the Production of History." *Alternation* 5, no. 1 (1998): 98-129.

Lettre de Dakar par une libre association d'individus libres. Paris: Champ Libre, 1978.

Lewis, Desiree. "Writing Hybrid Selves: Richard Rive and Zoe Wicomb." In Erasmus, *Coloured by History,* 131-158.

Lewis, Jack. *A Normal Daughter: The Life and Times of Kewpie of District Six*. South Africa, Idol Pictures, 2004.

Lodge, Tom. *Sharpeville: An Apartheid Massacre and Its Consequences.* New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Maart, Rozena. *Rosa's District Six*. Toronto: Mawzeni House/TSAR Publishers, 2004.

Mabon, Armelle. *Prisonniers de guerre «indigenes» : Visages oubliés de la France occupée.* Paris: Éditions La Découverte, 2010.

Mamdani, Mahmood. *Citizen and Subject: Contemporary Africa and The Legacy of Late Colonialism.* Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press, 1996.

---. "Amnesty or Impunity? A Preliminary Critique of the Report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa (TRC)." In "Ethics," special issue, *Diacritics* 32, no. 3/4 (Autumn-Winter, 2002): 32-59.

Mandel, Naomi. *Against the Unspeakable: Complicity, the Holocaust, and Slavery in America.* Charlottesville VA: University of Virginia Press, 2006.

Massey, Doreen. *Space, Place, and Gender.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994.

Mauny, Raymond. "En marge du centenaire de l'abolition de l'esclavage, l'île de Gorée," *Paris-Dakar*, April 22, 1948. Quoted in Bocoum, Hamady and Bernard Toulier. "La fabrication du Patrimoine : l'exemple de Gorée (Sénégal)." *In Situ* 20 (2013). http://insitu.revues.org/10303

Mills, Ivy. "Sutura: Gendered Honor, Social Death, and the Politics of Exposure in Senegalese Literature and Popular Culture." Ph.D. diss, University of California, Berkeley, 2011.

Millien, Sarah Gertrude. *God's Stepchildren.* New York: Boni and Liverigtht, 1924.

Ministère de l'Information et des Relations avec les Assemblées, République du Sénégal. *Livre blanc sur le suicide d'Oumar Blondin Diop.* Dakar: Ministère de l'Information et des Relations avec les Assemblées, 1973.

Munro, Brenna. *South Africa and the Dream of Love to Come: Queer Sexuality and the Struggle for Freedom.* Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2012.

Murphy, David. *Sembène: Imagining Alternatives in Film and Fiction.* Trenton NJ: Africa World Press, 2001.

Ndiaye, Falilou, Manfred Prinz, and Alioune Tine, eds. *Visages publics du Sénégal : 10 personnalités politiques parlent.* Paris: Harmattan, 1990.

Murray, Noëleen, Nick Shepherd, and Martin Hall, eds. *Desire Lines: Space, Memory and Identity in the Post-Apartheid City*. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Ndiaye, Boubacar Joseph. *L'Esclavage : ses origines et ses repercussions en Afrique, Gorée : Histoire et traite des noirs, avec des citations de l'auteur.* Dakar: Maison des esclaves, 1986.

---. *The Slave Trade at Gorée-Island and Its History, Slavery: Its Origins and Consequences in Africa (with Quotations from the Author).* Translated by Momar Khary Diagne. Dakar: Maison des esclaves, [1989?].

---. *Il fut un jour à Gorée-- : l'esclavage raconté à nos enfants.* Neuilly-Sur-Seine: Michel Lafon, 2006.

Nicholson, Zara. "58,000 claimants not on claims list"' *Cape Times*, May 6, 2014. http://m.capetimes.co.za/article/view/s/95/a/406200.

Non-European Unity Movement. "A Declaration to the People of South Africa from the Non-European Unity Movement." April, 1951, Cape Town. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/declaration-people-south-africa-non-european-unity-

movement-statement-neum-april-1951%C2%A0.
---. "A Declaration to the Nations of the World, Statement of the Non-European Unity Movement." July 1945, Cape Town. http://www.sahistory.org.za/archive/declaration-nations-world-statement-non-european-unity-movement-signed-rev-z-r mahabane-dr-g.
Nora, Pierre. "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire." In "Memory and Counter-Memory," edited by Natalie Zemon Davis and Randolph, special issue, *Representations,* no. 26 (1989): 7-24.
---. *Les lieux de mémoire*. Paris: Gallimard, 1984-1992.
Nuttal, Sarah and Carli Coetzee, eds. *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1998.
O'Brien, Donal B. Cruise."Political Opposition in Senegal: 1960-67." *Government and Opposition* 2, no. 4 (1967): 557-566. doi:10.1111/j.1477-7053.1967.tb01185.x.
Parent, Sabrina. *Cultural Representations of Massacre: Reinterpretations of the Mutiny of Senegal*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
Petersen, Carlo. "District Six claimants want all development stopped." *Cape Times*, March 16, 2015. http://www.pressreader.com/south-africa/cape -times/20150316/281496454763472/TextView.
Pimstone, Millie, Milton Shain (convener) and Adrienne Folb. *The Jews of District 6: Another Time, Another Place*. Cape Town: Kaplan Centre for Jewish Studies and Research, 2012.
Pfaff, Françoise. "The Uniqueness of Ousmane Sembène's Cinema." In *Ousmane Sembène: Dialogues with Critics and Writers,* edited by Samba Gadjigo, Ralph H. Faulkingham, Thomas Cassirer, and Reinhard Sander, 14-21. Amherst MA: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.
Ranicière, Jacques. *Film Fables*. Translated by Emiliano Battista. Oxford: Berg, 2006.
Rassool, Ciraj and Sandra Prosalendis, eds. *Recalling Community in Cape Town: Creating and Curating the District Six Museum.* Cape Town: District Six Museum, 2001.
Rassool, Ciraj. "Introduction." In Rassool and Prosalendis, *Recalling Community*, vii-xii.
---. "Memory and the Politics of History in the District Six Museum." In Murray, Shepherd, and Hall, *Desire Lines: Space, Memory and Identity in the Post-Apartheid City*, 113-127.
---. "The Rise of Heritage and the Reconstruction of History in South Africa." *Kronos,* no. 26 (August 2000): 1-21.
Riesz, Janos. "Thiaroye 44 : Un événement historique et ses représentations littéraires." In *Conflits de mémoire,* edited by Véronique Bonnet, 303-319. Paris: Karthala, 2004.
Rive, Richard. *District Six, Buckingham Palace*. 1986. Cape Town: David Philip, 1996. Page references are to the 1996 edition.
---. *Writing Black*. 1981. Cape Town: David Philip, 2013. Page references are to the 2013 edition.
---."My Sister was a Playwhite by Mary X." *Africa!* (July 1955): 27-31.
---. *Advance, Retreat*. Cape Town: David Philip, 1983.
Rothberg, Michael. *Multidirectional Memory: Remembering the Holocaust in the Age of Decolonization*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.
Rothberg, Michael, Debarati Sanyal, and Maxim Silverman, eds. "Noeuds De Mémoire: Multidirectional Memory in Postwar French and Francophone Culture." Special Issue, *Yale French Studies* no. 118/119 (2010).
Samb, Djibril, ed. *Gorée et l'esclavage, Actes du Seminaire sur "Gorée dans la traite atlantique: mythes et realités" Gorée, April 7-8, 1997*. Dakar: IFAN-Cheikh Anta Diop, 1997.
Samb, Momar. "Dégluleen Mbokk yi" in *Ru yu Mar*. Dakar: n.d.

Sampson, Anthony. 1956. *Drum: The Making of a Magazine*. Johannesburg: Jonathan Ball, 2005. Page references are to the 1956.

Sanders, Mark. *Complicities: The Intellectual and Apartheid*. Durham NC: Duke University Press, 2007.

Sanyal, Debarati. *Memory and Complicity: Migrations of Holocaust Remembrance*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2015.

Seck, Charles. *Gorée : Guide Touristique*. Dakar: SAFER, 1966.

Sembène, Ousmane and Thierno F. Sow. *Camp de Thiaroye*. Senegal and Tunisia, SNPC and SATPEC, 1987.

Sembène, Ousmane. *Ceddo*. Senegal, Filmi Doomi Reew, 1976.

---. *Emitaï*. Senegal, Filmi Doomi Reew, 1971.

Senghor, Léopold Sédar. 1948. "Tyaroye" *Hosties Noires*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1956. Page references are to the 1956 edition, published in a single volume with *Chants d'ombre* (*Chants d'ombre suivi de Hosties noires*).

---. "Préface : De l'île de Gorée à la nation sénégalaise." In *La turbulente histoire de Gorée* by Jean Delcourt, vii-xii. Dakar: Clairafrique, 1982.

---. "Ce que l'homme noir apporte." In *Liberté I : Négritude et humanisme*, 22-38. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1964.

Shell, Robert. C. H. *Children of Bondage: A Social History of the Slave Society at the Cape of Good Hope, 1652-1838*. Hanover NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1994.

Silver, Carol G. "Images of Empire: Art and Artifacts in Cape Town, South Africa." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 34, no. 1 (2006): 335-342. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25058751.

Simpson, Graeme and Deborah Posel, eds. *Commissioning the Past: Understanding South Africa's Truth and Reconciliation Commission*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2002.

Soudien, Crain. "District Six and Its Uses in Discussion about Non-Racialism." In Erasmus, *Coloured By History*, 114-30.

Thiaw, Ibrahima. "L'espace entre les mots et les choses : mémoire historique et culture matérielle à Gorée (Sénégal)." In *Espace, culture matérielle et identités en Sénégambie*, edited by Ibrahima Thiaw, 17-38. Dakar: Codesria, 2010.

Thioub, Ibrahima. "Le mouvement étudiant de Dakar et la vie politique sénégalaise : la marche vers la crise de mai-juin 1968." In *Les Jeunes en Afrique : La politique et la ville*. Vol. 2, edited by Helene d'Almeida-Topor, Catherine Coquery-Vidrovitch, Odile Goerg and Françoisé Guitart, 267-281. Paris: Harmattan, 1992.

Traoré, Mahama Johnson. "Cinema and Freedoms: Reflections of a Senegalese Film-Maker." In *African Experiences of Cinema*, edited by Imruh Bakari and Mbye B. Cham, 67-69. London: British Film Institute, 1996.

Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa. *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of South Africa Report*. Vol. 5. Cape Town: Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 1998-2003.

UNESCO Institute for Statistics (UIS) Information Paper. "Adult and Youth Literacy: National, regional, and global Trends, 1985-2015." Montreal: UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2013. http://www.uis.unesco.org/Education/Documents/literacy-statistics-trends-1985-2015.pdf.

UNESCO. "UNESCO World Heritage Site Criterion (vi)." http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/26.

Vergunst, Nicolaas. *Hoerikwaggo: Images of Table Mountain*. Cape Town: South African National Gallery, 2001.

Viljoen, Shaun. "Richard Rive: A Skewed Biography." Ph.D. Diss., University of the Witwatersrand, 2006.
---. *Richard Rive: A Partial Biography*. Johannesburg: Wits University Press, 2013.
Wade, Abdoulaye and M'baye Gana Kébé. *Une fresque pour Thiaroye : théâtre.* Dakar: Éditions Maguilen, 2008.
Ward, Kerry and Nigel Worden. "Commemorating, suppressing, and invoking Cape Slavery." In *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Memory in South Africa*, edited by Sarah Nuttall and Carli Coetzee, 201-217. Cape Town: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Wiazemsky, Anne. *Une année studieuse.* Paris: Gallimard, 2012.
Western, John. *Outcast Cape Town*. Minneapolis MN: Univeresity of Minnestora Press, 1981.
Wicomb, Zoe. "Shame and identity: the case of the coloured in South Africa." In *Writing South Africa: Literature, Apartheid and Democracy, 1970-1995*, edited by Derek Attridge and Rosemary Jolly, 91-107. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Williams, James S. "'C'est le petit livre rouge / Qui fait aue tout enfin bouge': The case for revolutionary agency and terrorism in Jean-Luc Godard's *La Chinoise*." *Journal of European Studies* 40, no. 3 (2010): 206-218.
Wieviorka, Annette. *The Era of the Witness,* translated by Jared Stark. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
Worden, Nigel, Elizabeth van Heyningen, and Vivian Bickford-Smith. *Cape Town: The Making of a City, An Illustrated Social History.* Cape Town: David Philips, 1998.

Archival Sources

"District Six Museum Foundation Trust Deed." April 11, 1994. District Six Museum Archives, Cape Town.
District Six Beneficiary and Redevelopment Trust. "Deed of Trust." October 11, 2001. District Six Museum Archives, Cape Town.
Ben Diogaye Bèye v. SNPC [*Société nouvelle de promotion cinématographique*], "Conclusions d'appel." May 17, 1989, Dakar. Ben Diogaye Bèye's personal papers, Dakar.
South African Jewish Museum."New Exhibition: The Jews of District Six: Another Time, Another Place." Press Release, October/November 2012 (undated), South African Jewish Museum, Cape Town.

Interviews With the Author

Bonita Bennett, Director of the District Six Museum. December 12, 2012, Cape Town.
Ben Diogaye Bèye, filmmaker. April 29, 2013, Dakar.
Fazeela Haffejee, English Senior Curriculum Planner (Western Cape Education Department). November 13, 2012, Cape Town.
Mamadou Koné, Secretary General of the Association of Senegalese History and Geography Teachers (*Association sénégalaise des professeurs d'histoire et de géographie*). April 26, 2013, Dakar.