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Abstract

The investigation of how something as intangible as language can be transposed into a site for visitors, a tourist attraction, forms the core concern of this thesis. Several efforts have been made throughout the world to create public structures which are dedicated to ‘Language’ in general, to a specific language or to some language-related issue. These structures take the form of statues, sculptures, museums and, as the major focus in this thesis, monuments. Language monuments have been built to be visited and admired, to stand as agents of national or cultural identity, to recognise, commemorate and memorialise the actions of people who have struggled and sacrificed themselves for language recognition, and to celebrate the history and development or the ‘triumphs’ and successes of a language.

Nowhere in the world is there such a concentration of language monuments than in South Africa. There are nineteen monuments dedicated to the Afrikaans language dotted throughout South Africa, the largest and most important being the Afrikaanse Taalmonument (Afrikaans Language Monument) in Paarl, Western Cape Province. The Taalmonument is the only monument of its type anywhere in the world: it is a monument conceived of and designed to acknowledge the birth, development and continued strength and dynamism of a language. This monument formed the basis of the empirical study described in this thesis.

The overarching aim of the thesis has been to investigate the ways in which a feature of intangible cultural heritage, in this case, language, can be made into material form through the process of ‘monumentalisation’ and how it then plays a role as a visitor attraction. The thesis reveals the relationship which exists between attraction and visitor. A phenomenological, hermeneutic methodological approach was taken to observe visitors as they interacted with the Monument, detailing their activities, reactions and performances. Visitors were interviewed about their experiences, impressions and perceptions of the Monument in order to gain insights into the meanings they attributed to the attraction and their encounter with it.
To make sense of the collected data, the thesis draws on theoretical perspectives influenced by post-structuralism, cultural studies and social constructivism, in addition to the body of theoretical work on tourist attractions emanating from tourism studies. In general terms, the Monument, as a tourist attraction, is examined as a 'text' which is 'read', interpreted and given meaning by visitors. The thesis also extends the notion of 'reading' and is expanded beyond the ‘occularcentric’ nature of the ‘gaze’ to include visitors’ emotional, sensory and corporeal responses to it so as to present a more holistic, embodied and sensory understanding of how tourists interact with and experience this particular tourist attraction.

The findings suggest that the visitor experience is a dynamic interplay between an individual’s cognitive and affective dimensions and certain external factors which impact upon the visitor’s encounter with an attraction, and which systematically help shape people’s feelings and cognitions. At the empirical level, the thesis provides a more nuanced perspective on the 'contestation' phenomenon as it pertains to visitor attractions.

Visitors’ interpretations of the ATM occur as an outcome of an interactive process which includes their corporeal and sensorial encounters with the Monument coupled with their intellectual or cognitive perceptions or understandings. It is in the relationship formed by visitors with the attraction and in their embodied, sensory encounter that meaning occurs. It is in the juxtaposition between the material and non-material aspects of the Monument and the physical and cognitive experiences of the visiting public, which create the powerful connection between the material manifestation of any attraction and its interpretation and meanings.
Figure 1.1  The Afrikaanse Taalmonument from above
(Source: Ricky De Agrela)
Chapter 1

Introduction

‘If you speak in a language they understand, you speak to their head. If you speak in their own language, you speak to their heart.’

1.1 Research Context

The impetus for undertaking this study derives from an unreservedly humanistic view that the preservation and maintenance of the varied and various expressions of our rich global human heritage and cultural diversity are of paramount importance.

Initially, it had been my intention to conduct research which would attempt to better understand the complexities of responses to tourism-related pressures in a (small) community by examining the effects or impact of tourism on language and language use in that community and how tourism and tourist-host encounters might influence the local linguistic landscape in terms of the maintenance and preservation of local vernaculars and of their continued viability. It became evident very quickly, however, that it would have been very difficult to attribute certain changes to local language usage only to the influences and impact of tourism, as a direct response to tourist-host interaction or to other influencing factors outside the more immediate sphere of tourism such as trade, business, media, in-migration or VFR and the perceived ‘strength’, ‘resilience’ or ‘fragility’ of the local culture, for example. In other words, to satisfactorily identify those mechanisms which could ‘safely’ be attributed to tourism in directly affecting language usage would be extremely difficult to isolate and verify.

After much consideration and further investigation, I realised I needed to focus my attentions on something more tangible and which could be investigated empirically. I
spent quite some time reading around several issues and investigating possible areas for research until, combining my background and experience in the fields of anthropology, linguistics, semiotics, and literary theory, I was eventually able to develop a conceptual framework which could incorporate my interests, while at the same time allowing me the opportunity to refine and concentrate my attentions on the processes of meaning-making in tourism. I was still uncertain as to how I might best empirically demonstrate the importance of language in the context of the field of tourism and, furthermore, how could in any way itself be a tourist attraction; that was, until I discovered the existence of a number of language monuments and museums scattered throughout the world.

Investigations into such tourist phenomena revealed that very little research had been conducted into the reasons for the emergence of such attractions, what motivates tourists to visit these particular attractions, nor how they are perceived or understood by visitors. It was this dearth of research which encouraged me to redress, in some way, this ‘silence’ in the literature by, amongst other things: trying to explain reasons as to why a particular aspect of intangible cultural heritage—viz. language—is emerging as a discrete form of tourist attraction; researching how an aspect of intangible cultural heritage is transformed into a particular type of material object—both as a cultural institution and as a tourist attraction; and examining how visitors interact with these attractions and how they make meaning from that interaction, so as to find out what is significant to them about the attraction and their reasons for visiting.

Ever since I first read David Harrison’s (1981) *The White Tribe of Africa*, I have been fascinated by the Afrikaner volk and of their identity and seemingly ‘liminal’ status within the African context. Of particular interest has been the development of the Afrikaans language. I have followed the changing role and position of the Afrikaans language in terms of its 'status' since the election of the first democratic government in 1994 as one of the eleven official languages and of the many negative reactions it has met with in terms of its position as a medium of education. It came as quite a surprise to learn that there existed a monument to the Afrikaans language (and a nearby language museum), built outside the city of Paarl in South Africa and which stood as unique in the world to have been the first of this type of 'cultural symbol' when it was established in 1975. Such was it that this monument became what I considered the perfect area of focus.
This thesis examines an unusual tourist attraction, the \textit{Afrikaanse Taalmonument} (Afrikaans Language Monument), which serves as both a monument to a language, Afrikaans, and as a visitor attraction. The Monument is situated in Paarl, South Africa and was inaugurated in 1975. It is one of the few visitor attractions situated anywhere in the world which monumentalises an intangible component of culture: language.

As a vehicle of intangible cultural heritage at the root of all societies, language defines the way in which we understand, make sense of and relate to the world. It defines our physical, social, cultural, spiritual and imaginary ‘territory’. Linguist, Bell, writes that ‘language is the expression of our unique relationship with the land and the cultural practices that have been handed down the generations for thousands and thousands of years’ (Bell, 1996:25). As such, it is in, and through, language that ideas, thoughts and considerations are developed and worked through. It is through the medium of language that our world is created, realised, defined and understood, and it is through language that we communicate our will and convey our thoughts. Burden (2004, 2007), for example, argues that to contextualise an artefact of material culture, the environment within which it belongs needs to be explained. Any such explanation will, for the most part, require the use of language. Thus, be it a collection of things in the mind or the words by which they are expressed, language signifies both the outward form by which the inward thought is expressed and the inward thought itself.

According to the Census 2011 data, Afrikaans is the third most widely spoken language in South Africa (behind isiZulu and isiXhosa), with language speakers numbering 6 855 082 people, which equates to 13.5% of the overall population. Afrikaans is spoken mainly by White Afrikaners, Coloured South Africans and small sections of the black population, the majority of Afrikaans-speakers being labelled as Coloured.

Most Afrikaans speakers live in the Western Cape, where it is the language of just less than half (48.4%) of the provincial population. It is also common in Gauteng, where 12.2% of the provincial population consider Afrikaans to be their home language.

Afrikaans is the dominant language in the Northern Cape, spoken by more than half (53%) of the provincial population. Afrikaans is spoken by 12.4% of the Free State's population, 10.4% of the people of the Eastern Cape, and 8.8% of the people of North
West Province.

Through story and oral tradition, song, performance, social practices, knowledge, folklore or text, language performs an integral role in the maintenance, development, safeguarding and protection of a society’s cultural heritage. Yet, alongside this notion, there has also been a rich and extensive material tradition in the preservation of our tangible and intangible heritage—‘monumentalisation’. The construction of monuments stretches back thousands of years (Tattersall, 1996). Monuments serve an intrinsic role and provide a basic and essential function as a symbol or representation of some aspect of the tangible, material culture of a society or an intangible concept, idea, trait or notion which they are designed to preserve or to commemorate. Monuments, then, serve the needs or desires of a community which wishes to build a structure to represent or symbolise a person or abstract notion of importance. Thus, as features of material cultural heritage, monuments are tangible in their substance but are intangible in their intellectual nature. Monuments ‘are not merely physical representations … but are a way of communicating directly the semiotic messages contained therein’ (Myers, 2009:661). Therefore, it is worth making the distinction here between ‘Monument’, as an idea, as a category of (semiotic) communication, a ‘genre’; and ‘monument’ as a specific, tangible instantiation of the concept of ‘Monument’. These distinctions go hand-in-hand, as it is in a ‘monument’ that form and substance are given to the ‘Monumental’ ideas and notions embodied in the structure.

In those societies where they are recognised, monuments form an integral part of a community or society’s tangible cultural heritage. By their very nature, they are erected as a testament to and as a catalyst or focal point for the commemoration of achievement, success, greatness, triumph or glory. ‘Monuments make heroes and triumphs, victories and conquests, perpetually present and part of life’ (Danto, 1986:153). For Danto (1986), monuments commemorate the memorable and embody beginnings. They are not temporary structures but are built for posterity and, as such, they present a rich social and cultural legacy. With the passage of time, monuments provide an ideological and political ‘snapshot’ and become iconic emblems of the values, mores and messages of a people, a time and a place. They ‘reflect the atmosphere of an era, its conflicts and sensitivities’ (Amit-Cohen, 2008:2).
Ironically, however, while they supply the continuity from the past to the present (Schwartz, 1982), the memory and heritage they imbue are not, themselves permanent, but ‘assume different forms and are shaped according to the mood of the time’ (Amit-Cohen, 2008:2). Monuments are built with the express purpose to impress or to create awe and to draw attention to feats of grandeur, valour and extraordinary qualities. Their physical presence and symbolic status lie in their strength to inspire and fashion emotional attitudes and responses. Monuments ‘coagulate’ (Amit-Cohen, 2008:2) community values, social identities and local pride and are invested with ‘soul and memory’ (Young, 1993:2).

Together, languages and monuments are symbols and repositories of culture and cultural expression. Together they contribute to a culture, community or society’s cultural heritage and to its cultural landscape, with monuments as the physical artefacts and cultural property, and language as an intangible attribute of a group or society. They are borne of and reflect particular traditions; they have structural form. Together, they embrace the tangible, brought to fruition in the physical act of their particular construction and the intangible, in what they represent and symbolise, the meanings they possess, the tropes they contain, and the ways by which they are interpreted. They are at once literal, figurative and rhetorical, and are used to achieve an effect, to express an idea, ideology or a thought, or to narrate the story of an event or a person. Each monument makes use of literary and architectural devices and conventions which rely on readers’ understandings to be able to interpret and to give meaning.

Monuments, also, are often popular tourist attractions. Attractions and landmarks inscribed with examples of language have always seemed to be an object of note for visitors. In ancient times, for example, the various inscriptions of Roman emperor Augustus’ life and accomplishments known as the Res Gestae Divi Augusti, have been found scattered across the former Roman Empire, and copies of the text have been made and carved in stone on monuments or temples throughout the Roman Empire (Casson, 1974) for visitors’ attention. Similarly, Mayan and Egyptian hieroglyphic inscriptions

---

1 Staiff et al. (2013) argue that ‘visitors’ have become synonymous with ‘tourists’ and tourism and that there is a complex dialogic, communicative relationship between heritage sites and those who visit them. Because of the different motivations which prompt people to visit a site or attraction and the many
in situ have attracted millions of visitors over the years. More recently, however, there has seen the emergence of particular structures and institutions which are more specifically dedicated to the commemoration and memorialisation of language in general or to a number of specific languages in particular. (See Appendix 1 for a comprehensive international list of language monuments and institutions.) Whilst most are institutions devoted to furthering our understanding of the history and development of language as a human phenomenon, a small number take the form of monuments or museums dedicated to demonstrating the vitality of a particular language by raising our awareness of it and of its cultural context. These phenomena today attract visitors who share a curiosity for seeing and experiencing the various ways and means by which language, as an essentially intangible component of cultural heritage, can be developed into some concrete form.

Language issues and concerns consistently hover at the surface in the minds of many South Africans (e.g. Masola, 2013). The context for these concerns lies in the turbulent linguistic background of the country. Afrikaans, described by Desmond Tutu as ‘the language of the oppressor’ and, thus, symbolic of much of the oppression and injustices to which many South Africans had been subjected (n.a., 2004), continues to groan, in the shadow of the former apartheid era, under the weight of its emotional ‘baggage’. Pressures from within the country are questioning the ongoing relevance of Afrikaans and, more widely, through the demands of globalisation, in terms of its economic and technical ‘use value’ in the face of English as the global lingua franca. To counter those pressures, efforts are being made to distance Afrikaans from its colonial and apartheid past and to secure its role as a significant social, cultural, economic and linguistic force in the development of the nation. For example, the Stigting vir Bemagtiging deur Afrikaans (‘Foundation for Empowerment through Afrikaans’), has as its mission to create sustainable economic progress through literate, self-sustainable different ‘conversations’ which people might have with an attraction. The term ‘tourist’ could have been used to differentiate between those who might otherwise be ‘local’ people simply making use of a site for other than ‘touristic’, but rather more leisurely, pursuits but, for consistency’s sake, the word, ‘visitor’, has been used throughout the thesis.
and environmentally conscious communities through the medium of Afrikaans (pers. comm. with the Director, Mnr Christo van der Rheede, June 2010). The ATKV (Afrikaanse Taal en -Kultuurvereniging [Afrikaans Language and Culture Association]) has implemented a variety of cultural projects to support their mission and vision statement which stresses the ongoing importance of ‘the Afrikaans language, culture, knowledge and creativity as an essential or indispensable part of a successful South Africa’ (‘Vir die ATKV is die Afrikaanse taal, kultuur, kennis en kreatiwiteit onmisbaar deel van ’n suksesvolle Suid-Afrika’) (ATKV website).

Since 1994, with the New Dispensation and the introduction of democratic government and universal suffrage in South Africa, there have been many who have argued for the removal of all the remaining material vestiges associated with ‘Afrikanerdom’ (Braid, 1997; Ciraj et al., 2000; Coombes, 2003). Because monuments are most often evocative symbols of selective (and, often, exclusionary) memory and representations of elements of history, culture and heritage as interpreted by those in a position of power and control, monuments have had and continue to play a very sensitive role in the development of nationhood in a country such as South Africa, with its cultural diversity and extremely turbulent history. For example, acclaimed South African performer, author, social activist and satirist, Pieter Dirk Uys, in the guise of his alter ego, ‘Evita Bezuidenhout’, a white Afrikaner socialite and self-proclaimed political activist, has recommended that all Afrikaner monuments should be taken away, isolated from general public view and relegated to live cut off and segregated, to suffer a similar fate to that of so many of those who served sentences in Robben Island prison during the apartheid years:

All Afrikaner monuments [should] be removed from the mainland and placed in the cells in the prison on Robben Island. It could then be called "Boerassic Park. (Evita Bezuidenhout, ‘Ambassador to Bapetikosweti’, the otherwise known South African satirist, Pieter Dirk Uys, quoted in Coombes, [2003], p. 19)

Uys’ satirical commentary was echoed by the acerbic South African cartoonist, Zapiro, who suggested that the displaced statues and portraits of apartheid’s political leaders should be corralled into a wild game reserve and theme park for the benefit of tourists (see Figure 1.2):
However meaningful such monuments, statues or portraits may have been to certain members of the population before the New Dispensation of 1994, ‘Tannie Evita’ and Zapiro mount a strong argument that these cultural artefacts no longer have any place in today’s South Africa. The implication here is that such monuments are detached from today’s reality and stand as anachronistic reminders of the nation’s social and political past, rather than reflecting the reality of its present. Some critics propound that any monument which may be associated with any of the ethnic groupings or historical events which have taken place in South Africa’s past or present is nothing more than an anachronism, a harbinger of divisiveness and should be torn asunder (pers. comm., Estelle Mare, March, 2010). Admittedly, by themselves, monuments ‘are of little value, mere stones in the landscape’ (Myers, 2009:660); but as texts they can serve as sites of cultural reflection and, for good or bad, act as a reminder of a society’s past.

It is against this socio-cultural backdrop that the Afrikaanse Taalmonument² (ATM), the primary focus of investigation for this study, needs to be contextualised. As a tangible manifestation representing the continuity of a particular cultural intangible, viz.

---
² Isabeau Botha, Marketing and name is “Die Afrikaanse Taalmonument” and we [the staff and Council] prefer to use the Afrikaans version in all correspondence or publications. Even many English speakers refer to the Monument using the Afrikaans, as in the "Taalmonument" (pers. comm., Isabeau Botha, May 2010). It is appropriate, then, that throughout this thesis that the official name be used. Alternatively, the abbreviation, ‘ATM’, will be used throughout the thesis or sometimes for simple stylistic purposes, the shortened but capitalised word, ‘Monument’.
language—and, specifically, the Afrikaans language—in a place where the relationship between the physical nature of the place and its intangible associations come together, the ATM forms a nexus between language, politics, culture, tradition, monument, and tourist attraction. Inaugurated in 1975, it was the first of this type of ‘cultural symbol’ to be built, although it was pre-dated by the *Eerste Taalmonument* [First Language Monument], erected in Burgersdorp in 1893 to commemorate the recognition of Dutch as an official language in the Cape Colony.

The ATM is a carefully designed, cultural construction, with physical and symbolic components, commemorating the origins, development and future of the Afrikaans language. As a tourist attraction, as a monument to the celebration of a particular language, the ATM is a focal point for domestic (rather than international or non-national) visitors to reflect on and perhaps re-assess their cultural and national identity. In this, the ATM encapsulates much more than the commemoration of a language. What might have originated as an expression of the genesis and development of a language, has come to represent the power, position and aspirations of the Afrikaans-speaking part of the South African population. Despite the ‘baggage’ of much wider socio-historical associations of the Afrikaans language and the residues of the historical ideas of nation and nationhood, ‘fomented by apartheid policies of division’ (Tomaselli *et al.*, 1996:50), efforts are being made to embody the wider aspirations of nation and nationhood into the ATM. These aspirations are based on the continued process of the inclusive, pluralistic principles of democratisation and reconciliation. ‘Monuments in the new South Africa,’ writes Myers (2009:668), ‘have become, it seems, as much a matter of realpolitik as of culture’.

The ATM acts as a resource through which to rearticulate (or, ideologically realign) the divisions of the past into the basis for a future founded on democratic pluralism. The ATM can thus be understood, not as a symbol which necessarily fragments the social fabric, but as one which can serve to demonstrate the social, cultural and ethnic richness of South Africa. As evidenced in the mission and vision statement of the ATM (ATM website), through the active efforts of the staff at the ATM, attempts are being made to ‘construct an identity that distances [the ATM] from the deeds of the past while
appropriately representing its position within the larger historical discourse’ (Myers, 2009:662).

The statuses of many of the monuments which pre-date 1994 remain quite controversial within contemporary South Africa (Marschall, 2009). If their roles can be guided by national goals and policies of reconciliation, mutual understanding and respect for and pride in the ‘new’ South Africa, then such monuments have the potential to make a valuable contribution to the bridging of the ethnic and cultural divides which have dominated South Africa for much of its history. Since most monuments built in the pre-1994 period in South Africa either mirrored the colonial legacy or, in many cases, were erected as tributes to Afrikaner nationalism and political ideology, it could be argued that those same monuments today can embrace attributes of inclusivity. In so doing, they highlight their place in and contribution to the development of the social, cultural and political fabric which is today’s South Africa. It is, therefore, important to understand monuments as social phenomena which are not isolated entities separate from their socio-temporal contexts within which they exist but as objects which play an active role in today’s society. Their relative successes or failures lie in their dynamism and transformative capacity to transcend their original confines to create of themselves something of ongoing social relevance and significance.

1.2 Study Aims and Objectives

This study explores some of the key dimensions of the emerging field of language-related tourism. While some research has been conducted into language-learning destinations and of the economic and social impacts of such a phenomenon, there has been no research which I was able to locate, outside of Burden’s (2004) and Beningfield’s (2004) studies, into the very different development of language monuments and other language-related sites as tourist attractions. This thesis is neither a comprehensive overview of the nature of art in public places, nor an analysis of the functionality of monuments and memorials in general. Rather, it specifically examines the Afrikaanse Taalmonument as a hub of visual memory and collective consciousness and focuses on exploring the meanings associated with an object’s ‘monumentalisation’—how that object is given meaning, how that meaning is generated and received, and how visitors experience and make sense and meaning of the
Monument in its role as a visitor attraction. This will be done by examining and analysing the visitor experience from a multi-sensory perspective. While the importance of the ‘gaze’ (Urry, 1990) in the visitor experience should not in any way be devalued, it will be shown that it is but one of the sensory means by which people encounter and interact with tourist attractions and, which serve to shape and influence visitor behaviour and generate meaning of their experience and of a site or attraction.

While a comprehensive discussion of what defines a monument and of the place of monuments in the pantheon of visitor attractions will be the main focus of Chapter 3, some discussion of the nature of monuments is necessary to explain how monuments are positioned in this study. A monument may be defined as a structure created to commemorate or honour a person, event, or idea that is significant to a populace for which it is constructed (Choay, 2001; ICOMOS, 1964; Riegl, 1982). The study offers some insights into visitors’ motivations for visiting such attractions, their perceptions of such attractions and of their impressions of their visits.

The study has the following four objectives:

(i) To examine the socio-political process that led to the development and construction of the ATM as a monument to the Afrikaans language;
(ii) To describe and analyse the ATM as a tourist attraction;
(iii) To understand the ways in which visitors experience the ATM; and
(iv) To critically examine why visitors visit the ATM, how they make meaning of the attraction, and the interpretation and meanings that visitors attach to the Monument.

My research positions language as a form of intangible cultural heritage, and as a determinant in the construction of cultural identity through the processes of its 'monumentalisation' (being transposed into a tourist attraction) in the tangible form of language monuments. This transposition may manifest itself in one or more tangible or intangible forms, depending upon the motives or intentions for embarking on the ‘monumentalisation’ process. A language may be elevated to a sacralised—
‘monumentalised’—position where its oral or written form is confined to the use of particular people in certain social contexts or where it is directly associated with certain respect, virtues, qualities or status. Furthermore, a language which might be endangered or under threat of extinction may continue to be used to strengthen and perpetuate a certain cultural or ethnic group. In this way, the language becomes a ‘monument’ to the tenacity of a people to endure and as an expression of their identity. Physical inscriptions of a language serve as metaphorical monuments to its capacity to persist or to celebrate what it stands for or represents. A manifestation of the monumentalisation of language which has increased in the latter part of the twentieth century and the early part of the twenty-first has been the construction of monuments, the primary purpose of which has been to recognise the language and to commemorate its importance in the lives of its speakers and to their heritage and culture. The notion of ‘monumentalising language’ is summarised in the following model, Figure 1.3. As Figure 1.3 indicates, we need not limit our understanding of ‘monumentalisation’ to only material manifestations such as monuments, museums and other memorialising objects that have been preserved over time. We can also encompass living expressions of language to include festivities and celebrations of language. Efforts made to elevate the status of a language or to help maintain its ongoing presence and practice in a local community, region or nation, can also be considered an act of monumentalisation. Whereas ‘language’ is most often described as a core element of a community’s ‘living’ or ‘intangible’ heritage—along with other skills which are handed down from generation to generation such as dance, performing arts, manual skills, social practices, knowledge and information, for example—in the terms presented here, language, in its physical manifestation, may be categorised as much a part of the tangible cultural heritage as other physical artefacts.
the physical manifestation & memorialisation of a language; creating a monument to language (the design and construction of a monument) permanent structure such as a monument or museum

making a language 'monumental' (the ideological dimension & satisfying social, cultural and political ambitions), embodying it with the qualities associated with a physical structure of similar nature

memorialising the language in permanent inscription usage (script afforded 'sacred' status)

metaphorically speaking, in its continued usage

Turning a language into a monument (reifying the language, turning it into an object for memorialisation/monumentalisation) e.g. the graphic representation of a language: the status of calligraphy in many cultures; sacred scripts; runes and their social/cultural/spiritual importance

Figure 1.3 'Monumentalising' Language

1.3 The Significance of this Research to Studies of Monuments, Monumentalisation & Visitor Attractions

Monuments are social in their production process—they are often conceived by committees and are meant to reflect a community's values in their meaning. By their very nature and form of construction, monuments are designed and built for permanence, to connect a particular time with present and future generations. They are often central in location, reflecting their importance as markers of the collective values attached to and ideologies of a people.

Monuments, however, are not without inherent problems. Monuments are, by nature, dynamic constructs and, over time, may come to stand for something beyond that to
which they were originally intended (Nora, 1984). Their meaning, significance and relevance alter over time (see Riegl, 1982), as they are impacted upon by the values, beliefs, ideas, understandings and perspectives of the generations that follow. If the significance of a monument fails to change through the continued renewal of the site, it may become an anachronistic relic of a bygone era and provide little relevance or social or cultural significance to a contemporary populace or citizenry. In the hands of a ruling elite, monuments may maintain an outward, or official, appearance of relevance and significance but, in the eyes of the general public, may bear few of the symbolic or representational hallmarks associated with such structures. Monuments must, therefore, have the capacity to absorb new meanings in order to maintain relevance with successive generations and new audiences, as well as to serve as a reminder of the site's original meaning to retain their cultural significance (ICOMOS, 2008). If a monument remains static in meaning, encapsulating a certain time and culture for which it was made, failure to resonate with the changing culture that surrounds it will arguably cause the monument to atrophy, if not in physical terms, then in terms of its meanings, significance and cultural relevance.

Monuments constitute an important ‘genre’ within the pantheon of visitor attractions and provide a primary motive for many people to visit a particular town, city, region or country. Along with sites of archaeological, historic, and artistic value, monuments, as tangible examples of material cultural heritage, become centres of visitor interest and, thus, become important attractions. ‘There has been increasing interest in heritage tourism both as a subject of academic study and as a growing component in the tourist industry,’ writes Chintaram et al. (2009:1). The consistent popularity and the increase in the numbers of visitors to cultural properties indicate their significance as sites of attraction. From the visitor standpoint, the rich legacy (Chintaram et al., 2009) of monuments, buildings and special landmarks emphasising the local character of an area generates a unique sense of place. People visit a monument, as they do most attractions, for a variety of reasons. Reasons might include such things as to experience being in its presence, to learn about its history and/or to become imbied in its ‘spirituality’ or to appreciate the efforts that went into the creation of what is often perceived in superlative terms because of its beauty, its structure or its sense of awe. Underlying this, it is important to keep in mind that the purpose of a monument is to encapsulate in its
structure and symbolism those cultural values which many humans intrinsically hold dear. Victory, triumph, achievement and success, conquest, feats of bravery or overcoming adversity, respect, horror, sacrifice, awe, celebration, war, the past, history in and of itself—these are but some of the traits which are often embodied within the structure of a monument. This, of course, is not to suggest that these values will be universally held by all who come into contact with a monument. In fact, as in the case of the ATM, these values might be openly and vigorously contested.

The potentially contentious nature of people’s attitudes towards monuments stems, in part, from the fact that people are active agents in the meaning-making process. They make meaning from their interactions with what they encounter, construing their own meanings in their experiences, rather than being passive targets (Incirlioglu, 2004:39; Staiff et al., 2013). As an integral part of my research, then, I have been particularly interested in examining how visitors interact with these attractions, how that ‘attraction’ is given meaning and how that meaning is generated and received by visitors.

This is a study which seeks to provide a much needed contribution to the under-served area of language tourism. In the broadest terms, my research augments the existing body of knowledge in the field of tourism and cultural studies in a number of ways. This thesis gives greater acknowledgement and emphasis to the importance of the research of intangible culture by making a distinct contribution to a body of knowledge through an original investigation (Moses, 1985). In the process, it raises the profile of language and languages and of their importance in the sphere of tourism studies; it furthers our understandings of visitors’ experiences at attractions and sites; and, most broadly, it opens up the debate on the impact of tourism on the local linguistic landscape for further research and scholarship.

1.4 Thesis Overview

Following on from this Introduction, Chapter 2 provides a theoretical framework within which to locate monuments in general and the ATM in particular, informed by existing scholarly research on visitor attractions. The discussion draws on the literature on visitor attractions to demonstrate the ways in which visitor attractions can be conceptualised and understood.
Chapter 3 provides a discussion of the notion of ‘monument’ and of its many and varied definitions, its various meanings and connotations. It draws on the extensive literature related to monuments and examines the contributions made by scholars in helping establish an understanding of what monuments are and what they represent to us and what they inculcate in us as humans. Chapters 2 and 3 therefore lay the theoretical groundwork for the more focused and closer detailed examination of the ATM in Chapter 5.

Chapter 4 explains the research methodology. The chapter moves from a general discussion of the study’s approach to critically reflect upon the research paradigm and other broad philosophical and methodological considerations which have directly influenced the research design and the various processes, procedures and practices used. This involves a discussion of hermeneutic (interpretive) phenomenology which outlines the importance of the qualitative data collection methods and techniques adopted for this research. This is then followed by a section in which I situate myself as the researcher. The research process and research design are subsequently described. Further to this, the data collection methods of direct observation and interview techniques are detailed, as well as a discussion of the ways in which one can apply these interpretative tools to infer knowledge from the data set of observations and interviews.

Chapter 5 details the origins and history of the ATM and how it has been, and is, perceived of as a symbol of cultural identity as well as a visitor attraction. So as to place those details into their socio-historical and cultural contexts, a narrative of the Monument’s emergence is told through a detailed discussion of the origins, development and social significance of the Afrikaans language as its backdrop.

Chapter 6 explores the physical and spatial attributes of the ATM and draws on and extends Edensor’s (1998) model to examine and analyse the visitor experience as ‘staged performance’.

Chapter 7 uses interview data to examine the ways in which visitors interpret and give meaning to the ATM and to the meaning they assign to the Monument. The various motivations which lead people to visit the site are explored, as are the details of the
multitude of meanings which this single location holds. It will be demonstrated that a visit to the ATM is an interactive encounter influenced by both the site attributes and individual’s socio-cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

Chapter 8 presents the conclusions, describes the study’s limitations and proposes potential future research directions.
Chapter 2

Visitor Attractions

Tourism depends on attractions. Rarely do people travel because they enjoy the car or airplane ride or because they want to stay in a particular hotel or dine at a restaurant in a different city. The desire to go to another place is stimulated by attractions. (Crompton, 2010:3)

2.1 Introduction

Visitor attractions are ‘fundamental to the very existence of tourism’ (Lew, 1987:553). Several authors (Lew, 1987; Gunn, 1979; Lundberg, 1980; Pearce, 1981; Pigram, 1983) have gone so far as to argue that, without attractions, tourism as we know it would cease to exist. The literature on visitor attractions is indeed quite extensive and the concept has been examined from many different and disparate disciplinary perspectives. The review of literature in this chapter is necessarily limited and directed towards the study’s aims and objectives. In broad terms, a good deal of attention is given to Dean MacCannell’s (1976, 2001) groundbreaking contributions to the study of attractions which derived very much from a sociological/anthropological/semiotic perspective; Neil Leiper’s (1990) systems analysis perpective; Phillip Pearce’s (1991, 2005) psychological approach; Alan Lew’s (1987) geographical analysis; and Clare Gunn’s (1979, 1988) concentric circle model which highlights attraction design and planning concerns. Each of these scholars is acknowledged in some detail for their theoretical contributions which provided me with the conceptual tools to approach the analysis of the empirical data gathered during my fieldwork.

The chapter begins with an overview of the many ways in which visitor attractions have been defined. While attractions must, tautologically speaking, take the form of something which entices visitors to visit them, it is often difficult to conceptually differentiate between what may and what may not constitute an attraction, if in fact any
such distinction serves any real or conceptual relevance. Distinctions may become blurred because what constitutes attractions and why visitors may be attracted to them will be largely determined by visitors’ motives or impetus for visiting or participating in some sort of activity. While cultural heritage may include tangible aspects, such as buildings, memorials and landscapes, there is an increasing recognition that it also includes the intangible such as cultural practices, oral traditions, events, music, cuisine and knowledge (McKercher & du Cros 2002). According to the WTO (2012), Intangible Cultural Heritage ‘is embodied in those practices, expressions, knowledge, and skills, as well as in associated objects and cultural spaces, that communities and individuals recognize as part of their cultural heritage. Transmitted through generations and constantly recreated, it provides humanity with a sense of identity and continuity.’ Yet, whilst there is a substantial and growing body of research into the area of ICH, with such things as the analysis of festivals, events, conventions, exhibitions and performances becoming the foci of academic attention, the research emphasis is overwhelmingly weighted in favour of more permanent and tangible attractions. Few studies of attractions which I was able to locate take into account intangible or temporary features or practices, rather implying a certain permanency which constitutes an attraction (Hu & Wall, 2005; Lew, 1987; Pearce, 1991), so the chapter addresses the ways in which examples of intangible heritage such as language can be as much an attraction for visitors.

More recently, analyses of visitor attractions have directed special attention to the contribution made by the human senses in making visitor experiences at visitor attractions (e.g., Crouch, 2001; Edensor, 1998; Rakic & Chambers, 2011; Xin et al. 2012; Veijola & Jokinen, 1994; Wearing & Wearing, 1996). Such a shift in perspective emphasises the importance of human interaction with and responses to a site. The move to address this ‘conceptual gap’ (Xin et al., 2012:81) demonstrates how crucial the different corporeal and sensorial experiences and their processes are in meaning construction, where visitors interpret and derive the general significance of an attraction based on the range of sensual modalities of experience. With Roden (2011), I prefer to argue that, in these terms, the role of the visitor is as co-creator or producer of an attraction, rather than as its consumer.
The chapter extends the analysis of visitor attractions to present a sensory approach to the tourist experience of an attraction. Previous studies privileged the sense of vision and were concerned with the ‘ocularcentric’ nature of the tourist gaze which failed to recognise the role of the body in the tourist experience’ (Xin et al., 2012:81). More recent research in tourism studies claims a holistic approach to the five senses with a view to understanding their role in global visitor experiences (Dann & Jacobsen, 2003; Gretzel & Fesenmaier, 2003; Govers, Go & Kumar, 2007; Kastenholz, Carneiro, Marques & Lima, 2011; Pan & Ryan, 2009). What may or may not be deemed to be a visitor attraction is subject to the whims of popularity, trends and patterns and the dynamics of taste. At any given time, both collective and individual socio-cultural, political, ideological, environmental and communicative contexts will contribute to forming the basis for the social judgement which results in what is recognised as an attraction.

The chapter then critically examines the ways in which intangible features of cultural heritage may be realised as visitor attractions. The discussion introduces the small but burgeoning field of language-related attractions and draws on the notion of ‘monumentalisation’ as one way in which language-as-attraction can be tangibly achieved.

2.2 ‘Visitor Attraction’ Defined

Boorstin (1964) has suggested that the concept of an ‘attraction’ (in touristic terms) is an essentially modern one, dating the appearance of the term from 1862. Regarded by many as the ‘first power’, ‘lodestones for pleasure’ (Gunn, 1988) and the core components of the tourism industry (Benckendorff & Pearce, 2003; Benckendorff, 2006), visitor attractions arguably form the integral and major part of the tourism infrastructure and marketing strategies of many destinations (Mehmetoglu & Abelsen, 2005) as well as providing a ‘fundamental element of the tourist experience’ (Fennel, 2008:2). Attractions serve two key abstract functions: to stimulate interest in travel to a destination and to subsequently provide visitor satisfaction (Gunn, 1988). MacCannell (1976) maintains that visitor attractions have such important social and cultural value that they give meaning to modern existence. As such, then, Gunn (1988:24) has suggested, ‘they [attractions] represent the most important reasons for travel to
There are as many different definitions of what constitutes a tourist attraction (Walsh-Heron & Stevens, 1990; Holloway, 1994; Swarbrooke, 1995; Lomine & Edmonds, 2007) as there are types of attractions. While attractions have received much attention from researchers, Richards (2002) argues that they are poorly understood, with research lacking conceptual sophistication and depth. Even though the visitor attraction is what lies at the 'heart' of tourism, what constitutes a 'visitor attraction', however, is not something which can be easily identified. Lew (1987) points out that various attempts have been made to reduce the concept to exploitable 'resources' (e.g. Ferrario, 1976:4); marketable 'products' (Wahab et al., 1976:38) and 'images' (WTO, 1980a, 1980b); place 'attributes' (Wittner, 1985:13); or 'features' (Polacek & Aroch, 1984:17). According to Beckendorff (2006:250), any decisive definition of what constitutes a visitor attraction ‘remains elusively out of reach’. Notwithstanding these shortcomings, recent research efforts reveal the many complexities associated with the visitor attraction which has resulted in a diverse range of functioning definitions and approaches to their better understanding.

A visitor attraction has been variously described as ‘a permanent resource, either natural or human-made, which is developed and managed for the primary purpose of attracting visitors’ (Hu & Wall, 2005:619); ‘all those elements of a “non-home” place that draw discretionary travelers away from their homes’ (Lew, 1987:554); and as ‘a named site with a specific human or natural feature which is the focus of visitor and management attention’ (Pearce, 1991:46). Such definitions (Gunn, 1972; Hede & Hall, 2006; Leiper, 1990; Lew, 1987; Pearce, 1998) combine key features in relation to the permanence of an attraction and of its various component elements and its primary purpose. Such definitions are, however, limited as they fail to take into account those experiences which are temporary in nature, including special events, festivals, hallmark events, major-events, mega-events (Jago & Shaw, 1998) and cultural displays.

What constitutes a visitor attraction may, as has been suggested above, be anything which might be tautologically oversimplified as being something which attracts visitation (Lundberg, 1985; Mill & Morrison; Holloway, 1985; Epperson, 1989). Dann (1996), for example, highlights the fact that with some creativity almost anything can be
transformed into an attraction. MacCannell (1976) extrapolates this notion even further, suggesting that modern society makes itself the principal attraction within which other attractions are embedded. Pearce, Morrison & Rutledge (1998:266), in accordance with Urry (1990), suggest that ‘attractions are the places and people which are the objects of the gaze of tourists’ (my emphasis) while to that definition could also be added ‘natural phenomena’ (such as whale watching, safaris, coral spawning or watching the Aurora Borealis, for example).

Some scholars (Lomine & Edmunds, 2007; Fyall, Garrard, Leask & Wanhill, 2008) categorise visitor attractions on the basis of the resource itself, as being either purpose built, with the intention of encouraging visitor attendance (theme parks, zoos, casinos); made objects whose original intentions have become displaced to become attractions (dam, sporting ground, museum, slum, village); natural phenomena (lakes, rivers, glaciers, forests); natural events (observing gorillas, wildflower blooming in the Karoo, South Africa or the Flinders Ranges, South Australia); and social, cultural, sporting or entertainment events. Sternberg (1997) categorised attractions as being either natural, historical, popular culture or fantasy environments, while Pearce (1998) suggested categories of natural environment feature, cultural or historical feature, or commercial feature. The lack of any succinct, rigorous definition highlights the fluid and contentious nature of what actually comprises a visitor attraction and highlights the difficulties in deriving meaning from a highly disparate and continually evolving notion within tourism studies. In the absence of any definitive meaning, this present study is not inhibited by or reliant upon any single definition of the term ‘attraction’. This approach, therefore, promotes the use of a number of conceptual frameworks which, collectively, permit and inform more eclectic understandings of the term.

2.3 Understanding Visitor Attractions

A number of conceptual frameworks have been advanced to help provide an understanding of the elements which constitute visitor attractions. MacCannell (1976) described visitor attractions in terms of a triadic structure of empirical relationships—between a visitor/tourist (the human component), a site (the actual destination or physical entity visited) and a marker (some form of information which the visitor uses to identify and give meaning to the particular attraction). A ‘marker’, then, represents a
site to a (potential) visitor and it is the marker which constitutes a site/sight or attraction as a site/sight or attraction (Culler, 1990). Therefore, if a marker, directly or indirectly, identifies an attraction as an attraction, then this identification process is of importance, particularly in terms of the perceived intentionality or unintentionality of attraction (Riegl, 1982). Markers may take the form of ‘on site’ plaques or placards, postcards, posters, clothing and other paraphernalia available for purchase and ‘mobile markers’ such as pamphlets and brochures or details in guidebooks or online websites designed to entice people to visit a site, to give information about the site or to serve as souvenirs or representations of the site (Culler 1990:5). Such markers, according to Culler (1990:6), be they ‘tacky representations—postcards, ashtrays, ugly painted plates’—or something which he might perceive to be somewhat less ‘vulgar’, are important. This is because they serve the purposes of helping to create a visitor sight or attraction and also function as important reference points from which a visitor can discover the features of significance when visiting sites/sights. The visitor more often than not engages in the creation of further markers by either writing or speaking about the attraction or, more generally, by photographing or otherwise recording it. Thus, and with direct reference to MacCannell’s conceptualisation, the visitor experience directly involves the production of, or participation in, a sign relation between marker and sight (Culler 1990:6) by a visitor. It is the proliferation of markers which frames something as an attraction for visitors. These markers inform the visitor that this place is a visitor attraction. Furthermore, it is the markers which stimulate interest in an attraction and serve as visitation-prompting mechanisms.

The marker and the sight can be confused, however: Holloway (1994) has suggested that a visitor attraction is ‘any site that appeals to people sufficiently to encourage them to travel there in order to visit it’. It can be argued, however, that it is, at least in part, the work of the markers which stimulate interest and create appeal which persuades a visitor to visit an attraction. If, as according to MacCannell (1976:110-111), a marker is a representation of—a semiotic ‘signifier’—or ‘information about a specific sight’, it is important to understand that that representation need not be a physical manifestation of the attraction but may be intangible, an abstraction and simply exist in the mind of the tourist rather than as some concrete object. MacCannell’s (1976:110) ‘use of the term extends it to cover any information about a sight, including that found in travel books,
museum guides, stories told by persons who have visited it, art history texts and lectures, ‘dissertations’ and so forth’. This, of course, does not suggest that the representation is not ‘real’, but it does suggest that the form of the representation, what and how it represents the attraction, will have some bearing on the tourist’s understanding, attitude towards and interpretation of the attraction—even before visiting. It stands to reason, then, that there may be as many markers or representations of attractions as there are potential tourists and what constitutes an attraction to one potential visitor may not to another, while what constitutes a visitor attraction at any given point in time may change.

MacCannell’s (1976) analysis places attractions firmly in the semiotic ‘camp’. He makes clear that the significance of attractions as markers of meaning and social production and consumption is far greater than the role of attractions as sites of activity. Although he concentrates on the nature of the ‘sight’, he is adamant that it cannot be viewed in isolation and must be seen as a part of a wider system of signification. Leiper (1990) draws upon this idea and further articulates it in his conceptualisation of attractions as comprising part of a wider attraction system. MacCannell (1976, 1990) has also provided a useful sociological account of the development of visitor attractions. He argues that there is an orderly development process of ‘site sacralisation’ through which some attractions move, wherein sites are transformed from simple places to ‘sacred’ and worthy attractions. To achieve this ‘sacred’ status, an attraction must be:

(a) **named**, with a clear label and location;
(b) **framed and elevated**, effectively placing a boundary around the attraction, controlling admission, promoting it and opening it up for visitation;
(c) **enshrined**, particular and unique features specified;
(d) **socially reproduced**, identified with or by a group or region; and,
(e) **mechanically reproduced**, having souvenirs or other curios manufactured.

This approach is limited by the fact that it describes only a possible ordered sequence in the development of visitor attractions and is not, as MacCannell purports, necessarily an orderly process. MacCannell’s framework is, nevertheless, a useful analytical tool for offering insights about the evolution of attractions and for understanding the steps
MacCannell considers ‘necessary for a site to become a successful tourist destination’ (Forristal et al., 2011:571).

Lew (1987) argues that under MacCannell’s conditions of the tourist-site-marker, virtually anything has the potential to become an attraction, including services and facilities. Lew, instead, chooses to emphasise the subjective and objective characteristics of attractions, providing typologies of how visitor attractions have been researched. He suggests that consideration should be given to three main areas of an attraction which he identifies as: the ‘ideographic’ (the physical uniqueness of a named attraction, including general environmental features such as natural beauty, climate, culture, social customs and characteristics); the ‘organisational’ (the spatial, capacity and temporal nature of an attraction); and the ‘cognitive’ (the study of visitor perceptions and experiences and how a place elicits visitors’ feelings, related to what Relph [1976] termed ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’) or what I prefer to term the ‘proximity-distance continuum’. This notion of the ‘proximity-distance continuum’ is based upon the idea of the real or perceived cognitive, aesthetic or affective association an individual feels s/he has with an attraction. That it is a continuum more meaningfully describes the relationship than the insider/outsider dichotomy suggested by Relph (1976), for instance, as it allows for much subtler and more nuanced explanations of the relationships people have with visitor attractions and the degrees of influencing factors which can impact upon and serve to define those relationships, as well as on visitors’ interpretations and meanings of an attraction.

Lew’s (1987) comprehensive and multi-dimensional view presents three research cross-perspectives which, when taken together, form the basis of a single body of knowledge. By apportioning the ‘attraction pie’ in this way emphasises the different disciplinary and ideological approaches in determining what constitutes the salient features of tourist attractions. It is unnecessary to repeat Lew’s (1987) lengthy discussions here, other than to point out that when attempting to incorporate organisational or cognitive perspectives to ideographic typologies, there is an increasing degree of abstraction. In terms of the ideographic approach, attractions have some ‘tangible, material presence’ and, at its most basic, it distinguishes between nature-oriented and those with a human orientation which Lew arranges along a nature-human continuum. Lew’s organisational
perspective focuses on the spatial capacity and temporal nature of attractions where each of these features contributes to an increased understanding of the organisation of tourist attractions which, when considered, are important in their planning and marketing. As well, Lew’s (1987) work is important as it provides a useful synthesis of scholarly research on attractions and a framework for considering the various aspects of attractions.

There has also been scholarly discussion in relation to the differentiation between visitor attractions and destinations. Although MacCannell concentrates on the nature of the ‘sight’, as discussed above, he is also adamant that it cannot be viewed in isolation but must be seen as part of a wider system of signification. Swarbrooke (2002:9), like MacCannell, explains attractions as ‘generally single units ... easily delimited geographical areas based on a single key feature ...’. Further to this, he suggests that destinations, in comparison, ‘are larger areas that include a number of individual attractions ...’, although such a statement is somewhat contentious as the definition of ‘destination’ depends very much on visitors’ perceptions. Leiper (1990) furthers this notion when he discusses attractions as comprising part of a wider system. For Leiper, attractions do not operate independently, but form a part of the broader local, regional, national and/or global milieu or system to which they (geographically, ideationally or conceptually) belong:

A tourist attraction is a systematic arrangement of three elements: a person with touristic needs, a nucleus (any feature or characteristic of a place they might visit) and at least one marker (information about the nucleus).

(Leiper, 1990:381)

An attraction ‘comes into existence when the three elements are connected’ (Leiper, 1990:371). The ‘nucleus’ is an attribute—‘any feature or characteristic of a place that a traveller contemplates visiting or actually visits’ (Leiper, 1990:371-372; emphasis in original)—which influences and motivates the decision to visit a certain place. Unlike Gunn’s (1988) concept of attraction magnetism (‘pull’ factor), according to Leiper (1990), visitors are motivated towards attractions, based upon the fact that their needs will be satisfied (‘push’ factor).

Gunn (1972, 1988) identified attractions as developed locations which are planned and managed for visitor interest, activity and enjoyment, and towards which people are
‘pulled’ or attracted. Gunn was the first to present a model of an attraction in diagrammatic form. His model, comprising three concentric rings, describes the physical resource settings which together make up the spatial environment of a visitor attraction. The central ring represents the ‘nucleus’ with the core attraction, the next ring is the ‘inviolable belt’, the space needed to give meaning to the attraction, and which separates the core attraction from the ‘zone of closure’ where can be found the collection of services, facilities and commercial aspects such as toilets, information and souvenir shops.

Pearce’s (1991) work involved a synthesising of Gunn’s concentric circles model with Canter’s (1977) sense of place model. Canter’s model uses a Venn diagram of three components considered necessary to gain a ‘sense of place’: the physical setting and attributes of the site, analogous to MacCannell’s (1976) ‘sight’ and Gunn’s ‘nucleus’; the activities offered for visitors at the site; and the concepts and meaning which visitors bring to the site and which is related to MacCannell’s (1976) notion of the ‘marker’. According to Canter (1977), it is through such things as signage, brochures and interpretation that visitors can conceptualise and derive meaning from and give meaning to an attraction through this ‘sense of place’ creation.

2.4 A Holistic Sensory Approach to Visitor Attractions

Recent research in tourism studies presents and positions a more holistic approach to the role of all the human senses of hearing, smell, taste and touch as well as sight in visitor experiences of attractions. This ‘sensory turn’ reflects the extent to which the traditional practice of sight-seeing has been eclipsed by the strategy of engaging all five senses and inducing a state of what Howes (2004, 2011) calls ‘hyperaesthesia’ in the visitor to attractions. Howes (2004) argues that there has been increasing multidisciplinary attention being devoted to scholarship around the importance of the role of the senses in the individual’s perception of the surrounding world. In fact, researchers in human geography, anthropology, environmental psychology and cultural history have been claiming that perception, understanding and meaning making are derived not only from the mind, but are also influenced by corporeal interactions with an environment or place within a specific period of time (Classen, 1997; Howes, 2004; Rodaway, 1994; Smith, 2007; Tuan, 1977). It is through the human senses that individuals are provided with
information about the surrounding world and mediate everyday experiences, allowing them to perceive and make sense of the world (Rodaway, 1994). Therefore, the relevance of the visitor experience to the conceptualisation of visitor attractions cannot be underestimated.

Some authors hold that tourism research has been systematically centred on the visual component of the tourist experience (Pan and Ryan, 2009). In 1990, Urry expanded upon MacCannell’s analysis of the sightseeing ritual by introducing the concept of the tourist ‘gaze’ (a term borrowed from Foucault, [1973]), thereby emphasising the primacy of the visual—‘the act of seeing, the gaze’ (Foucault, 1973:ix)—in visitor practices. Foucault (1975) elaborated on his concept of the gaze to illustrate a particular dynamic in power relations which Urry (1990) was to take up. For Urry (1990), ‘the power relations inherent in the gaze enable people to both visually possess the objects of tourism but at the same time determines what they can gaze upon’ (Urry, cited in Richards, 2001:1050). Whilst Urry (1990) argued that the ‘gaze’ is socially organised and that visitors do not have complete agency, MacCannell (2001) has challenged Urry’s ‘universalised’ notion of the gaze, suggesting that visitors may, in fact, have even less agency than Urry proposes because they are largely controlled by the power of narratives and various discourses which shape visitors’ experience of attraction (Pritchard & Morgan, 2000). Nevertheless, this does not necessarily mean that there is an ocular predominance in tourism, since cultural, social, and geographical factors have historically determined shifts in sensory perception (Howes, 2005; Smith, 2007; Classen, 1997; Tuan, 1977), and, consequently, in travel experience (Adler, 1989; Markwell, 2001; Pocock, 2002). Thus, more recent studies point to the complex role that all bodily senses play in the embodiment of visitor experiences by focusing on a holistic approach of the senses (Dann & Jacobsen, 2003; Ellis & Rossman, 2008; Gretzel & Fesenmaier, 2003; Govers et al., 2007; Pan & Ryan, 2009; Urry, 2002; Veijola & Jokinen, 1994).

The theoretical basis for this research is drawn from what might be termed ‘experience studies’. It has been observed that rewarding and positive visitor experiences lie at the heart of successful tourism (de Botton, 2002; Morgan et al., 2010; and Ryan, 2000). Recently, researchers (Schmitt, 2003; Baerenholdt, Haldrup, Larsen & Urry, 2004;
Cutler & Carmichael, 2010) have suggested that it is important to measure multiple aspects of how people respond to sites and settings. Places, surrounding environments and activities engaged in by visitors have, therefore, been described as multisensory, constituted not only by visual impressions, but also by the associated sounds, smells, tastes and touch (Bitner, 1992; Casey, 1996; Heide & Gronhaug, 2006; Howes, 2006; Macnaghten & Urry, 1998; Porteous, 1985; Rodaway, 1994; Tuan, 1977; Urry, 2002). For the participant, experience tends to be a holistic and integrated flow of reactions and emotions as they move through space and time. Taking MacCannell’s example, for instance, for people watchers who intentionally sit sipping their coffees and camparis at outside venues observing the ‘passing parade’ of locals simply going about their daily business in Rome (MacCannell, 1976:130-131), the ‘attraction’ for them may constitute much more than the site itself. Instead, the ‘attraction’ incorporates those much less tangible, sensory features, not only of the sights but the sounds, the smells, the tastes and the activities occurring around them at a particular time, which together create the visitor experience.

In this context, besides the paradigm of embodiment which implies an integration of mind and body (Csordas, 1990; Merleau-Ponty, 1962), it becomes important to understand the paradigm of emplacement which suggests the sensory interrelationship between body, mind and environment (Howes, 2006; Rodman, 1992; Tuan, 1977). Regarding this relationship between body, people and places, Porteous (1985) devised the term ‘sensescapes’, arguing that, similar to the notion of landscape, with its primarily visual connotations, other senses can be spatially ordered or place-related, such as ‘smellscape’, ‘soundscape’, ‘tastescape’, or geography of touch (Macnaghten and Urry, 1998; Urry, 2002), ‘scapes’ that suggest multiple sensory experiences within different geographical and touristic contexts (Degen, 2008; Rodaway, 1994; Crouch, 2002; Markwell, 2001; Pocock, 2002). While Oh, Fiore & Jeoung (2007:120) consider that ‘everything tourists go through at a destination can be experience’, Mossberg (2007) prefers to use the ‘experiencescape concept’ as an extension of Porteous’ (1985) ‘smellscape’ and Bitner’s (1992) ‘servicescape’. The latter refers to the physical features around a service production, influencing individuals’ internal responses and behaviour, while the former focuses the tourists’ global consumption, which includes a destination as an experience environment.
Schmitt (1999) postulates that experiences can be characterised by five strategic experience modules which, though circumscribed, are connected and interact with each other: sensory (sense), affective (feel), creative cognitive (think), physical/behaviours and lifestyles (act), and social-identity (social). Pearce et al. (2013) similarly write that visitors’ overall experiences are constituted by the perceptual, cognitive, sensory, social, and that bodily and emotional experiences arise from their interactions with the attributes of the destination (see Figure 2.1). This line of thinking explains the physical site or social setting as playing an important role in stimulating sensory and other bodily experiences as well as social experiences for visitors (Pearce et al. 2013). Furthermore, how an attraction is perceived is related to the development of conceptual ideas about the attraction. The combination of perceptual experiences and social experiences can lead to a higher level of cognitive experience and increased knowledge and, together, each of these experiences plays a role in generating emotional experiences. When visitors experience a destination, they typically engage in the process of associating the destination with some familiar constructs, whether they are familiar ‘self’ (e.g., recollection of past experiences) or familiar ‘others’ (e.g., relating the destination/experience with similar settings/constructs). The critical step in the process of experience is that of meaning construction, where visitors derive the general ‘significance’ of the experience based on the various interrelated elements of experience. The perceived meaningful experience will eventually generate the feeling of attachment to a site (Pearce et al. 2013).

Specific sense modalities (Greztel & Fesenmaier, 2003; Rodaway, 1994) are operationalised when they are coupled with elements which contribute to the visitor experience. These include bodily experiences and behaviours exhibited (e.g., hearing, seeing, walking, etc.) (Groenewald’s [2004] ‘spatiality’ and ‘corporeality’), affective reactions (e.g. positive and negative emotional expressions or gestures identified), cognitive mechanisms used to think about and understand the attraction, the behaviours exhibited and the relevant relationships (‘relationality’) which define the visitor’s world. In combination, these experiences and behaviours all combine in real or lived time (‘temporality’) to provide the means by which to make meaning of an attraction.
Edensor (2001:65), visitors ‘perform’ tourism, itself a type of ‘social drama’ (Geertz, 1983), where visitors and locals, i.e. ‘non-visitors’, distinguished by their connection with a locality through residency (Sherlock, 2001:276), perform their ‘roles’ as ‘actors’ by walking, gazing, photographing, remembering. Echoing MacCannell’s (1976) and Goffman’s (1959) notion of the ‘dramaturgical approach’ to human interaction where actions are dependent upon time, place, and audience, the spaces upon or social contexts within which they perform are termed ‘stages’. It is on these touristic stages that visitors engage in their ‘choreographed’, regulated and ‘culturally coded patterns of tourist behaviour’ (2001:60) or spatially-scripted and directed ‘performances’. Here Edensor (1998) assumes a postmodern approach by outlining a theory of the visitor experience which interconnects Urry’s ‘gaze’ with bodily movement and memory. Edensor (1998:200) ‘disavows the idea that places have some essential identity’ to argue that the meaning of an attraction is constructed by those who visit it and is, therefore, subject to improvisation and contestation.

2.5 Intangible Cultural Heritage as Visitor Attraction

The perception that a temporary or intangible feature of a society including oral traditions, performing arts, language and social practices and events (UNESCO, 2003) can form the basis for a visitor attraction has often been overlooked in much of the tourist literature. As evidenced in the definitions above (Section 2.2), whilst there is plenty of literature which examines such things as events, the overriding perception
seems to be that an attraction takes the form of a permanent and tangible object or place. Such definitions, however, neglect those embodied traditions or living expressions which are played out or performed, either consciously or unconsciously, staged or unstaged which form the basis for people to visit a destination. Increasingly, visitors are looking beyond the experience of the packaged tour or the three ‘Ss’ (Sun, Sand and Sex) holiday and the global wealth of culture and traditions has become one of the principal motivations for travel, with visitors seeking to engage with new cultures, experience other places and to become physically, emotionally and spiritually involved in the cultural heritage of other communities and societies (Robinson, 2008). What is termed ‘cultural tourism’ is, according to Edgren (2008:16), a member of the Finnish National Board of Antiquities and the Monitoring Group on Cultural Heritage in the Baltic Sea Region, ‘one of the fastest growing industries in the world, with people fascinated by and attracted to aspects of cultural heritage and wishing to be offered a suitable experience’.

Heritage is a broad term applied to a range of material objects, places and practices which a particular culture or society values and wishes to conserve (Carlsen et al., 2008). Such ‘cultural properties’ (Bouchenaki, 2003:1) form part of what is termed ‘cultural heritage’. According to the Venice Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites (ICOMOS, 1964) where a code of professional standards was established to provide an international framework for the preservation and restoration of ancient buildings, ‘cultural heritage’ consisted only of ‘monuments and sites’ and dealt with architectural heritage (Bouchenaki, 2003:1). Over the past fifty years, however, the term has broadened from its much narrower sense to include such tangible entities as landscapes and collections of objects and there is now an increasing recognition that cultural heritage also includes intangible cultural features (McKercher & du Cros, 2002).

Tangible aspects of cultural heritage present obvious focal points and may afford a desirable experience for visitors simply through their physical presence (Carlsen et al., 2008). However, it is not only tangible cultural heritage sites which attract tourists. Intangible cultural heritage, in the form of the performing arts, festivals and ritual practices, for example, also act as foci for visitors. The obvious physical appeal and accessibility of tangible heritage lends itself more readily to the ‘tourist gaze’ whereas
accessing intangible cultural heritage arguably requires a more complex interaction between a visitor and an activity centred on some level of engagement requiring an effort on the part of the visitor to interpret and make meaning of its significance. The capacity of these intangible entities to generate webs of signification and value lies embedded within. It is from within the embedded representations and symbolism that they articulate sets of particular social relations, embody certain beliefs, structures and values, symbolise and are representative, while transmitting and communicating certain ideas, beliefs, attitudes or feelings.

The relationship between intangible culture and tangible cultural heritage ‘is so close,’ writes Ito (2003:1), that they are ‘impossible to separate. Intangible culture produces tangible cultural objects which require intangible culture’. This, Bakker (2003:1) insists, is ‘the indivisible link between praxis and a philosophical and theoretical base’. Beyond the ‘bricks and mortar’ of a tangible cultural object, Ito is suggesting, it is the intangible features attributed to them which give those objects their cultural meaning. ‘It goes without saying,’ he continues, ‘that intangible culture makes the background of tangible cultural property, such as monuments and sites’ (2003:2). Although not strictly falling within the scope of this thesis, it is important to at least make mention of the commodification and value of intangible heritage when used for tourism.

Local culture, through festivals, performances and other events are often appropriated for tourism purposes. Since MacCannell (1973) first raised the issue, a whole body of literature already exists in tourism studies regarding the question as to whether such events should be considered ‘authentic’ or ‘staged’.

The WTO (2012:2) writes that ‘[f]ostering the responsible use of this living heritage for tourism purposes can provide new employment opportunities, help alleviate poverty, curb rural flight migration among the young and marginally-employed, and nurture a sense of pride among communities.’ Often, however, the opposite seems to be true. George (2010), however, argues that there ‘is often an inequity gap which exists in benefits distributed to many communities whose cultural heritages are being appropriated and exploited by multiple commercial entities for tourism purposes and personal gain’.

She further contends that ‘[l]ittle, if any, of the profits realized benefit the local community – the actual creators and owners of the local culture’. Clearly, then, there exists a need for the responsible management, protection and safeguarding of intangible
cultural heritage through tourism development (see also Carlsen et al., 2006 and Ahmed, 2006).

In coming to terms with the intangible values, associations and meanings, Bakker, thus, (2003) contends that there is an inseparable relationship between the physical aspect of a site or attraction and its intangible qualities. According to Bakker (2003:1), the ‘cultural significance’ of an attraction or site derives more from those intangible features which it embodies—its social or spiritual values, its symbolic qualities and meanings, its associations—than from its setting, use or fabric. Bouchenaki (2003:2) argues that ‘symbols, technologies and objects are tangible evidence of underlying norms and values’ and that there is a symbiotic relationship between the tangible and the intangible. ‘The intangible heritage,’ he writes, ‘should be regarded as the larger framework within which tangible heritage takes on shape and significance’ (Bouchenaki, 2003:2). Further to this, Michael Petzet (2003:1), President of ICOMOS, in his Introductory Lecture to the ICOMOS 14th General Assembly & Scientific Symposium, writes that a monument is ‘more than a tangible “object” consisting of a certain material’. Rather, he maintains, a monument is ‘an archive of authentic sources for cultural history, social history, industrial history, etc.’ while insisting that monuments, even in their materialisation, have ‘a mostly intangible dimension’ (2003:1-2).

For Petzet (2003:2), the tangible and intangible ‘are only two sides of the same medallion [sic].’ Tomaszewski (2003:1) explains that a ‘materialistic’ approach dominated the discussion of the values associated with monuments: ‘[T]he artistic, architectural, technical and historical values of their material substance’ were what was important. Consideration of non-material values, including the messages, content and symbolism, he adds, has only more recently been taken into account when assessing cultural property.

‘Intangible cultural heritage’, according to the definition provided by UNESCO (2003) in Article 2 of its Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage includes ‘language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage’ (Article 2.2, Unesco, 2003). Article 2 also includes many practices which are dependent upon their oral transmission for their maintenance and continuation, including oral traditions and
expression, performing arts, social practices, rituals and festive events, knowledge and
practices concerning nature and the universe, traditional craftsmanship. Language in
some manifestation is implicit within each of these domains, so much so that language
forms the cornerstone for the perpetuation and transmission of any society’s social and
cultural heritage. Language is vitally important in people’s efforts to constitute,
negotiate and articulate, to themselves and to others, a sense of cultural
distinctiveness—the corpus of ‘authentic’ traditions, cultural mores, or other specialised
activities (Garrett, 2007:139-140). As such, language is an integral and defining
expression of the culture and identity of a tourist destination and is a primary
contributing factor in defining what is unique, authentic and original about a
destination. Language serves to most directly (visually and aurally) differentiate—to
‘demarcate’ (Urry, 2002)—one tourist location from another and helps to give it its
particular ‘flavour’ and character.

In the face of mounting pressures to maximise their visitor potential by attracting the
broadest visitor base, one way host communities can try to carve out a niche in the
global tourism market, while at the same time trying to maintain their own unique
character, preserving their identity and ‘sense of place’, is to create an attraction for
visitors, related in some way to their own language and culture. As such, concrete
manifestations of language through such things as monuments, museums, statues or
other constructions, institutions, festivals or days dedicated to a language have begun to
appear in many parts of the world. Indeed, a small, but increasing, number of sites
around the world have been designed with the visitor in mind and to promote some
language-related theme (see Appendix 1 for a comprehensive list). Together, they
represent an emerging category of attractions available to visitors who are interested in
visiting sights which are dedicated to raising awareness and educating people about the
importance of language and languages around the world and alerting people to the
importance of language and languages as an integral part of cultural capital. For each of
these attractions, then, it could easily be argued that their design and construction have
been predominantly driven by moral and ideological imperatives. How language is
manifested as a visitor attraction will be defined by the purposes and functions of the
attraction which will, in part, determine its realisation (see Figure 1.3).
A language-related site is, for the most part, a purpose-built construction, publically acknowledging the importance of and to celebrate (a local) language in some tangible way, designed for public visitation and providing visitors with a variety of language-related experiences, activities and exhibitions. Some are dedicated to demonstrating the vitality of a particular language by raising our awareness of its literature and cultural context (e.g. the Lituanistikos židinys [Lithuanian Language Museum] in Vilnius, Lithuania and the Museu da Lingua Portuguesa [Museum of the Portuguese Language], São Paolo, Brazil). Others are dedicated more to the celebration and memorialisation of a language (e.g. the Monument to the Russian Language, Belgograd, Russia) or to the commemoration of people or events important in the history and development of particular languages (e.g. the stature of Sts Cyril and Methodius in Moscow and the ‘Shaheed Minar’ Language Martyrs’ Monument, Dacca, Bangladesh). As well as these sites, there are a large number of festivals, exhibitions and days held internationally and dedicated to the celebration of languages. Such manifestations offer a tangible means by which visitors and locals alike can develop a relationship with a language as well as recognise its intrinsic role as part of the broader cultural heritage.

That a certain number of ‘language monuments’ currently exist around the world suggests that one way to make language tangible and accessible is to create a real ‘place’ as a focal point where visitors can both physically and mentally interact with language and its various articulations. The creation of a physical manifestation as a representation or commemoration of language is one possible dimension of what I have described above (Figure 1.3) as the process of ‘monumentalisation’. It is important to point out, however, that from both the phenomenological and constructivist viewpoint taken in this study, the idea of ‘place’ as a physical entity is replaced by one which sees ‘place’ as a mental construct—as ‘a result of a synergetic relationship existing between an individual, a physical site and related elements, that occur as the individual ascribes either perceptual or associational meanings to settings’ (Bakker, 2003:1) (cf. MacCannell’s and Leiper’s triadic relationships when describing what constitutes an attraction detailed above, Section 2.3). The suggestion here, of course, is that within the ‘monumentalisation’ process, those associated with motives behind, and the physical design and setting for, the construction, intentionally and purposefully encode certain meanings into the structure. For visitors, however, those circumscribed meanings may
be deciphered or decoded very differently, depending upon a number of different social, cultural and experiential factors which affect and help shape the relationship between the visitor, the physical site and its related elements.

Hall (1997:2) emphasises that culture is not ‘so much a set of things ... as a process, a set of practices’. Things “in themselves”,’ he suggests, ‘rarely if ever have any one single, fixed and unchanging meaning ... It is [however] by our use of things, and what we say, think and feel about them—how we represent them—that we give them a meaning’ (Hall, 1997:3). That people create monuments to language suggests some ideological, political, cultural, social or psychological imperative (Saffran, 2004). Yet, for whatever reasons a monument might be constructed, the very act of ‘monumentalising’ language points to its importance within the broader human psyche. The process of ‘monumentalising’ language, then, provides an innovative locus for the focusing of attention on this vitally important cultural symbol. Furthermore, language-related phenomena appear to be attracting ever-increasing numbers of visitors to them, perhaps suggesting a growing curiosity about language and an interest in the centrality of language and its social importance in all aspects of human experience.

2.6 Interpretation and Meaning-Making of Attractions

To help theoretically ground the observations of and comments made by visitors presented and analysed in Chapters 6 and 7 as to their interpretation of and meanings attached to the ATM, an outline of the literature on visitor interpretation studies is undertaken here, paying close attention to the work of key interpretation theorists including Moscardo (1996, 1999); Ham (1992, 2003); Weiler (2003); and Bramwell & Lane (1993).

Interpretation is a communication tool that is used to facilitate and enhance the ways in which visitors engage with the places they visit. It has been described as ‘an educational activity’ (Tilden, 1957); ‘a communication process’ (MacFarlane, 1987); ‘a management tool’ (Sharpe, 1982); and ‘a process of stimulating and encouraging appreciation’ (Carter in Wearing & Neil, 1999). Effective interpretation enables visitors to make connections between the information being given and their own knowledge and experience. A person’s knowledge, attitudes, values and behavioural orientations are
important factors when considering visitors’ interpretation and meaning-making of an attraction (Ballantyne & Packer, 2005). This suggestion is not unique and there have been a number of authors who have provided conceptual models for effective interpretation. As early as 1957, in his classic Interpreting Our Heritage, Tilden (1957) proposed a model of six principles, including the role of the guide and the need for addressing visitors’ emotions, which he argued led to effective interpretation, the result of which ‘he hoped would provide a more satisfying recreational experience’ (Bramwell & Lane, 1993:71-72).

Most recently, researchers have drawn on both communication theory and constructivist approaches to emphasise personal ‘meaning-making’ at attractions (Hein, 1999, 2001a, 2001b; Silverman, 1993, 1999). The ‘meaning-making’ literature stresses the view that visitors are active agents, rather than passive recipients of messages. It recognises that individuals bring their own backgrounds, experiences, orientations and attitudes to an attraction and are not necessarily predisposed to faithfully adhere to what any interpretive material might suggest (Doering & Pekarik, 1996).

Lidchi (1997) asserts that the value and meaning of objects and sites are inseparable from their context and are intelligible because their interpretation and meanings are shared and recognised by others in society. Hall (1997) rightly argues that meanings learned in the same or similar cultural or linguistic group will differ between individuals and rather than thinking of meaning in terms of ‘accuracy’ or truth, we should think more about meaning more ‘in terms of effective exchange—a process of translation, which facilitates cultural communication while always recognizing the persistence of difference and power between different “speakers” within the same cultural circuit’ (1997:11, emphasis in original). The nature of the different ‘translators’ will have a significant impact on the range of meanings which are recognised as ‘valid’ or acceptable and which are recognised as not. The understanding and interpretation of the same tourist attraction, for example, will depend on any number of variables impacting upon the visitor’s cognitive as well as the affective and sensorial processes of understanding and interpretation.

Hein (1999) concludes that human beings interpret data which the ‘senses take in from the natural world and from the symbolic and cultural worlds of words and signs’
This perspective very much aligns with a constructivist approach which recognises the importance of individual meaning-making and makes it a central tenet of practice (Hein, 1999). Constructivists argue that ‘people construct new knowledge and understandings based on what they already know and believe’ (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999:10). In other words, people make meaning based on experiences and how these fit into what they already have in their minds (Hein, 1999), demonstrating the ‘dialogic’ relationship and path of communication between the attraction and the visitor.

As long ago as 1992, Ham made a call to professional interpreters to ‘embrace the tourist’, a call which has been largely ignored from a theoretical perspective in the interpretation literature, an observation which has also been expressed recently by others (cf. Markwell & Weiler, 1998; Uzzell & Ballantyne, 1998). Ham (1992) developed a model that focuses on the style of interpretation and its content. His model states that, in order to be effective, interpretation needs to address four components. Firstly, it needs to be enjoyable so that people need to be motivated to engage with the interpretation. Secondly, it needs to be relevant to visitors; i.e. providing stories and concepts so that people can connect to the attraction through their own experience. The role of stories and metaphors is critical here. Thirdly, it needs to be organised and provide a clear structure to guide visitors and, finally, interpretation needs to be thematic and provide a message that visitors will remember following their visit. Ham’s conceptualisation has been termed the EROT model of interpretive communication: enjoyable; relevant; organised; and thematic. Ham (2003) argues that the first three components are applicable to any form of entertainment and that, if the aim of interpretation is to influence visitors’ attitudes or to form personal connections to the attraction, then the development of a theme or thematic component is critical to effective interpretation. This process, termed ‘thematic interpretation’, as defined by Ham (1992), centres around the provision of messages. The way these messages are provided and the communication outcomes will have different emphases depending on the aims that are being addressed.

Ham (2003) believes that if interpretation is to enhance visitor experiences, the first thing that must be accomplished is to provoke visitors to think about whatever is being interpreted. Effective themes, he suggests, enable visitors to make important
connections between their experiences and the feature being interpreted (Ham, 1992). When a theme matters and provokes the mind to thought, it stimulates a mental process of thinking, wondering and meaning making (Ham, 2003). Each person comes to a destination with a variety of influences where their knowledge of an area and previous travel experience can influence their interpretations of their experience (Jennings & Nickerson, 2006). Interpretation should be viewed as a mechanism for producing meanings that allow visitors to put a place, thing, time period or concept into some sort of personal perspective and to identify with it in a significant way (Ham, 2003). Taking these things into account, it is important to note, however, that not all themes are equally capable of stimulating visitors to think, as some themes simply do not matter to some, while others matter so much that people are provoked to think and ponder on new ideas never before considered (Ham, 2003).

Moscardo (1999) developed a model from the field of psychology which drew on the work by Langer (1989a, 1989b) on mindfulness. She has argued that visitors would only engage with and respond to on-site interpretive messages if they were mindful, i.e., interested, alert and willing to think about the interpretation provided. A key feature of her study was that she separated the interpretive experiences into three components: the style of interpretation (communication factors); the physical environment (physical factors); and personal factors relating to the visitor’s expectations, interests and mood (visitor factors). According to this model, when interpretative material is provided which appeals to a range of learning styles, in a physical setting that visitors feel comfortable in, it is more likely that visitors will become alert and interested in the interpretation and ultimately have a positive memorable experience of the attraction. This model exemplifies the challenges posed in terms of the complexity and uncertainty of how and when visitors interact with interpretation at an attraction. It is, therefore, important that any interpretation that is provided needs to be effective.

The emphasis on on-site interpretation to enhance visitors’ experiences of an attraction has been termed ‘meaning making’ (Ballantyne & Packer, 2005) and emphasises the way people construct their own knowledge (interpret and make their own meaning) based on their past and present experiences. Messages provided for visitors may not always be interpreted by visitors in the same way or the way that they might have been
originally intended. Serendipitous or unexpected events such as the spectacular landscape seen in the afternoon glow or sighting of a squirrel running between the trees may be of much greater significance, for example, and far more memorable than the experience of the attraction itself.

According to the poststructuralist French philosopher, Derrida, meaning is never fixed but is ‘subject to an endless process of deferral’ (Derrida, quoted in Weedon, 1987:25). Moreover, ‘[t]he effect of representation, in which meaning is apparently fixed is but a temporary retrospective fixing’ (Derrida, quoted in Weedon, 1987:25). Any temporarily fixed meaning will depend upon the discursive context within which it is situated (Mason, 2011). The recognition that any act of signification involves different and competing meanings which are dependent upon context is valuable when looking at the array of interpretations and meanings offered by visitors to an attraction and in looking at reasons as to why visitors may subscribe to those interpretations. Although speaking more directly about museum exhibits, Mason’s theorising is equally as relevant as when analysing meaning making at other sites and attractions. She suggests (2011:21) that meaning changes ‘when their place is revised or through the passage of time’ and the changing way in which visitors will understand objects in a different way. Re-signification is, over time and because of changing contexts, from a Derridean perspective, inevitable.

Visitors are much more than passive, unengaged recipients of meaning (Rossman & Ellis, 2012). They are, in fact, actively involved in the meaning-making process where the consumption process of attractions is characterised by complexity and diversity in respect to visitors’ faculties (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994). No longer are visitors understood to be the endpoint in a model of a simple, linear transmission of information and meaning or, to use Bennett’s (1995) terminology, a ‘monologue’, (1995:103-104) where ‘interpretation’ of an attraction is seen as something that should be done ‘for’ or ‘to’ visitors, forwarded in a one-way message to the visitor-recipient by some human or other on-site interpretive ‘transmitter’ (Mason, 2005).

Rounds (1999) goes so far as to say that it is meaning-making, rather than the acquisition of any information about an attraction or site in what he calls the ‘cultural transmission paradigm’ (1999:5) which is the primary objective of a visitor’s
experience. In the ‘transmission model’—also known as the ‘magic bullet or hypodermic needle theory’ (Mason, 2005:201)—a visitor is ‘injected’ with a message (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994:13) which sees the visitor, to some large degree, as a willing, passive recipient in the receipt of information and knowledge. The implication here, then, is that the visitor is more or less a tabula rasa—a ‘blank slate’—who uncritically accepts what he or she is told about an attraction (Rounds, 1999:5). According to Hall, ‘the receiver[s] of messages and meanings are not passive screens on which on the original meaning is accurately and transparently projected’ (Hall, 1997:10), but are, instead, active agents intimately engaged in the processes of production and consumption of meaning. Visitors are anything but empty vessels (Karp & Lavine, 1991; Falk & Dierking, 1992, 2000) and the meaning-making process is very much based upon a ‘transactional’ relationship developed between visitors and attractions (Hooper-Greenhill, 1994).

Pierre Bourdieu's ideas have been employed relatively rarely by tourism academics. They are, however, useful when trying to understand the transactional relationship between visitors and attractions to which Hooper-Greenhill (1994) refers. Bourdieu (1990) describes a person’s ‘auto-context’ as one’s ‘habitus’ (1990)—the internalised sensibilities and the embodiment of those lasting, acquired schemes of perception, thought and action which are encountered throughout life. As Bourdieu suggests, it is inevitable that these forces will come to bear to some greater or lesser degree on the way in which a visitor to an attraction will interpret it and, ultimately, give meaning to it. As such, then, the ‘transmission’ model fails to take into account the complexity of thoughts, beliefs, morals, values and attitudes or, more notably, the ‘pursuing of personal agendas’ (Rounds, 1999:5). Each of these factors will directly influence and impact upon a visitor’s interpretation of any information and knowledge and, ultimately, to the meaning made of the attraction. The ‘meaning-making paradigm’, therefore, differs from the ‘cultural transmission’ model by recognising the interplay of cultural and individual elements in the process and by defining outcomes in the terms of the construction of meaning rather than the acquisition of the culture (Rounds, 1999). Furthermore, while such a paradigm acknowledges the fact that a person’s interpretation and the meaning afforded an attraction will be very much influenced by culture and
socialisation, it nevertheless ‘confronts the complex and ambiguous challenge of facilitating a highly-individual process of interpretation’ (Rounds, 1999:5). Hall writes, ‘Things don’t mean: we construct meaning, using representational systems—concepts and signs’ (1997:25, emphasis in original) and this thesis is informed by this epistemological approach. Any meaning, Hall suggests, is assigned to an object which, in and of itself, has no inherent meaning beyond that afforded it by an individual, group or community. Important to this study is a belief that meaning, though, is not ‘fixed’ (Hall, 1997:11, 25) but rather fluid and dynamic, contingent and variable and will change according to historical, social, geographical or cultural contexts.

Interpretation is not a one-sided effort situated in the supply side of the tourism experience but rather an outcome of an interactive and iterative process that intersects with aspects of the supply of tourist experiences with the characteristics of the tourists themselves. Visitors form the essential component in the interpretative ‘equation’ by playing an active role during the interpretation experience (Reisinger & Steiner, 2006). The visitor experience is at once dynamic and individualistic and the ‘strength’ and ‘depth’ of that experience will depend very much upon the ‘emotional engagement’ (Rossman & Ellis, 2012:5) invested by the visitor. Interpretation, it is demonstrated, is equally a facilitator of emotional experience, and to make people ‘more aware of the places they visit’ (Herbert, 1989:191), as it is a means to gain knowledge or voice opinion.

‘Meaning’ is always about something (Rounds, 1999) and it is when a visitor encounters—and interacts with—an attraction that meaning comes about. That relationship between the visitor and the attraction, engendered by the physicality and experiences of the process of ‘consumption’ of attractions is, according to Bagnall (2003:87), ‘based as much on emotion and imagination as it is on cognition’. In other words, the process of meaning-making is characterised by affective and experiential dimensions which have equal if not greater influence on determining how an attraction is interpreted and given meaning than simply by cognitive understandings.
Any information about or knowledge of an attraction is ‘filtered’ through a visitor’s own ‘context’ of emotions, experiences, personal accumulated knowledge and social and cultural background. How visitors are ‘positioned’—what I have described as the proximity-distance continuum, in terms of their spatial, temporal, social, cultural, economic, political, ethnical, ideological and linguistic ‘proximities’ to an attraction greatly influence the ways in which visitors respond to and interact with it. As well, the ‘lens’ through which visitors ‘view’ an attraction tempers the many ways in which they interpret it and the meanings they attach to it.

The way in which an attraction is interpreted and the meanings assigned to an attraction by a visitor are thus the result of the negotiation of all of those combined affective, sensorial and cognitive, internal and external factors impinging upon the visitor. ‘We are not given this world,’ writes Sacks (1995), ‘we make our world through incessant experience, categorization, memory, reconnection’ (1995:114). To reiterate, meaning is not fixed within attractions or sites; nor can the analysis of meaning and meaning-making be confined to any single theory or perspective. Meaning is produced out of the combination of the ‘object’ or site itself, its location and context, how a visitor interprets that attraction or site, what effect it has on a visitor, what is actually known about it and the visitor interaction with it. In turn, visitor interaction with, and understanding and appreciation of, an attraction will be heavily influenced by his or her personal and social context which will affect and direct interpretation. Each of these factors combine to form what becomes the overall ‘visitor experience’ of the attraction or site.

What meanings can be attributed to attractions and visitor sites will depend very much on what visitors ‘bring’ (in an embodied sense) to them. Such meanings may change according to how an individual engages with the attraction which, in turn, may affect that person’s understanding, or influence the way in which they may interpret it. Any interpretation is, of course, influenced by a visitor’s personal knowledge and individual experiences (‘context’), coupled with their sensorial and affective responses to the attraction or site. Falk & Dierking (1992) contend that visitor ‘context’ should be sub-divided into three overlapping and interrelated domains: the ‘personal’—what the
visitor brings to the experience in terms of prior experiences, knowledge, interests and motivations; the ‘socio-cultural’—the social, cultural and historical conditions of their visit; and the ‘physical’—how a visitor interacts with space and the physical aspects of the attraction or site. From such a perspective, it would appear that the range of possible meanings given to attractions and sites by visitors is potentially infinite. However, personal experience and anecdotal evidence from discussions with people who have visited the same attractions or sites indicated that there is, more often than not, a degree of consensus and patterning between visitor interpretations and meanings gleaned. Consistent with Urry’s (1990) contention that the collective ‘gaze’ is socially formed, visitors often share similar feelings, respond in a similar fashion and derive broadly similar meanings from their overall experiences of attractions and sites. As Jaworski & Thurlow (2009:255) suggest:

> the identities of tourists, the representations of tourist truths and the interactional organization of tourist sites work together – they mediate each other – in producing the Habitus (Bourdieu, 1990) of tourism as an individual and collective disposition to gaze and (inter-)act in certain ways.

On first sight, this situation presents somewhat of an epistemological conundrum: How can we say that potential meanings accorded an attraction or site ‘will vary according to each individual and their [sic.] own personal, social and physical context of their visit’ (Mason, 2005:206), while at the same time recognising that people’s interpretations are often shared within certain groups? This is an era of ‘multiple, fluid, hybridized and contradictory nature of postmodern identities’ (Hall, 1992; Woodward, 1997). So answering this question and better understanding the complex patterns of visitor responses and meaning-making of attractions and sites requires a less than simple response. I will briefly draw on a discussion of Bourdieu and his notion of ‘habitus’, Hall’s (1997:18) notion of shared ‘conceptual maps’ and Fish’s (1980) argument that individuals belong to ‘interpretative communities’ and share ‘interpretative strategies’ to demonstrate how people, for many different reasons and in many different circumstances, will share similar perceptions and understandings of the world around them.

Bourdieu (1990) argues that people’s ‘shared’ or ‘similar’ habitus is an important factor contributing to social reproduction because the social and cultural dimensions are
central to generating and regulating the practices that make up social life. Individuals learn certain ways to respond to certain interactions and the conditions in which an individual lives generate dispositions compatible with these conditions (including tastes, understandings and practices). Hall (1997), in a similar vein, argues that individuals as members of a similar cultural or linguistic background, group or perhaps those who have had similar experiences will rely on sharing ‘conceptual maps’ (1997:18). Fish (1980) emphasises the complex, yet fluid contextual nature of these ‘shared’ understandings in his discussion of his concept of ‘interpretative communities’. For Fish, his ‘communities’ are defined, amongst other things, by experiences, knowledge, demographic or socio-economic factors, identity, practices and a sense of belonging. ‘Membership’ is not confined to one single group at any one specific time as an individual is able to belong to one or more of these ‘communities’ simultaneously, dependent upon which affiliation is called to the fore at a specific time.

Running parallel to the ‘personal’ interpretation and meaning-making path is the construction of meanings and messages of tourist attractions by the producer(s) of the attraction or site in what might be categorised as the ‘intentional’ interpretation and meaning. From this perspective, the construction of meanings and messages, very broadly speaking, begins with an idea for an attraction (or, in the case of a naturally-occurring site, its identification and designation as an attraction), the motivation for its creation and its overall intention, the site to be used, its design, its construction and its presentation. At each of these stages, decisions are made and acted upon. Decisions are not made in a paradigmatic or discursive vacuum. Decision-makers draw on and are informed by their pre-existing knowledge, beliefs and values and by the various discourses and ideologies circulating within the society and, to use Fish’s (1980) analogy, within the ‘interpretative communities’ to which the decision-makers belong. The decisions and choices made are intentional acts and the ways in which various components are selected and combined will influence what—and in what ways—a site or attraction will communicate to a visitor and, in turn, how the visitor will make sense of and give meaning to the attraction or site.
Particular styles and strategies and use of space and place also have a direct influence on how a visitor will interpret and give meaning to an attraction. At work are various aesthetic, affective, didactic, symbolic and narrative techniques which guide visitors towards certain ideas, thoughts, impressions and feelings by prioritising certain points or features they wish to communicate while neglecting others. Whilst intention, purpose and function may be very clear in the minds of the producers of an attraction, alongside these will be unintended meanings which may well be at variance with those original messages or meanings.

This discussion demonstrates the extent to which contemporaneous discourses and ideologies enshrined in them impact upon interpretation and meaning and also shows how at different historical moments, certain perspectives and understandings are given greater legitimacy than others. This is not to suggest that at any given moment there will not be competing ideologies and discourses in operation, affecting individual and group interpretations at the same time as individuals, themselves, also challenge certain beliefs and values, while reproducing and endorsing others.

A further way to think about and investigate patterns in visitor responses to attractions is the notion of ‘selective reading’. Hall (1980) argued that ‘any signifying practice will foreground or privilege certain meanings above others and these will be presented as the most appropriate or logical set of meanings—the ‘preferred reading’ (Mason, 2005:207). Readings which selectively accept and reject elements are known as ‘negotiated’ while ‘oppositional’ readings reject the preferred reading outright. The implication here is that the ‘preferred’ reading reflects the authoritative ‘voice’ of the producer or figure or organisation responsible for and in control of the attraction and a particular ideological framing of the attraction offers visitors a particular way of interpreting what they see and experience. The presentation of the ‘preferred’ reading can take an array of forms: from on-site signage, detailing the various features of the attraction and how they have been interpreted; leaflets, audio tours and on-site guides, providing certain information to visitors about the attraction; and entries in guide books including facts and interesting ‘titbits’ about the attraction to emphasise its appeal to the visitor as an attraction. For certain visitors, a reading offered to them will suffice their
curiosity but it is often in the negotiated’, ‘oppositional’ or nuanced readings where we
best see evidence of a visitor’s most ‘active and questioning engagement’ (Dicks,
2000:73) with an attraction.

In Hall’s (1980) original analysis, any differentiated readings arose from the structural
constraints imposed upon individuals through class, employment patterns and power
relations. Such a perspective fails, however, to recognise the power of multiple
discourses and ideologies at work at various historical moments which dominate certain
ways of thinking and not others (Foucault, 1973). As well, it fails to question the
capacity of individuals to act independently and to make their own free choices, or
‘agency’ (Barker, 2000) as they impact upon the meaning-making process. The fact
that visitors will respond in many different and subtly nuanced ways to an attraction
(Dicks, 2000) further serves to reinforce the argument that any ideological framing or
general reading of an attraction will inevitably vary amongst visitors. The extent to
which an individual’s interpretations and meanings of certain attractions are constrained
by social systems is debatable, but an individual’s cognitive belief structure, formed
through one's experiences and the perceptions held by the individual, may not
necessarily inhere to any degree with those meanings intended by the producers.

Meaning is itself a site of controversy and contestation. Meanings are the products of
the ongoing interpretive and meaning-making processes of exchange and dialogue
dependent upon many different factors. The process of meaning-making is neither
neutral nor objective but, rather, embedded in the realm of cultural politics. It is,
instead, the mind of the meaning-maker which defines, legitimises, negotiates, agrees or
opposes certain meanings (Jordan & Weedon, 1995).

2.7 Conclusion

This chapter has described visitor attractions and pointed to their centrality to tourism.
The preceding discussion has drawn attention to the fact that much of the scholarship
has been concerned with the more definitional, pragmatic and functional aspects of
tourist attractions and that there is a dearth of analysis along the lines of what an
attraction ‘means’ and how meaning is made of an attraction. The chapter has reviewed
major contributions to the defining and conceptualisation of attractions and has drawn
attention to those theorists whose work has most heavily influenced my own
understandings. It has explained how, in recent years, much greater attention has been
given to examining the visitor experience, particularly as it is realised through the
senses. Tourism is an all-sensory, lived experience, involving new sights, smells,
sounds, touches, and tastes. Whilst the primacy of the gaze is acknowledged, the
manner in which a visitor experiences and constructs meaning of any attraction is
articulated holistically, through the combination of sensual, cognitive, affective and
behavioural components which together make up the visitor experience or, drawing on
situated and instantiated by visitors’ interaction with and responses to a site.

Whilst monuments may, in general parlance, also include naturally-occurring
phenomena and, more generally, objects which are believed to be imbued with certain
‘monumental’ qualities, in line with Choay’s (2001) definition, the term ‘monument’
as used in this thesis specifically refers to ‘commemorative monuments’—structures
which have been built for some celebratory or commemorative purposes. The
following chapter investigates how ‘commemorative monuments’, as a type or ‘genre’
of visitor attraction, built at a particular time and for a particular purpose, are
manifestly ‘brittle’ or ‘fragile’ and are, by their very nature, often the subject of
changed perspectives and attitudes. When an attraction engenders highly emotional or
discursive reactions, not because material or intended elements have changed over time
but because the socio-cultural discourse has changed and its interpretive context
transformed, an attraction may become the centre of controversy, contention and
contestation. As will be demonstrated, the preponderance of the social, political and
ideological domains which provide the impetus for the very being of monuments are
themselves dynamic and can provide the force behind their decline in importance or
eventual demise.

Such a discussion is extremely pertinent for this study, as the focus of the thesis, the
ATM, owes its very existence to something which itself has no independent existence
but which is, at the same time, the primary vehicle of both the tangible and intangible
cultural heritage at the root of all societies, i.e. language.
Chapter 3

Monuments

Monuments immortalize our heroes, celebrate our accomplishments, and mourn our losses. Whether in a public park, private cemetery or city square, these sculptures of stone and steel reflect the moral, cultural and social makeup of their surroundings. Just as the Column of Trajan still stands in Rome and the fall of the Soviet Union brought about the razing of hundreds of statues, some monuments stand as permanent testimony to the accomplishments of a nation and an individual, while others topple at the swing of the pendulum that is public opinion. (Tattersall, in Reynolds, 1996: 33)

3.1 Introduction

Tourist encounters with major cultural attractions such as monuments and other iconic monumental structures have been, and continue to form an important, often central, motivation for many tourists to visit a particular destination (Towner, 1985; Richards, 2001:4). This chapter examines the ‘genre’ of tourism attraction broadly described as ‘monuments’, by critically engaging with the literature which best demonstrates and explains those characteristics commonly associated with this particular type of social construction. Monuments play an important role in the pantheon of visitor ‘must-sees’. Whilst it is not the primary focus of this thesis to develop a framework for the study of monuments *per se*, to assist in broadening our understanding of the nature of monuments as social phenomena and as foci of visitor interest, a deeper and more systematic approach towards the investigation of monuments is provided here. The development of such a method of analysis can provide a framework for further study of monuments and serve to help make taxonomic sense of the experience of monuments and to draw to the surface those features and characteristics which would help us better understand the notion of ‘monumentalisation’. To that end, analysis based on the significant work on monuments by Alois Riegl (1982) is woven through the discussion to capture and evaluate the complex network of the socio-cultural values of monuments.
The chapter opens with a discussion of the ubiquity of monuments as a feature of human society and, as a consequence of that ubiquity, draws on literature from a range of disciplines where monuments have been a focal point of investigation. Despite the various definitions of monuments presented, there is a certain ambiguity associated with the term ‘monument’. Monuments may take either natural or manufactured form but it is the concern of this study to examine and analyse those humanly-created constructions which share certain ‘monumental’ qualities. The chapter then continues with a detailed discussion of monuments as sites of contestation.

3.2 Monuments Defined

In a chapter entitled ‘The Evolution of Humanness’, Tattersall (1996:33), a biologist, argues that the human urge to create monuments, that most culturally driven of all expressions of the human spirit’, was born over 100,000 years ago. According to archaeologist and philologist, Childe (1945), monumental architecture was one of ten criteria of civilisation where monument building is seen as an important index of social complexity. In a similar vein, architectural historian, Choay (2001:7), who has written extensively on historical monuments, contends that monuments are very nearly a ‘cultural universal’ and that they exist on all continents and in almost all societies, literate and non-literate.

All complex societies invest in cultural and actual capital in structures akin to monuments (Nelson & Olin, 2003). Arendt (1958) asserts that to design and construct a monument is something which lies at the heart of the human condition. Alois Riegl (1982) begins his essay, Der moderne Denkmalkultus: Sein Wesen und Seine Entstehung (translated as The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and Its Origin), by discussing the origin and essence of monuments, stating that ‘[i]n its oldest and most original sense a monument is a work of man erected for the specific purpose of keeping particular human deeds or destinies (or a complex accumulation thereof) alive and present in the consciousness of future generations’ (Riegl, 1982:24).

It is important to be cautionary in any discussion of the idea that there is some deeply-rooted human urge to recall and to commemorate, to dedicate and to confirm and draw attention to important people, events and ideas in the form of a ‘monument’. Childe
(1945), Choay (2001), Nelson & Olin (2003) and Riegl (1982) speak of the global ubiquity of monuments but it is important to point out that, as ‘important parts of our life’ (Kalmár, 2009:311), to state that the concept of a ‘monument’ is something which links all human societies may be construed as being a Eurocentric perspective. Choay (2001:7) writes that a monument is ‘a defence against the traumas of existence, a security measure [as well as] the guarantor of origins’. As such, monuments appear to perform an important psycho-social role in society by grounding a society or community’s inheritance in a specific historico-temporal context while, at the same time, grounding individuals in a society and building and reinforcing traditions and a sense of community by extolling the triumphs and successes of a people in their actions and in their ideology. Many societies, however, may use different strategies to perform the same functions that monuments serve in those societies where they are recognised. A monument is ‘a defense against the traumas of existence, a security measure [as well as] the guarantor of origins’ (Choay, 2001:7). As such, monuments appear to perform an important psycho-social role in society by grounding a society or community’s inheritance in a specific historico-temporal context while, at the same time, grounding individuals in a society and building and reinforcing traditions and a sense of community by extolling the triumphs and successes of a people in their actions and in their ideology.

The word, ‘monument’ is indeed an ‘elusive’ (Gough, 2002:201), even slippery term. Nelson & Olin (2003:2), for example, demonstrate the imprecision inherent in the word, by describing it in such general terms as ‘what art history chooses to celebrate and proclaim a monument’. In its original Latin, ‘monumentum’ derives from the verb, monere, meaning both ‘to remind’ but also ‘to admonish, ‘to advise’, ‘to warn’ and ‘to instruct’ (Griswold, 1998:74). In its original context, a ‘monumentum’ could be described as ‘any artefact erected by a community of individuals to commemorate or to recall for (present and) future generations, individuals, events, sacrifices, practices or beliefs’ (Choay, 2001:6). This suggests that monuments may carry both or either instructive or cautionary messages to the public of the past, while at the same time may reflect the values that the public contemporarily embraces and serves as focal points for the collective values and memories of a community, city, region or nation. Beyond its intentional and commemorative functions, both Gough and Young describe a monument as a ‘celebratory and triumphalist’ marker, while stressing its physical
characteristics by stating that it ‘should bear the attributes of scale, permanence, longevity and visibility’ (Gough, 2002:202). Riegl (1982:22), however, contrasts the temporal or transient status of monuments by discussing the fact that, through the centuries, monuments are not treated in the same manner, some being valued and preserved, while others are ‘used as quarries for building materials’.

Tomaselli and Mpofu’s (1997) definition introduces a further layer of meaning to the term, by emphasising an important dimension which lies at the heart of any definition of a monument. For Tomaselli and Mpofu (1997:57), a monument is:

a deliberately built or preserved structure or image which is made to represent or denote a specific historical experience considered significant in terms of the evolution of a people’s identity. Monuments are symbols of historically discursive and contested contexts in the life development of groups and nations (my emphasis).

Not only is a monument intended to commemorate or celebrate but is designed as an instrument for shaping people’s attitudes and engaging visitors in a persuasive discourse. A monument is, thus, never ‘neutral’, but is a complex social construction in which are enshrined allegorical statements of values, ideologies, status, collective memory and shared identity. People construct monuments with particular intentions in mind, but these objects, by their very nature, become metaphorical ‘palimpsests’, encapsulating within their ‘anima’ or inner spirit, the beliefs and values of certain people at a particular moment in time.

The reasons for constructing monuments, writes Danto (1986) is:

so that we shall always remember. Monuments commemorate the memorable and embody the myths of beginnings. Monuments make heroes and triumphs, victories and conquests, perpetually present and part of life. With monuments, we honor ourselves. (Danto, 1986:152)

It is in the explication of these principles that monuments bring ‘the past into the present to inspire the future’ (Baca, 1998:131). A monument, rather than being a retrospective form which looks to the past for its inspiration, is just as often built to celebrate and promote, endorse or support contemporary ideals and aspirations as well as to laud what are perceived to be outstanding examples of such human attributes as ‘gallantry’, ‘courage’, ‘valour’, ‘ingenuity’, ‘integrity’ and ‘fame’ or ‘infamy’. Monuments acknowledge and celebrate achievement, success and glory through the production of
narrative and the processes of myth-making. It is in their role as vehicles of the ‘monumentalisation’ process that monuments are constructed to tell a story and to legitimate dominant narratives embodied in their subject matter, be it a person, an event or an idea. It should not be overlooked that within the process of monumentalisation there is harboured an important myth-making function which often serves as a tool of power and manipulation and of legitimization, to endorse or propagandise a particular social or political world-view or ideology.

Foote et al. (2000) and Forest & Johnson (2002), for example, have suggested that there is a very close connection between monument-making and political propaganda in the twentieth century. However, it could be argued that there has always been a synergistic relationship between the erection of monuments and political and ideological intentions or personal self-aggrandisement. Political regimes have made, and continue to make use of opportunities to erect monuments as a means by which to inscribe their own sets of values and meanings and to establish their own authority. That there is an accompanying sense of power and control associated with the reasons and strategies for, and motivations behind, the construction of a monument cannot be denied. Whoever is responsible for the instigation and implementation of the project, the designer or architect, the financial source to construct it, the purposes for which it is built, its positioning, what it depicts, represents or symbolises, all are important considerations when delving into the motives for a monument’s existence. Furthermore, consideration of the reasons why social groupings mark certain places or spaces as ‘meaningful’ or ‘monumental’ is important to the discussion here. Dominant discourses and decision-makers often dictate what and how a monument should be constructed, while controlling the outward expression of its dominant messages (Edensor, 2000; Trudeau, 2006).

Interesting here is Riegl’s (1982:21) distinction between those monuments which are gewollte ‘wanted’ or ‘intentional’—i.e. deliberate creations whose purpose is established a priori and built to satisfy a commemorative need—and ungewollte—‘unintentional’—those which are historical or the preserved remnants of some revered past, constituted a posteriori from a pre-existing object or structure and which, as a concept, are ‘forged in order to designate assets belonging to the nation’ (Riegl,
Riegl’s distinction between the intentional and unintentional monument is an important one. Intentional monuments are those which are consciously and deliberately constructed for the purpose of commemorating or memorialising; they are ‘markers or monuments which have no other purpose than to memorialize a person or an event’ (Forster, 1982:2). As such, an ‘intentional monument’, for Riegl, has a direct ideological function. It is ‘erected for the specific purpose of keeping single human deeds or events (or a combination thereof) alive in the minds of future generations’ (Riegl, 1982: 21), and is concerned with commemoration, or ‘prospective memory’ by making ‘a claim to immortality, to an eternal present and an unceasing state of becoming’ (Riegl, 1982: 24, 38). (See Figure 3.1, Summary of Riegl’s Taxonomy for a synopsis of Reigl’s conceptualisation of monuments.)

By contrast, ‘unintentional’ monuments are constructions whose original purposes and functions have now been overridden or superseded by their ‘monumental’ value. According to Riegl (1982), unintentional monuments share three values: age-value which contributes to the aura and authenticity of an object and includes signs of temporal duration and creates a context for nostalgia; the present day use-value, the practical functional performance of the object and the benefits to people actually using monuments for utilitarian purposes; and, finally, stressing the importance of their temporal aspect, Riegl (1982) argues that, in contrast to intentional monuments, unintentional monuments are valued for their historical-value, as records and as keepsakes (‘time-specific and documentary’ [Rowlands & Tilley, 2006:500]). Such monuments are invested with what Riegl (1982:35) calls ‘memory-value’. Riegl goes on to note:

The historical value of a monument arises from the particular, individual stage it represents in the development of human activity in a certain field. The more faithfully a monument's original state is preserved, the greater its historical value. (Riegl, 1982:34)

Rowlands & Tilley (2006:500) contend that, ironically, a monument ‘is an object taken out of history, by history. Yet, it stands for history in terms of what it has left behind, as a mnemonic trace that also separates it from the present.’ They argue, instead, that a monument hovers about in a state of liminality, belonging ‘neither to an original setting from which it has been abstracted or copied nor to the present, in which it resists
### Summary of Riegl’s Taxonomy

#### MONUMENT

**INTENTIONAL**
- A ‘deliberate’ monument; a human creation erected for the specific purpose of keeping single human deeds or events (or a combination thereof) alive in the minds of future generations (1982:21); concerned with commemoration or prospective memory; conditioned by its makers.

**UNINTENTIONAL**
- Historical monuments, ‘the remains whose meaning is determined not by their makers but our modern perception of those monuments, i.e. by retrospective memory’; ‘a monument of art’ (1982:24).

#### ART VALUE
- All monuments possess aesthetic value, either for their ‘newness-value’ or contrasting inspirational relative art value (1982:42-50).

#### HISTORICAL VALUE
- ‘To maintain as genuine as possible a document for future art-historical research; (1982:34); a responsibility to preserve existing monuments.

#### AGE-VALUE
- A knowledge of age contributes to the aura and authenticity of an object to create a context of nostalgia; manifests itself in its visual perception and direct appeal to the emotions (1983:32-33).

#### USE-VALUE
- The utilitarian & economic benefits of monuments for people; may include the destruction of decaying monuments endangering people’s lives (1982:39).

---

**Table 3.1 Summary of Riegl’s Taxonomy**
assimilation’ (Rowlands & Tilley, 2006:500). By way of example, in light of the more recent social, cultural and political transformations which have occurred in South Africa, rather than posturing the Afrikaanse Taalmonument as merely a product of an apartheid past, it may be more realistic to conceptualise its current social, cultural and ideological ‘position’ as being transitional or liminal. The temporal complexities of monuments are quite evident here. Monuments are socially constructed and are therefore always in the process of being created, always provisional and uncertain and always capable of being discursively manipulated towards desired (individual or collective) ends. In view of Rowlands and Tilley’s (2006) comments here, for a monument to remain relevant and viable, might be to suggest that it must typically remain within this liminal state of persistent transition or permanent becoming.

The meaning accredited to ‘unintentional monuments’ is determined not by their makers but, rather, by our modern perceptions of these monuments, i.e. by retrospective ‘cultural memory’. Riegl adds, however, that deliberate monuments can also, over time and because of their changing significance, become 'unintentional' monuments. In terms of their fluidity, dynamism and mutability, Holtorf (2002) convincingly argues that all monuments can be seen as unintentional in the sense that even if they were built with specific purposes in mind, their meanings are negotiated and change over time within the history, culture and cultural memory of each present generation.

In contrast to Riegl’s categorisation of values associated with monuments, Lipe (1984) in his article, ‘Value and meaning in cultural resources’, takes into account a more contemporary, pragmatic approach to the analysis of monuments. To Riegl’s framework, Lipe identifies four different, though related, types of resource value for determining the use and benefit of cultural material objects (amongst which he includes monuments) for the present and future. Cultural resources, he argues, are subject to the same cost-benefit imperatives which affect all areas of modern economic life and that they compete with alternative uses for the space, energy, time and attention that they require. ‘Cultural resources,’ he argues, ‘exist as part of today’s cultural context and human environment, both of which are being continually modified, and at what appears to be an accelerating pace’ (Lipe, 1984:7). As such, any individual or societal decisions to preserve, neglect or even destroy certain cultural objects will have an
economic dimension which could conceivably extend to its core: ‘Some present-day economic uses’, for example, ‘may be so divorced from that past context as to effectively sever the associative links that give the property its cultural resource value’ (Lipe, 1984:8). One way in which an object’s economic worth can be gauged is in its utilitarian value ‘which derives not from a property’s connection to a past cultural context, but from its ability to serve a present-day material need’ (Lipe, 1984:8). Whilst for any number of reasons or influences its functions may change over time, any adaptation in the use of a cultural property may cause conflict between its current and/or proposed uses and the values that led to it becoming a cultural resource in the first place.

The commentary here serves to highlight those attributes which are most directly associated with monuments. Treated in isolation, the various features are of general interest but they are of particular importance in the broader terms of this study as they expose to critical scrutiny certain facets about monuments which, consciously or unconsciously, come to bear on visitor experience, interpretation and meaning-making of the ATM. Much of the behaviour, thoughts, opinions and ideas of those visitors observed and interviewed derive from and substantiate the theoretical perspectives presented here and, importantly, what follows in the discussion of the inherently contested nature of monuments presented in the following section and, more directly to the ATM, in Chapter 5. The precarious nature of monuments is evidenced, then, not only in the socio-cultural, political or ideological transformations which may lead to changes to their significance or relevance, but also in their perceived values.

3.3 Monuments as Sites of Controversy & Contestation

As has been argued in the preceding section, monuments are vehicles for the communication of certain ideas, ideals, beliefs, values or attitudes which are presented in such a way as to imply their very veracity in some concrete, tangible form. They are the visual representations of ideological beliefs and, so, even from their inception, throughout the period of their construction and then far beyond their unveiling or inauguration, monuments may, at least potentially, be the subject of contention and controversy. King (1999) described how monuments act as sources of friction and argument. Before they are completed, monuments arouse controversy about how to say
whatever they are intended to say and, afterwards, about what they really mean. The controversy stems largely from the fact that a monument, by its very nature, is a representation of someone or something and, as with any representation, is open to any amount of conjecture or interpretation. King (1999) supports this argument by suggesting that the meanings of monuments are not fixed. What is important for King is how the public become involved with them—in commissioning and building them, honouring them and talking about them. Even the most seemingly benign or uncontroversial representation of someone noteworthy of commemoration or memorialisation may be criticised by viewers and other commentators for its failure to present a ‘truthful’ representation of that person or rendition of that event or idea. In an article in which he discusses the dialectical relationship between the public and monuments, King (1999) emphasises the potential, if not inherent, controversial quality which exists in this particular form of concrete expression. King asserts that:

Monuments are often sources of friction and argument about how to say whatever they are intended to say and, afterwards, about what they really mean. Even when they do not carry any explicitly statable single message, they nonetheless invite and focus thought [and] are intended to set up in an audience a line of thinking about a subject matter (cited in Eldridge, 2003:25).

As alluded to earlier, the intended ‘line of thinking’ about a monument may or may not be the ‘true’ version of historical events, the achievements of an individual or the essence of an idea. Monuments often reveal an adherence to an official version of history, or a singular narrative within many alternate versions and it is in their realisation that they ‘legitimate’ what it is that is trying to be communicated. Yet, the messages ‘instilled’ in a monument are rarely, if ever, literal. Rather, they are rather physically-structured three-dimensional metaphors imbued with symbolic, semiotic information which may often hide controversies or even shroud truth in some fictional representation or myth. According to Broszat (1988:90-91), monuments are ‘cultural reifications’ which reduce or ‘coarsen’ historical understanding by burying people and events beneath layers of myths and explanations. As well, because they are three-dimensional in form, monuments, as works of sculpture and architecture, invite multiple points of view by engaging the visitor, as one moves around or through them. According to Eldridge (2003), it is in and through that interactional experience where a person gives meaning to a monument by engaging with the physical structure.
Therefore, it is not the literal subject matter of the monument which gives the monument meaning, but rather its representational or metaphorical value:

The audience takes up the afforded point of view and so comes to be aware of the subject matter as it is experienced from it. This makes it clear that what is presented in a successful imitation is not just a subject matter ‘in itself’ but a subject matter as it matters to and for an experiencing human intelligence. (Eldridge, 2003:27-28)

This statement implies that the inciting or inspiring an emotional response is a central tenet in the design and construction of any monument. The purposes of a monument, then, are to inform or to call to mind some ‘neutral bit of information’ (Choay, 2001:6), and to inculcate an emotional response through an individual’s interaction or experience with it. Consequently, certain elements of a monument will often incite similar and shared responses amongst visitors or viewers, although evidence derived from my own observations and interviews with visitors at the ATM might suggest that different elements of that monument provoke very different responses.

Monuments often also encapsulate educational knowledge in their cognitive value and introduce a general pedagogy of civic duty: citizens share values and ideology and a historic meaning that, once mobilised by various sentiments, will play the affective role of living memory (Choay, 2001). Any monumental representation, then, is mediated by a particular historical and ultimately cultural discourse (Hall, 1997). Any monument must, therefore, be recognised as a discursive public structure, a vital function of which is to both propagandise and mythologise in its shape, form and message. According to Choay (2001), a monument, in whatever guise it may take, serves as an antidote to entropy. Its essence lies in its capacity to preserve and maintain what was, what is, and/or what will be, in what stands as a positive and praiseworthy communal focal point. By mobilising and engaging individual and collective memories through the mediation of affectivity, ‘the immediacy and continued relevance of the intention or purpose for the construction of the monument is brought to life’ (Choay, 2006:6). The essence of a monument, therefore, lies in its capacity to affirm and to endorse, to extol virtue, to provide material evidence of power, achievement, heroism, success and faith and to instil a sense of respect, dignity, honour and pride. By demonstrating the different possible physical and metaphysical qualities and aesthetic, tactile and temporal
dimensions of a monument is to address the multiplicity and subtlety of textures (Young, 1993:ix) which contributes to the generation of different meanings for monuments.

‘In any society, monuments and other elements in the symbolic landscape can become focal points of contestation over the political, social, or religious values they symbolize’ (Marschall, 2009:167). Over time, the subject matter of many monuments undergoes symbolic transformation and its veracity contested. What may have initially represented a positive cultural icon or iconic moment may years after installation represent a local, national or cultural point of contention. As such, a monument engenders highly averse emotional reactions, not because the site or its material symbolic elements have changed, but because the cultural discourse has changed and its interpretive context has transformed. The rhetorical function of a monument, thus, shifts over time; even when it is a fixed representational structure, changes in social and personal context reveal that its meaning is interpretably open.

It is also important to understand that the status which accompanies a monument is contextual and its reception will be very much guided by historically, socio-culturally and geo-politically or situationally-based attitudes, beliefs, values and standards (cf. Riegl’s [1982] discussion of the enduring value and temporality of monuments). What is currently understood to be a monument may not remain so in the future. Over time, through different socio-cultural, political and ideological filters, and because of contextual and attitudinal shifts, monuments may be re-interpreted quite differently. As a result of the processes of re-interpretation, (brought about by changing social, political or cultural perspectives, for example), ‘re-semantisation’ (according to changing patterns of cognition, conceptualisation or imagination, where meaning may consciously or unconsciously change over time) or even ‘de- monumentalisation’ (Smith, 2007:88, 89), monuments may no longer achieve their originally-designed iconographic, allegorical, symbolic, motivational or semantic objectives. As a consequence of its ‘re-positioning’ or ‘re-alignment’, a monument may, in socio-cultural terms, decline in importance or value which may involve its eventual demise.

Changes in social, cultural and ideological contexts, for example, reveal that attractions
are interpretably open (Martin, 2007). Monuments, however, Lowenthal (1985) suggests, may project an image of permanence onto a landscape but they serve to deny the realities of change. For Paxson (2007:1), attractions such as monuments are negotiated realities because ‘[n]egotiation implies active dialogue’. Such sites and attractions which have undergone social, cultural, ideological or symbolic transformation may become discursive points of contention, contestation and/or conflicting narratives. This contest over interpretation, meaning and representation can give rise to multiple cultural and political discourses relating to issues over what social, cultural or political ideologies are represented and who has the power to represent them (Chidester & Linenthal, 1995; Philp & Mercer, 1999; Pratt, 2001). Other social groups or individuals may also have different views of the meaning of that place and how it is represented and such opposition to dominant discourses demonstrates how a monument can itself be ‘read’ as a complex, contested and symbolic power system (Cosgrove, 1989).

As Tattersall’s quote at the beginning of the chapter suggests, monuments are, by their very nature, characteristically fixed and permanent structures (Bradley, 1984 in Thomas, 1990:176). Built for posterity, monuments are concrete representations of certain held beliefs current at a particular time, in a particular place, and for particular people. They are, thus, imbued with a time, a place, a context and an ideology. Paradoxically, however, ‘in the dual criteria of significance and permanence’ (Elliot, 1964:52), it is the circumstances of that presentation which demonstrate the inherent lack of symbolic and interpretive stability and of the extreme mutability of a monument in terms of its continued status, value, function and meaning. The enduring power of architecture to construct a monument which can ‘survive’ overt changes in presentation and the contingencies of history with its dignity and power intact for posterity belies the fact that monuments, and what they stand for or represent, do not and cannot transcend the virulent waves of social, cultural, political or economic processes of change. Henri Lefebvre writes:

An existing space [and in terms of the present discussion, we might well include monuments here] may outlive its original purpose and the raison d’être which determines its forms, functions, and structures; it may thus in a sense become vacant, and susceptible of being diverted, reappropriated and put to a use quite different from its original one. (Lefebvre, 1991:167)
In *The Significance of Monuments* (1998), Bradley traces the origins and development of monuments and discusses their role in forming a new sense of time and space. He uses a number of case studies to demonstrate how monuments, with people’s changing consciousness, are modified and reinterpreted to meet the changing needs of society (see also Levinson, 1998). Bradley insists that monuments, whilst borne out of a specific time and place, are not restricted to that context but are continuously (re-)interpreted, used and re-used during their life histories as well as in later activities. It could be argued that a monument contributes to telling part of the social narrative. That it endures over time suggests that what it ‘stands for’, or what it ‘tells’, continues to remain important to people, even though its original intentions may have changed over time.

Changing attitudes, values, standards and beliefs have a strong influence on the (re-)interpretation of a monument and of its perceived continuing and varying socio-political and cultural appreciation and use-value. Forster rightly points out the relatively tenuous status that most monuments enjoy '[c]hanges in the economic conditions and shifts in interest and taste make [monuments] easy victims. What is “saved” at one time may just as easily be “condemned” at another’ (Forster, 1982:2).

Yet, it is ironic that it is in its stasis as a ‘seemingly frozen face in the landscape’, that a monument exhibits a dynamic, ‘everchanging life’ (Young, 1993:x). Consequently, Young argues, each successive generation, under circumstances different to its predecessors, invests a monument with new meanings, the result of which is an evolution in the monument’s ongoing significance (Young, 1993:3). ‘The very idea of the monument,’ writes Forster (1982:2), proves ‘to be at once historically determined and relative to the values of every time’.

In summary, then, a monument is a part-social and communal biography that stands as a reminder and a record in the public and private mind of both historical and current realities. A monument is a complicated structure which stands at the confluence of historical, social, cultural, political and aesthetic dimensions, where a vast array of
material, aesthetic, temporal, spatial and ideological forces converges in one site or object. Being in the presence of a monument invites reflection. It provokes and activates human thought in order to communicate some virtue or trait for some social purpose through a dialectical relationship between the monument and visitor.

The evocative nature of a monument, where the viewer or visitor is engaged in the articulation of their thoughts and feelings in response to or as a reaction to it, may afford the potential for conflict. Such responses will inevitably change over time as a consequence of such things as changing struggles, changing ambitions, changing attitudes, beliefs and standards. As a result of those changes, the form of the monument may seem out of sympathy with its era, it may communicate feelings which sit oddly with contemporary ideals (de Botton, 2006:173), and its inherent qualities may sharply contrast with those which are currently held in some degree of esteem. With inevitable changes in taste and attitudes, ‘there will always be casualties in the form of unloved monuments’ (de Botton, 2006:168).

Dubin (2006) traces the transformation and refashioning of cultural institutions in South Africa since 1994. He argues that museums and related ‘social locations such as monuments’ (2006:2), for example, have adopted various strategies to shed their former ideological biases and become more inclusive. As well, he suggests, it is in such places ‘where differences may be confronted, memory explored, and new identities negotiated’ (2006:xiii). This has not been an easy process, he writes: ‘[S]takeholders have struggled to come to terms with how the country’s history and collective identity have been presented in the past, and to square existing representations with current sensibilities’ (2006:1). Dubin discusses the contested nature of cultural sites by pointing out the fact that they form the intersection of, at times, contradictory narratives and ‘divergent interpretations’ (Dubin, 2006:1888) which are confirmed or rejected by different sections of the population. He also suggests (2006:2) that such sites are used by ‘diverse parties’ to affirm or reaffirm certain agendas, ideas, values, beliefs and to restore or reinscribe narratives which have been suppressed or erased and, most magnanimously, as sites of reconciliation, ‘developing new relationships between the past, the present and alternative visions of the future’ (2006:2). The mission and vision statement of the ATM place it very squarely within Dubin’s understanding of the role of South Africa’s cultural
institutions. The ATM cannot be isolated from South Africa’s apartheid legacy. Current ATM policies and practices, however, clearly reflect ‘one of the most highly valued aims within all aspects of South African life’ (Dubin, 2006:5)—‘transformation’—the definition of which encompasses the goals of ‘inclusion, assimilation, participation, collaboration’ (Dubin, 2006:5) and the efforts made to redress the apartheid ‘yoke’ and ‘parochial group allegiances’ (Dubin, 2006:27) which it continues to bear in some quarters.

Coombes (2003) also deals with the role played by South Africa’s visual and material culture in representing the past while at the same time contributing to the process of social transformation. As with Dubin (2006), Coombes highlights the contradictory investment in these sites among competing constituencies and the tensions that these contradictions potentially create when considering attempts to create or recover historical icons and narratives. New strategies to overcome these tensions, Coombes argues, are being negotiated in the monuments, museums and other cultural institutions in South Africa, through the processes of transformation, to embody different models of historical knowledge and experience and representations of the past (2003:11). This is certainly not an easy process, Coombes (2003:8) suggests, as ‘all memory is unavoidably both borne out of individual subjective experience and shaped by collective consciousness and shared social processes’. These processes can, and do, transform monuments. Coombes writes (2003:14): ‘even the old stalwarts of the apartheid regime have subsequently become reanimated and reappropriated in surprising ways as the staging posts for new and competing identities’. Monuments, Coombes argues (2003:25), are ‘unstable signifiers’, due to ‘[s]ometimes serendipitous, sometimes strategic, and sometimes opportunistic’ (2003:25) circumstances and the way they are translated ‘the supplemental meanings that necessarily transform the “original” through the act of translation’[2003:25]) by ‘readers’ capable of performing their own reading, ‘even in circumstances where the raw material reproduces a set of fairly standard...tropes’ (2003:25). (The many ways in which visitors ‘translate’, ‘read’, interpret and make meaning of the ATM are detailed in Chapter 7.)

Marschall (2009), as with both Dubin (2006) and Coombes (2003), discusses the efforts which have been placed on the transformation and democratisation of the heritage sector
in South Africa since 1994. Marschall reiterates Coombes’ (2003) comments about the role of memory in the (re)-creation of commemorative monuments, memorials and statues. Despite the fact that not everyone identifies with their changing roles, she argues these cultural emblems cannot be underestimated, as it is in their roles as symbolic markers of the political discourses which fuel reconciliation, nation-building and the creation of a shared public history in South Africa that the importance of these cultural objects lie. In a similar vein to Dubin (2006) and Coombes (2003), Marschall indicates that commemorative monuments and memorials are fraught with contradictions in contemporary South Africa. Monuments and memorials, she writes, are ‘symbolic entities whose intended meanings underscore or challenge the dominant discourses of the cultural landscapes they inhabit; or as commemorative beacons responding to the political, cultural and psychological needs of the society that installs them’ (2009:305).

In terms of the link between monuments and tourism, for Marschall monuments ‘are visual markers attracting and directing the tourist gaze’ (2009:305). Monuments, according to Marschall (2009:305) serve as focal points of tourists’ experiences of a cultural landscape, by commodifying ‘complex historical circumstances and personalities through transformation into recognisable icons’ while also creating ‘visual imaginaries of the past and of the nation’, supporting certain cultural policy, serving (sometimes disguised) political agendas, and entrenching ‘particular readings of the past’. Whilst Marschall (2009:309) contends that ‘the majority of the [South African] population perceives architectural structures and sculptural objects of the colonial and apartheid eras as “white heritage”’, the case of the ATM is somewhat ambiguous here. The motives behind the construction of the ATM invoke a contested landscape of memory and where it may have once been associated with ‘ideological causes no longer shared or even explicitly despised’ (2009:310), it is today marketed as an educational and entertainment site ‘that opens up a perspective on the historical viewpoint of a minority’ (2009:310). The contested nature of the ATM is further exacerbated by the ways that it is interpreted. Its interpretation, writes Marschall (2009:310) ‘must walk a tight rope between defending a particular community perspective while simultaneously indicating that this community has shifted away’ from the ideology which had prompted its construction in the first place while acting as a symbolic marker of the old order (2009:29) and historical point of reference (2009:32). For South Africans of differing cultural, ethnic and linguistic
backgrounds, this shift in perspective may have a direct impact upon how they interpret and give meaning to the ATM.

3.4 Monuments as Visitor Attractions

In those societies where they exist, the notion of monuments and what they represent appears to be indelibly etched in the human psyche and, as such, it is little wonder that visitors seek out encounters with major cultural attractions such as monuments and other iconic monumental structures. In fact, visiting important objects of material cultural heritage has always been a major object of travel, as the development of the Grand Tour from the sixteenth century onwards attests (Towner, 1985).

Major cultural attractions are arguably the basic markers of tourist culture (Richards, 2001), so much so that today, cultural attractions such as monuments constitute the largest sector of the European attractions market and continue to form the central motivation for many visitors to visit a particular destination (Towner, 1985; Richards, 2001). This may not, of course, be true in cases of nations or regions whose natural flora, fauna and/or topography comprise the major form of visitor attraction (such as South Africa, Kenya and Tanzania with their vast game reserves). This ‘genre’ of built attractions, therefore, forms an essential part of touristic material culture. A matrix of relational social and cultural elements including practices, representations and spaces go together to formulate the distinct identity of monuments as visitor attractions. Edensor (1998) argues that tourist places are constructed in a way that social, cultural, political, ideological and spiritual identities can be imagined and expressed. Melding Edensor’s (2002) analysis of the relationship between material culture and human agency, this section explores the ways in which monuments constitute social, cultural, spatial, temporal and performative contexts by demonstrating how they may be ‘framed’ in terms of those social factors which most directly influence and impact upon their existence and on the experience of visitors.

Not unlike Riegl’s (1982) and Lipe’s (1984) analyses of the different value judgements associated with monuments, Edensor (2004:104) states that ‘people collectively come to (temporary) arrangements about the value of particular things, what they symbolically mean, how they should be used, and about who should own them and why’. Material
objects such as built attractions carry meaning because of their contextual
emplacement in a set of connections with other elements. At the same time, they ‘have
embodied within them the social relations which gave rise to them through their design,
the work of producing them, their prior use, the intention to communicate through them
and their place within an existing cultural system of objects’ (Dant, 1999: 2). It is
through their particular relationship that the elements become institutionalised and are
realised in the particular form of visitor attraction.

Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) explore what heritage means and how it is used
to encourage people to identify with particular places and with heritage and 'traditions'.
They argue that cultural objects such as monuments are used in the creation and
management of collective identities and, most especially, the different ways in which it is
involved with the questions of multicultural societies such as South Africa. Heritage sites
are used politically and commercially to shape, not only national strategies, but also the
ways in which people represent themselves, and are represented, in diverse and hybrid
societies. For Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007), living and contemporary
cultures and cultural practices are very much part of the inherited past. The inherited
past in multicultural or plural societies, is at best complex. Ashworth, Graham and
Tunbridge (2007) argue that the very essence of heritage production and consumption is
about power and power relations. The cultural display of one heritage suggests that
others are, by necessity, left out, or ‘disinherited’. This is nowhere more visible than at
monuments such as the Voortrekker Monument, where the emphasis is on the
triumphalism and heroism of the Afrikaner pioneers as they made their way north from
the Western Cape to found their own republic. The ATM may be accused by some of
having been borne of a similar ideology, although the hybrid nature of the Afrikaans
language and the way in which that hybridity has been embodied in the different
component sections which together combine to form the ATM would suggest that the
ATM, while reflecting the multiple origins of the language, integrates that multiplicity
into a single, shared linguistic heritage as a marker of plurality in South African society.

Furthermore, just as Dubin (2006), Coombes (2003) and Marschall (2009) have
emphasised, so Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) insist that heritage and identity
are indivisible as well. People and societies are inextricably linked to the past, and
societies constantly look backward to understand their current and future group and individual place in the world.

This idea of present-centredness is a recurrent theme in the recent literature on heritage. For Lowenthal (1998:xv) for example, ‘in domesticating the past we enlist [heritage] for present causes ... [it] clarifies pasts so as to infuse them with present purposes’, such as those intimated by Dubin (2006:5ff.) in the South African context: transformation, representation, reception, memory and reconciliation. The contents, interpretations and representations of the heritage resource are selected according to the demands of the present and, in turn, bequeathed to an imagined future (Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge, 2007). It follows, therefore, that heritage is less about tangible material artefacts or other intangible forms of the past than about the meanings placed upon them and the representations which are created from them.

There remains, too, the question as to how far heritage and identity are interconnected with place and territoriality. Ashworth, Graham and Tunbridge (2007) argue that heritage cannot be seen in isolation from the landscape or physical setting where history occurred or where heritage occurs today and this is clearly evidenced in the physical and symbolic importance of the dramatic setting of the ATM in terms of the ‘place’ per se and in the ways in which visitors respond to and interpret the setting and site (see Chapters 5 and 6).

In the discussion of monuments as tourist attractions, the interplay between the physical, psychological, cognitive, social, semantic, semiotic, affective, sensory and historical dimensions overlap and interact to greater or lesser degrees. Each has a bearing on a monument’s role as a tourist attraction as well as influencing and impacting upon the visitor experience of this type of site/sight. Reynolds very succinctly expresses this interplay of multiple dimensions of monuments and writes that:

Monuments are often simply perceived as another form of public structure, but they are more than that. Monuments are first and foremost reminders. They are embodiments and symbols of our traditions and values. We build monuments to people and events because those people and events are important to us for the values they possess or represent. In addition to communicating our traditions, beliefs, and values from generation to generation, monuments also help us to come to terms with the unknown, the
unexplained, and the mysteries of life. They express our deepest emotions, both social and personal. (Reynolds, 1996:59)

The discussion which follows offers an analysis of the ways in which these dimensions interact and the effects they have in the formation and ‘life’ of a monument and of the visitor experience.

As human beings, we build monuments to remind us of where we have been, where we are heading, who we are and what qualities and characteristics we hold in high regard, respect and veneration. To immortalise an individual, to reify and concretise a notion, idea, belief, attitude or value, a monument is designed to instil in the consciousness of the viewer certain values or standards. A monument is a means by which to bolster a nation’s, community’s or individual’s reputation and legitimise the social and/or political credentials and credibility of an individual, group, belief or ideology. It may also serve as a means of controlling dissidence by extolling virtues in such a way as to bolster cultural capital in its assertion of such things as national identity. For Verschaffel (1999:335), the significance of monuments in the contemporary era lies ‘primarily in their suitability to be transformed into an icon and in their potential to promote a cultural identity’. To this, Tomaselli & Mpofu (1997:57) add that a monument is ‘a deliberately built or preserved structure or image which is made to represent or denote a specific historical experience considered significant in terms of a people’s identity’ (my emphasis).

A monument is not restricted to any one form but may incorporate a number of different features to create a unique structure. Irrespective of its specificities, however, monuments are all constructed on the assumption that they will be seen to attract attention (Young, 1993:13) and invite interaction. In other words, in order to be brought into being, a monument needs visitors, in the same way that for MacCannell (1976) and Leiper (1990), a visitor attraction is a relationship between a nucleus, a marker and a visitor. People see them, admire them, stand in awe of them, despise them, criticise them, and physically and emotionally interact with them. Essential to our understanding is the fact that a monument is generally defined as a structure which stands out by its ‘central and eye catching position’, by its size, scale or magnitude and by its positioning in relation to the surrounding landscape (Verschaffel, 1999:333). As
with any attraction, a monument creates a configuration of time and space (Jokinen & Viejola, 1997; Nelson, 2005) that defines it as offering something different from and separate to the everyday lived experience. A monument is, thus, a landmark, something out of the ordinary, a construction to be gazed upon, admired and experienced by people and, in that act, to induce in the visitor a range of emotional responses.

Relative to its immediate environment, a monument may physically harmonise with its surrounds. Alternatively, it may quite conspicuously stand out because of its incongruity with or disconnection from its physical environment. Monuments are, if not literally then at least metaphorically, ‘framed’ or bordered in such as a way as to afford them the prominence and visibility they demand by marking off the distinction between what I term the ‘attractional’ experience and the ordinary experience for visitors by creating an extra-ordinary space and time. Gunn (1972), in his recognition that attractions involved more than sights demonstrates this sense of space quite clearly in his tripartite conceptualisation of concentric circles that his ‘nucleus’ (the central component of a tourist attraction) immediately around which is an ‘inviolate belt’ (the area around the attraction which acts as a ‘signpost’ and affords visitors the opportunity to observe it from a distance, while allowing the attraction sufficient space to isolate it from its surroundings), beyond which is the ‘zone of closure’ (the boundary which defines the attraction and its immediate surroundings). In terms of visitor movement from the everyday to the extra-ordinary, from the ‘zone of closure’ to the ‘nucleus’, from the ordinary to the ‘attractional’ experience calls to mind the process suggested in MacCannell’s five stages of sight sacralisation. Gunn’s theorising can be further re-interpreted if we superimpose MacCannell’s notion of sight sacralisation onto Gunn’s conceptualisation. What occurs is a movement from the ‘profane’ (where Gunn’s ‘zone of closure’ is characterised by more ‘mundane’ commercial concerns) through to the ‘sacralised’ (in accordance with MacCannell’s formulation) and back again, passing into a spatio-temporally, liminal zone (Johnson, 2010a, 2010b). On return, the visitor gradually becomes re-integrated into the everyday. Such a conceptualisation demonstrates how an attraction or site can be understood to act as a zone wherein everyday obligations are suspended. This presents an interesting alternative way in which visitor experiences of an attraction might be analysed.
A monument, it has been established, is usually erected to commemorate in the present, and in the future, someone or something which derives from the past. Although the intentions for its existence are both immediate and contemporaneous, a monument is, quite literally and paradoxically, an anachronism. For monuments, this dichotomy of existing in the present while (intentionally or unintentionally) representing the past is one of its intrinsic features. The dichotomy further extends to the types of representation contained within the monument which can be broken into two elements: the ‘narrative’ and the ‘conceptual’. Story-telling plays an important role in remembering and recalling, so an important feature of a monument is to ‘tell’ a story. The story is told visually, texturally and, perhaps, textually, by the way in which the person, event, message or idea has been shaped and constructed or by the inclusion of certain interpretive text, or both. Conceptually, an understanding of the story is enhanced through the socially and culturally embedded conventions presented in the physical structure. If visitors share certain cultural and social definitions of these conventions, then what will be produced will amount to ‘quite similar semantic relations’ (Kress & Leeuwen, 2001:44) (cf. Hall’s [1973, 1980] notion of a ‘dominant reading’). In fact, a general understanding of those signifying features which ‘make up’ a monument may include such architectural features as its size, shape and sense of grandeur, its public prominence and its stylised subject matter which often incorporates a historical narrative, as well as certain abstract qualities such as its capacity to inspire awe and wonder and, through its message, to promote certain human emotions, all of which, together, constitute its ‘monumentality’.

Elliot supports this argument, stating that monuments being designed in dedication to the idea of ‘monumentality’ comprise two aspects or ‘consensus constructs’ (Emanuel, 1997), both of which have far-reaching relevance when analysing and discussing visitor responses to their experiences of monuments:

(1) the creation of an architectural objective which will, through its permanence, its dignity and its form evoke feelings that are in sympathy with its purposes; and

(2) the creation of idealised architectural form which will, having liberal budget and simple function, act as an abstract architectural style.
To these may be added a third principle which the spatial practice of a monument must take into account, viz., its site. The importance of the site for any monument, particularly in terms of its visibility, cannot be overemphasised. Its position relative to its visitors may have a potentially huge psychological impact upon them, exerting a sense of imposition, dominance or power over the visitor. As well, the site where the monument is situated will similarly have an important and direct impact on a visitor’s interpretation of it and of the meaning which is given to it. A monument’s engagement with its surroundings, its physical context and its relationship to other buildings, gardens or landscapes, may be of great significance for our better understanding of its behaviour as a complex system (ICOMOS, 1993:42). The combination of these characteristics and features are what go together to define a structure’s ‘monumentality’.

The notion of ‘monumentality’, however, is difficult to define. Whilst, on the one hand, it suggests the physical characteristics which combine in the construction of an object to commemorate or venerate, it is in its cognitive sense of ‘monumentality’ that the notion can best address the important emotional, symbolic and ideological functions of monuments. Buildings and structures may refer to people, events and ideas in many ways, but these particular constructions may not necessarily be deemed to be ‘monuments’. However, anything can quite readily be deemed to be a monument if it is, in fact, imbued with certain cognitive attributes deemed to be ‘monumental’ and characteristic of its perceived ‘monumentality’. At first glance, this might appear to be a somewhat circular argument. In order to afford a structure its monumental ‘status’, it needs to invoke some sort of emotional response or reaction in its audience. Enshrined within the design and structure of monuments are embedded allegorical statements of values, ideologies, power, control, dominance, triumph, devotion, sacrifice, thanks, status, collective memory and shared identity, for example. As well, monuments have imbued in them a panoply of human emotions which has the capacity to communicate the social, political, cultural or ideological and symbolic messages with which monuments are imbued. Where some visitors may be awe-struck by the sheer size or proportions of a building or structure, some by the symbolism associated with the site and some by the emotional response it engenders, none of these independently in and of themselves is necessarily sufficient to warrant the building, structure or site to be
designated as a ‘monument’. It follows, then, that it is only once it has been cognitively
imbued with ‘monumentality’ that it truly becomes a ‘monument’. That status comes
about as a result of the negotiation of the complex layers of historical and cultural
discourses which are embedded in the representation and which are cognitively and/or
intuitively interpreted by visitors to signpost expected experiences and create an
‘expected place’ (Tressider, 2010:609).

The architectural style of a monument may have an equally strong effect on a visitor’s
interaction with it, and influence his or her appreciation of it. In any discussion of
monuments, it is important that their sculptural qualities not be overlooked.
Monuments may be described as ‘architectural sculptures’ because, like sculptures, they
are three-dimensional, representational forms, aesthetic and part ornament, most often
designed and constructed for public display, to be admired and, in that admiration, to
elicit certain feelings and to make us aware of and communicate some innate ‘truth’.
Like a sculpture, a monument is not experienced by sight alone but is a construction
which can call upon many of the senses for its fullest appreciation. A monument is a
solid construction which requires human involvement or participation in it as the major
reason for its existence. Human interaction with a monument will, for instance, often
see demands being made on not only the visual but the aural, haptic and olfactory
senses of the visitor as well as the drawing on of the internal, psychological and
emotional responses of those engaging with the monument.

Also like a sculpture, it is, quite paradoxically, in a monument’s surface where the signs
are formed in which we may discern some underlying meaning and interpretation
(Rogers, 1983:165). What may initially appear as a curve, line, texture or particular
feature in the design may, in fact, with closer analysis and sufficient cultural capital,
form a powerful symbol which conveys important ideological messages to its audience,
and so helps to encourage a particular interpretation. Whatever their form, monuments
necessarily synthesise visual and pictorial aspects and it is through their artistry or
‘aesthetics’ that relevance and potency is revealed, for it is their artistic or aesthetic
intent which engenders emotional responses and reactions from visitors who come into
contact with them.
The ideal monument, as espoused by the architect, Tamms, must go beyond human scale. According to Tamms (1993), a monument should be executed with amplitude, solidly put together and built according to the most established rules of the trade, as if it were for eternity. It must, in the practical sense, be absolutely without utility but it must have an idea behind it (cited in Michaud, 1993:232). Further to this, Elliott (1964:52) writes:

Monuments deal with ideas that are expressed in general and simple terms and are executed in a deliberate manner ... The thoughts that lead to the establishment of a monument demand a degree of impressive formality in the design, since a serious and meditative mood is the principal objective. A monument is, then, a physical manifestation of an emotional response to people, events or ideas.

Elliott (1964:52) goes on to argue that ‘a monument does not really function as a means of explicit communication [but that] it is predicated on the assumption that the viewer already knows the pertinent facts about it and its subject’. Furthermore, he adds, ‘monuments are customarily overlaid with minutiae and subtleties of symbolism which are meaningless without the viewers’ previous knowledge’. This brings in a touristic dimension, in that it is suggested that locals with previous and appropriate socio-cultural knowledge may understand what the monument represents, stands for or symbolises, whereas an outsider, or a visitor, may not, unless the visitor has had some previous attachment of association with the place, culture or what the monument represents. MacCannell (1976) argues, however, that nobody visits a sight or experiences it directly or immediately without having already been provided with some background knowledge or understanding supplied by markers, those objects, such as the array of souvenirs, popular artefacts and accoutrements which have the semiotic facility to convey particular images and meanings of a sight. MacCannell’s argument here is somewhat tenuous. MacCannell fails take into account the fact that people simply ‘stumble across’ attractions by accident and may be totally unaware of any of that attraction’s markers. To say, then, that a tourist attraction, in MacCannell’s (1976:41) terms, consists of a tripartite framework which emphasises the ‘empirical relationship between a tourist, a sight and a marker’ is to suggest that he is talking more generally of sites/sights deemed to be ‘tourist attractions’.

75
tripartite framework which emphasises the ‘empirical relationship between a tourist, a sight and a marker’, monuments are very often (directly or indirectly) inscribed and imbued with a number of meanings and a structure to organise them. ‘Monuments appear to be permanent markers of memory and history [which] they do so both iconically and indexically, i.e. they can evoke feelings through their materiality and form as well as symbolise social narratives of events’ (Rowlands & Tilley, 2006:500).

Unlike other types of attraction, monuments might well be included as markers of themselves, as it is often in the symbolism, the statuary, the inscriptions or other ornamentation where visitors are provided with information that might not be otherwise known to them prior to their visit. As with the sites/sights themselves, the meanings attached to markers, however, can never be fixed. Particularly where objects such as monuments are invested with such symbolic import, ‘the dominant meanings which centre upon them are apt to be challenged, not because the objects are insignificant, but in terms of what they signify’ (Edensor, 2002:113).

There is an inherent belief that monuments are constructed _sub species aeternitatis_, i.e. not only for the present but for future generations, which combines with a belief in the ‘eternal’ validity of the communicated values with which a monument has been imbued. Young (1993:3) suggests that, in its ‘seemingly land-anchored permanence [a monument] could also guarantee the permanence of a particular idea or memory attached to it. In this conception, the monument would remain essentially impervious to time and change, a perpetual witness—a relic to a person, event or epoch’.

The placement, timing of construction and the iconography of a monument can serve to legitimise the present through the construction of the past and, in so doing, formulate a program for the future. It is quite paradoxical, then, that monuments are, by their very nature, designed and constructed for permanency, yet the different and disparate ways in which they may be interpreted may arise as an aspect of struggles between different interest groups and individuals (Thomas, 1990) over time and in different circumstances. Equally as paradoxically, their permanence may result in a struggle between past and present, creating a rift between present reality and the traditional context (Thomas, 1990) in terms of their continued relevance and in their interpretation. For visitors, this situation may present them with a quandary when trying to create
meaning of such an attraction. A monument, in sum, is not only a product of its time but also, simultaneously, attempts to be outside time. Ironically, this is precisely the strategy of monumental architecture: it attempts to freeze time, to be a-historical by violating the fluid historical processes of change by imposing its fixed meaning or message on the future. As such, while monuments can represent or symbolise something for a brief period of time, the logic or strategy behind their construction attacks the diachrony of time. According to prominent South African Professor of Art History, Maré, monuments ‘become relics very quickly’ (pers. comm., 7 April 2010). For Maré, then, monuments have a very limited ‘shelf life’ and quickly become anachronisms (Maré, 2004).

Monuments become loci of remembrance, as well as articulating what they represent, encapsulating and absorbing meanings and transmitting them back to the public in reciprocal interaction. This activation of a monumental site creates a hub of collective memory, which French theorist, Nora (1984), terms a ‘lieu de memoire’ (‘place of memory’). For Nora (1984), ‘true memory has disappeared’ (cited in Rowlands & Tilley, 2006:501) and the memory being ‘preserved’ in a monument can simply be fabricated as an extension of a particular political or economic imperative. By focusing on one perspective of memory, then, monuments inevitably propagate a selective memory and, in their presentation, may be accused of ‘re-writing’ an event or a person to suit some broader social, political or cultural agenda, or to further some idea or value for the purposes of political expediency, for example. Once again, MacCannell’s ‘markers’ or ‘contextual material’ (Parry, 2007:67), including such things as visitor-generated interpretations in narrative form, can provide linkages in the interpretation and meaning-making process for visitors who, presented with varying degrees of interpretive scaffolding (Samis, 2007) in the form of signage, information boards, brochures or leaflets at a monument. In this way, visitors might then be in a better position to formulate their own ideas, if they are offered information beforehand, rather than having to rely on what is presented to them on-site.

Monuments are, according to Kersaint (cited in Choay, 2001:77) ‘irreproachable historical witnesses to history’, produced in a specific historical ‘moment’ or context. Because a monument is a representational practice which can be ‘questioned’, its
evidence ‘read’, interpreted and understood, it is not unlike any textual, historical
document or image which can be read to provide information or as a witness who offers
a ‘lens’ through which to view and evaluate a perspective of a person, event or idea.
Metaphorically, I would suggest that monuments ‘speak’ to those through their
symbolic language with whom they enter into ‘conversation’. Whilst it is inherent in its
intention that the ‘conversation’ which is entered into is constructed in such a way so as to
guide and shape the attitudes and beliefs of the human ‘interactors’, the way a visitor
engages with a monument in metaphorical conversation will differ depending upon the
socio-cultural attributes of the visitor, such as ethnicity, gender, age, sexuality, cultural
literacy. It is in the engagement and interaction with the monument that meaning is
constructed. This illustrates a constructivist perspective where meaning is not created
but is mediated and constrained by the qualities and history of an object which, itself, is
shaped by our consciousness (Crotty, 2003).

Meaning, then, is constructed in a dialectical relationship between a subject, in this case
a visitor and a monument, and necessarily involves language and concepts which are
culturally embedded in our consciousness. Further to this, Pierroux (2005) argues that
meaning is constructed through human activity which is always socially situated, often
through discourse, either explicit or implicit and mediated by language. The discourse
‘between’ a visitor and a monument is both explicit and implicit. The physical
eXternalities of a monument which are informed by its symbolism and iconography
meet with the personal context of the visitor which encompasses an individual’s prior
knowledge, interests, attitudes, values and beliefs, as well as motivations and
expectations. As well, Johnson (2010a:8, 2010b) argues that the visitor is ‘positioned’
within a certain set of discourses which work together with the ‘eye/I’ to direct the gaze,
according to their value system, and what they already know or believe to know, to
shape their interpretation and meaning-making. However, I argue that a visitor’s
experience, and the ways through which meaning is made, are not determined entirely
by the gaze but are also constructed through a holistic, embodied, multisensorial
experience.

Accordingly, when discussing visitor interaction with an attraction, whether a
monument or otherwise, the sensory and corporeal dimensions need to be emphasised.
Bodily movement and sensory perceptions affect the ways visitors interpret and make meaning of sites (Hooper-Greenhill, 2007), as do other physical context features such as ease of movement and navigability, climatic conditions and other more ephemeral factors such as ambience and atmosphere. How visitors ‘perform a diverse range of enactions’ is a major way in which to understand how they make sense of an attraction (Edensor, 1998:7). The corporeal and sensual experience of interacting with things is shaped by the physical qualities of objects and the ways in which they are sensually apprehended (Edensor, 2002:106). Accordingly, being-in-the-world is experienced, and places are constituted by the kinaesthetic experience of things and the ways in which they facilitate and extend action (see Macnaghten and Urry, 1998). Things have ‘a physical presence in the world which has material consequences’ (Dant, 1999: 2). They possess qualities which are smelled, felt, heard and looked at, although such sensory mediation is always culturally specific, located in traditions of sensual apprehension (Classen, 1993).

Ostensibly, on face value, monuments are commissioned and erected in order to commemorate. Closer analysis, however, of their complex iconography, narratives and symbolism reveal their self-consciously persuasive and propagandistic intent (Coutu, 2006:15). By their grandeur, their symbolism, by what they represent, monuments aim to discursively manipulate the visitor towards desired (individual or collective) ends. They shape a common understanding and appreciation of someone or something by promoting a particular interpretation, through some consciousness-raising process and emotional response, to raise public awareness and consciousness of some value or virtue, notion, shared ideal, aspiration, individual or collective achievement or success, to legitimise certain actions or events, or to sway public opinion and direct audiences to a specific interpretation. Whatever their design, however, it is their purpose—their message—and in their continued success to convey that message, their capacity to maintain that message in the public collective psyche which will determine their continued viability as ‘wanted’ monuments, or their survival as anachronistic remnants with little contemporary meaning.

In their educative or propagandistic and related roles, monuments are important in shaping and defining memories—both individual but, most importantly, for the
The term ‘monument’ was described as ambiguous and eluding any definitive classification. It has been argued that it is possibly more appropriate to describe the features which together constitute how a monument may be tangibly realised and, more importantly, what it stands for and symbolises. To that end, this chapter has worked towards developing a framework to facilitate the present study and this investigation of monuments as visitor attractions. Because of their precarious nature in terms of their subject matter and in their representation or symbolism, monuments are highly contested objects, a contestation that goes well beyond defining them. The notion of ‘monumentality’ has also been addressed. As a result of the processes of monumentalisation, monumentality is the abstract product or set of characteristics and qualities with which a monument is endowed. In an effort to emphasise the non-physical nature of those qualities, I have made a play on the word to extend the notion of include the cognitive *monumentality*.

Woven throughout the chapter have been references to the work of Alois Riegl, whose taxonomy of monuments forms the backbone for much of the more recent theoretical analysis. History demonstrates how people, ideas, events and ideologies all fall in and out of favour. Similarly, their monumental realisations may, if they are unable to move with their times, suffer the same fate as what it is they have been constructed to
commemorate or venerate may have suffered. Alternatively, however, what were not intended as monuments may, in time, be designated as such. Riegl’s taxonomy accounts for the dynamic nature of monuments.

A discussion of monuments as tourist attractions has been presented, demonstrating the physical, social, ideological, communicative, semiotic, symbolic and educative dimensions and their importance on the visitor experience as the means by which visitors interact with, interpret and make sense of monuments corporeally, sensorially and affectively. This chapter guides the ways in which the ATM is positioned and analysed as a visitor attraction in Chapter 5. The theoretical impetus and the various methods used to gather the empirical data for later examination and analysis are detailed in Chapter 4.
Chapter 4

Methodology

Tourism is an important subject of academic inquiry precisely because it is an extension of our humanity and the cultures we inhabit. (Robinson et al., 2000: iii)

4.1 Introduction

In their 2007 review detailing the growth and development of tourism as a discrete subject of increasing academic interest, Tribe and Airey (2007:3) write that ‘[t]ourism research has come a long way since the first developments in the identification and delineation of a tourism subject area in the mid-1960s’. From beginnings which centred predominantly around the economic and business concerns of the industry, tourism today can be conceived of in a much more eclectic and multi-disciplinary way. Tourism may be considered as a business to be predicted, managed and controlled (Cooper, 2002). Tourism is also a socio-cultural phenomenon, capable of illuminating aspects of the modern condition (Franklin, 2003), and can be studied from a range of disciplinary perspectives—geography, anthropology, psychology, sociology, cultural studies (Ritchie, Burns & Palmer, 2005:ix). Tribe (2006:1) describes the ‘totality of tourism studies’ as having now ‘developed beyond the narrow boundaries of an applied business field and has the characteristics of a fledgling post-modern field of research’ while Graburn & Jafari (1991:7) have commented that ‘no single discipline alone can accommodate, treat or understand tourism; it can be studied only if disciplinary boundaries are crossed and if multidisciplinary perspectives are sought and found’. Given the predominance of the disciplinary approach of economics, it is hardly surprising that early research was dominated by positivist research methods and the laws of natural science (Tribe & Airey, 2007:5). A social scientific research perspective has tried, however, to counter what it sees as a somewhat mechanistic approach by
highlighting the advantages of phenomenological methodologies (Franklin & Crang, 2001).

As well as having demonstrated how the study of tourism has been extended into many different disciplines, Tribe and Airey (2007) have also shown how tourism studies are making use of multifarious methodological approaches and theoretical perspectives. As a consequence of this eclecticism, any philosophical debates underpinning which specific methodologies might need to be employed in particular tourism research must take into account the perspective from which ‘tourism’ is viewed or the motives for which the tourism research is being conducted.

Ateljevic, Pritchard & Morgan (2007) have also argued that more recent approaches to the study of tourism demonstrate a notable critical shift away from those concentrating on business research methods or constrained by undertaking positivist forms of research. More recent approaches emphasise interpretative and critical modes of tourism enquiry by locating the phenomenon in its wider social, cultural, economic and political contexts and where research methods grounded in a social science perspective are adopted. The diversity of this development is evident in the variety of approaches and methods used and perspectives from which tourism can be viewed (Ritchie et al.:ix). Reflecting this diversity as well, there has seen in recent times a concomitant increase in the number of publications devoted to various aspects of tourism research and, in particular, to the broader philosophical debates which underpin specific methodologies (Phillmore & Goodson, 2004).

In light of this discussion, this chapter presents an explanation of the methodological orientation of this study in terms of the research paradigm employed, a justification of chosen methodology, and a description of the methods used to collect data relevant to the research aims and objectives. The chapter situates this study within a tradition of critical social research—as a consequence of both the study’s broad aims and the processes and techniques employed to value and privilege the participants’ voices. Furthermore, this chapter presents the methodology and methods used to interrogate a
central aim of this thesis, viz: to describe and interpret visitors’ experiences of the ATM and to distil the meanings those visitors assign to the Monument.

As has been established, in recent years, there has been an emerging shift in tourism studies away from ‘heavily (post) positivist, quantitative’ knowledge practices ‘laden with business prerogatives’ (Pritchard & Morgan, 2007:11) in favour of a more critical mode of enquiry which emphasises the interpretation of data and the contextualisation of research coupled with the flexibility of choice of a range of social science perspectives, paradigms and methodologies. Many scholars view tourism from a predominantly socio-cultural perspective as a complex social phenomenon which is intimately connected to various contemporary influences, changes, crises, instabilities and challenges which manifest themselves at the global, regional, national and local levels. This is the approach taken by me. Taken from this standpoint and in line with the quote from Robinson et al. (2000) at the opening of this chapter, studies in tourism are, irrespective of the disciplinary trajectory from which it is approached, essentially concerned with the study of a particular aspect in the social life of humans.

Positioning tourism as an inherently social phenomenon, the behaviour and experiences of tourists—their motivations for travel, the decisions they make before, during and after their travel experience, what they actually do during their visits and the behaviour they actually exhibit at tourist attractions and sites—forms the foundation for tourism study. The analysis of data gathered in the observation and analysis of those interactions and behaviours and the recording and interpretation of the different types of behaviour associated with the activity of tourism, then, while providing better appreciation for social scientists and others of visitor behaviour and experiences, more broadly offers the possibility of generating valuable knowledge and insights to improve and enrich our overall understanding of human activity (Bowen & Clark, 2009; Ross & Lukas, 2005:4; Uysal, 1994).

For any investigative project, the selection of methodologies and research methods does not occur in a vacuum and nor is the research process entirely dictated by the subject matter or phenomenon under investigation. Rather, while each individual research
project requires its own unique set of methods and techniques to best address its aims, objectives and intended outcomes, the methodologies and methods are linked fundamentally to the way in which the researcher approaches central questions of ontology and epistemology and the adoption of related research paradigms.

4.2 Epistemological and Methodological Foundations
The research paradigm adopted in this thesis may best be described as a hybrid, eclectic mix of deliberately trans-disciplinary theoretical perspectives and methodological approaches. I was reluctant to locate myself within any one particular area of investigation such as ‘heritage studies’ or ‘visitor studies’ because of my desire to work both within and against received notions of method and frameworks implicit within those positions. To take an eclectic, multi-perspective (bricolage) approach has allowed me the flexibility to draw from various theoretical perspectives most relevant and salient to best suit the overall research endeavour. It has also allowed me to employ a methodological approach which would allow for the collection of the richest possible data for later analysis.

Important to this study is Hollinshead’s (2004) discussion of messy and complex research and the ontological and epistemological challenges and burdens which these place on the researcher.

For qualitative tourism researchers in an already complex, multidisciplinary field of research, the challenge is in ‘finding out’, and developing methods that enable the researcher to penetrate the surface and mine the rich complexities of individual experience. An eclectic methodological approach which incorporates both observational and interactional methods of data gathering necessarily has meant that the research for this thesis would be both messy and complex. In recognising that in both the research design and practice there are myriad ways in which it can be conducted, interpreted and written, Hollinshead (2004:63) urges scholars to recognise that ‘the ontologies of being, meaning and identity in the contemporary age is frequently a messy matter of infinite interpretive possibilities’ (see also Dwyer et al., 2012).

The very nature of the visitor ‘act’ as a social and cultural phenomenon or form of cultural praxis foregrounds the notion of human agency and of the meanings derived from everyday human interaction with various objects, cultural artifacts and practices
(Flyvberg, 2004). This study, then, draws on a hermeneutic, phenomenological tradition to examine the experiences of visitors and the meanings made at and of a particular visitor site. Along with the methods used for the collection of essentially qualitative data, its interpretation and analysis, my subsequent reflection on the data to ascertain if there are any particular ‘phenomena’ which link or flow through the various experiences and the development of resulting theoretical conceptualisation, together, place this study squarely within the hermeneutic and phenomenological ‘camps’. A primary objective of my research has been to use these traditions to develop a fresh, new approach by incorporating a post-structuralist/social constructivist perspective where, according to Lewellen (2002), such an approach views all ‘reality’ as being socially constructed, with social objects and phenomena being ‘read’, interpreted and given meaning. The ways in which visitors ‘read’ and make sense of what are
traditionally considered cornerstones of the tourism endeavour—visitor attractions as ‘texts’ has only rarely been used in tourism studies (Gottdiener, 1995; Knudsen et al., 2007; Abousnnouga & Machin, 2010). It has been my intention, then, to employ established theory drawn from the fields of cultural studies, sociology, anthropology and semiotics which may be described, at best, as peripheral to ‘mainstream’ tourism studies to establish a new ‘reading’ of old ‘texts’ as an alternative to any other of the more traditional approaches in the examination of visitor behaviour and interaction with tourist attractions.

A key driving factor for this approach is what feminist theorist, Rich (1980) describes as the notion of ‘re-vision’. Simply stated, ‘Re-vision [is] the act of looking back, of seeing with fresh eyes, of entering an old text from a new critical direction’ (Rich, 1980:370). So it is through this particular lens of ‘re-visioning’ that my own epistemological standpoint, and the assumptions which underpin my ontological and epistemological ‘home,’ can best be understood. ‘Reality’, which is constructed and experienced in myriad ways by different individuals and communities, and ‘knowledge’, which is created through the experience of and interaction with the world, are not static, but are fluid, dynamic and contextual and shaped by historical, social, political and social pressures and influences. Such an epistemology presents implications in terms of chosen research paradigms. Without wishing here to engage in an evaluation of their typology, to return to Guba & Lincoln’s (2008: 260) classification of research paradigms, I clearly position myself within the paradigms which they categorise as ‘postmodern’, namely those of critical theory, constructivism and participatory research.

The interpretive aproach asserts that reality, and our knowledge of reality, are social products (Orlikowski & Baroudi, 1991). Our understanding of the ‘world’, as an extension of subjective experience, is conceived of as a dynamic and ever-emerging social process. Any explanation of meaning is sought within the frame of reference of the social actor (Burrell & Morgan, 1979), and it is this interpretive perspective which ‘attempts to understand the meanings embedded in social life and, hence, to explain why people act the way they do’ (Gibbons, cited in Orlikowski & Baroudi, 1991:13).
In light of this position, for my epistemological self, I subscribe to a social constructivist worldview wherein socially-constructed reality is viewed as an ongoing, dynamic process, and where reality is reproduced by people acting on their interpretations and knowledge of it. According to Boghossian (2001), a phenomenon is socially constructed if it is contingent on our social selves, suggesting that it would not exist had ‘we’ not ‘built’ it and that to have meaning, it needs to serve some social purpose. Constructivist epistemologies therefore generally insist that individuals construct their own unique versions of reality and that people looking at or interacting with something together never actually see or experience the same thing in exactly the same way. Social constructivism refers to an individual’s making meaning of knowledge within a social context. To discover the meanings which visitors construct for themselves from their experiences or encounters with a visitor attraction, as part of a wider, dynamic and context-framed inter-subjective awareness (Jackson & Sorenson, 2006:166), is a key objective of this thesis.

Social constructivism also rejects absolutism and puts forward the idea that there are many ways to structure the world and that there are many meanings or perspectives, none of which may be ‘objectively’ determined as being ‘correct’. To argue from a perspective, however, that seems to suggest that every visitor in every location will experience, respond to and give meaning to an attraction in a completely unique way is to suggest that, within our socially-constructed worldview, there is little or no collective or shared ‘reality’. I prefer to believe that there are certain ‘core’ and shared human reactions, responses and understandings and this belief is tested (in Chapter 7) in the analysis of visitors’ comments about their experience at the Monument and the meaning they make of and from it. Visitors’ individual commentaries will, of course, be of interest in and of themselves but, in the end, it will be the shared, inter-subjective ideas, themes and meanings which will help to provide a deeper understanding of social reality in general and which will, ultimately, prove to be of greatest interest to other scholars and researchers. A key element in the analysis of the observation of visitors and interview data has, therefore, been to uncover any unifying practices which might become apparent. The nature of my study requires an interpretive approach, based on
the idea that the social world is not a ‘given’ but is made up of human consciousness, ideas and concepts, shared and collective beliefs, languages and discourses, all of which are themselves socially constructed (cf. Barker & Galasiński, 2001).

Because visitors to an attraction comprise people from different social, ethnic, cultural and linguistic backgrounds with diverse interests and motivations for visiting a particular tourist site, each visitor will have something unique to offer to its ‘cumulative’ construction. The attraction is, then, at once and paradoxically, the individual interpretation, the collective interpretation, as well as the sum of these constructions. Each contribution towards its creation is made by an individual who exists in a given time and place and who brings to bear on the attraction his/her accumulated prior knowledge, understanding, appreciation, expectations, biases, values, beliefs and emotional responses. Visitors’ only create the ‘attraction’ through their social interaction, their discussion, communication, sharing of thoughts and feelings and the negotiation, coupled with their personal reflection of those thoughts, feelings, ideas, reactions and emotions towards the attraction. For the social constructivist, then, the socially-constructed ‘knowledge’ of an attraction only comes about as an outcome of personal experience which is mediated by one’s own prior and accumulated knowledge and experience with that of others.

Phenomenologically-oriented research studies everyday events from within the life-world of the person experiencing them. Phenomenologists, thus, aim to describe phenomena as they manifest themselves in the consciousness of the experiencer (Moran, 2000 [1945]). ‘The aim is to determine what the experience means for the persons who have had the experience and are able to provide a comprehensive description of it’ (Moustakas, 1994:13). Central to a phenomenological approach is its emphasis on the prominence of the ‘subjective’ in the overall experience. Subjective experience occurs within a particular social and cultural context, and it is through the interplay between the subjective and the social and cultural that an individual interprets their surroundings which, in turn, gives rise to knowledge creation (Becker, 1992; Ehrich, 2003; Merleau-Ponty, 2002; Moran, 2000). In terms of the researcher, the phenomenological approach asks that the subjective observer temporarily step aside and suspend his or her own
personal (and with that, social and cultural) presuppositions about the nature of ‘reality’ in order to appreciate the perspectives of the people under observation and of the ways in which others interpretively experience and produce their ‘reality’.

For the researcher, the data which are the source for any interpretation derive from both the observation of human action and through the oral engagement (interviews and conversations) between researcher and visitors. This social action involved in the research process is best understood in terms of what Giddens (1976:162) has called the ‘double hermeneutic’: engaging in conversations with tourists (the first hermeneutic) and then interpreting those conversations, in order to build ‘consensus constructs’ (the second hermeneutic). Goulding (1999) warns any researcher making use of a hermeneutic phenomenological approach that ‘lived’ experience may not always honour the standard conceptual boundaries pre-defined by the researcher and must be understood in relation to the context of that specific ‘life world’ from which it emerges. Denzin & Lincoln (2005:3) further argue that this type of qualitative research involves an ‘interpretive, naturalistic approach to the world [where] qualitative researchers study things in their natural settings, attempting to make sense of, or interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them’. Dialogue between researcher and interviewee should be flexible and pre-specified questions should only serve as a guideline and not dominate the natural flow of conversation. Similarly, qualitative observation is itself fundamentally naturalistic in that it occurs within the context of occurrences and experiences of those being observed, thus drawing ‘observers into the phenomenological complexities and realities of the participants’ worlds’ (Echevarria, 1994). The identification of any common characteristics or themes should be rendered in ‘emic’ (those of the participants) terms (Goulding, 1999: 864–865) and emerge through the ‘inductive’ (Merriam, 1998:8) synthesising or merging of analysed interview data which provide the focus for thematic interpretation (Morse, 1994).

References to the recommendations and caveats by Giddens (1976); Denzin & Lincoln (2005); Goulding (1999); Echevarria, (1994); Merriam (1998); and Morse (1994) highlight the fact that the type of qualitative research which I have undertaken is, by its very nature, diverse, complex and nuanced (Holloway & Todres, 2003). Scenes and
scenarios which are the subject of this type of research are rarely straightforward but are, so to speak, ‘messy’. Messy and complex though the scenarios might be, the study is squarely located within the tradition of qualitative inquiry and draws upon and shares many of the characteristics and dimensions outlined by Patton (1980), Eisner (1998) and Merriam (1998) in their taxonomies of features which work together to create the character of qualitative research.

4.3 Conducting Fieldwork

Fieldwork is a characteristic element normally associated with ethnographic research design, and so, with this in mind, it was felt that a fieldwork case study would afford me the greatest opportunity to embed myself in the ‘lived experience’. My role as both tourist and researcher afforded me the opportunity to observe and examine at close range tourists’ interactions with and responses to a specific attraction and gain an understanding of what meanings or understandings they had gained from their experiences there.

Prior to the commencement of the fieldwork, the research design outlining the ethical framework within which the research would be conducted was submitted to and approved by the Southern Cross University Human Ethics Committee (HREC Number ECN-09-102). That document contained details of the study, outlining the strategies which would be employed to conduct the research in an ethical manner. It highlighted precautions which needed to be undertaken by the researcher to protect and preserve privacy and anonymity of all participants in the study, as well as noting any contingencies to be adopted in the eventuality that any matters arose which had, up until that point, remained unforeseen.

I spent a period of approximately three months conducting observations, interviews and further secondary research in South Africa. I had not been to South Africa before, so I felt it important to familiarise myself with the broad social and cultural environment of South Africa, particularly in relation to cultural and social information contingent with the times and politics since the initial proposal for the construction of a monument to the Afrikaans language in 1942. I visited a number of other well-known monuments
and landmarks in South Africa—most notably the Voortrekker Monument outside Pretoria, the Apartheid Museum in Johannesburg, Sammy Marks’ House, Robben Island, District 6 Museum in Cape Town, the Women’s Monument in Franschhoek, and Stellenbosch University Museum, as well as visits to Soweto and Nelson Mandela’s house there, Hillbrow in Johannesburg, to various parts of Cape Town, and to towns and townships in Western Cape Province—all of which helped me to gain a much broader and more nuanced understanding of contemporary South Africa and which provided me with the social, cultural, historical and political contexts through which to understand to some degree the nature of the ATM.

Certainly the focus of this thesis is on the ATM—a construction in concrete and granite. Yet, the Monument is, in and of itself, more directly the catalyst through which to learn more about ourselves as humans—what motivates us, how we are motivated and why we feel, act and behave in certain ways in certain circumstances. It serves, then, as the backdrop for the observation of visitors’ and, as well, my own behaviour, actions, reactions and comments and of their—and my—responses to a unique tourist attraction. By living in the ‘field’, I was also able to gain a greater insight into the context through which social, cultural and political debates specifically related to the Afrikaans language, monuments in South Africa and the future of the ATM itself were engaged and framed. (See Table 4.1 Phases of Fieldwork which maps the observational element and phases involved in the fieldwork process.) Ultimately there is a need for tourism researchers ‘to recognize reflexivity not only as a self-indulgent practice of writing ourselves into our research, but also as a wider socio-political process which must incorporate and acknowledge the 'researched' and our responsibilities to them in the production of tourism knowledge’ (Ateljevic et al., 2005:9).

To employ a reflexive approach, then, has implications for this study, for it suggests that such a study is not, nor can be, anything other than interpretive. It is important, however, that the parameters for that interpretation be given a social and cultural context. To that end, what follows is a brief reflection on the self which, according to Hollinshead and Jamal (2007:101), is ‘that highly personal yet interactive analysis of the way insights are obtained in and about and single research context in terms of sociological rather than theoretical growth’. Thus, to incorporate a reflexive dimension
to the study allows for an account of my interestedness and engagement in the particular area of research.

### Table 4.1 Phases of Fieldwork

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Arrival in South Africa and orientation (Johannesburg/Pretoria) (Week 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting with Prof. Karel Bakker (Head of the School of Architecture, University of Pretoria) to see the original blueprints of the ATM; meeting with Prof. Estelle Maré, art historian (Week 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Arrival and orientation in Paarl (Week 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meeting, rapport building with ATM staff and visiting ATM and Museum (Week 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal orientation to the ATM (Week 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Beginning observation phase (Week 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Beginning interview phase (Week 3, lasting until Week 10—’saturation point’, or point of ‘ambient awareness’))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concurrently with observations and interviews, meetings with ATM staff, organising interviews with suggested respondents (Week 3 ongoing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visit Erna van Wijk (Week 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Archival, library research (Paarl, Stellenbosch, Cape Town; further interviews with interested respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6</td>
<td>Focus Groups held (Week 11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An important part of this study, then, includes reflections upon my own involvement, not as a researcher, but as a visitor to the Monument. Along with the data provided by those many visitors whose actions and behaviour I observed and those whom I interviewed, I, too, became one of the observed and one of the interviewed. As well, my behaviour, ideas, thoughts and feelings became part of the data and provided equally valid insights into perceptions held by visitors about the site and of any value given to their experiences there. Whilst I have not included myself *per se* as one of the observed or interviewed, my own responses, reactions and feelings have helped to inform my understanding of those of visitors. To turn away from the individual and the biographical, I believe, is to deny a potentially rich source of evidence that the
‘observation’ my own experiences can provide.

At once both a visitor and a researcher actively engaged within the very field being researched, that this study derives from an insider’s perspective is not a methodological option, but rather a given. In this type of study, the researcher’s own conceptions are required in order to make sense of what has been studied (Chapman & Smith, 2002). As visitor, I became part of my own research field and engaged as both researcher and participant in the reconstruction of my own construction, as well as that of all other ‘participants’ (Hollinshead & Jamal, 2007:94).

The role of the researcher, then, is acknowledged as the linchpin in the research process bringing particular concepts to the process of analysis. The important relational elements of the person, position, rules, ends and ideology of the researcher and factors such as the geographical situatedness (in terms of country of origin and work, language and cultural community) of a researcher are further important considerations which need to be accounted for. Similarly, the location of the studies and the influence of those personal and other geographical factors will bring to bear on the construction of tourism knowledge. This situating or locating the researcher within the physical and intellectual context of the research project is what Tribe and Airey (2007:9) term ‘positionality’.

4.3.1 Positionality—Locating the Researcher

Ateljevic (2005) argues that there is a need for tourism scholars to be more transparent about their own positioning and to ‘reveal the geo-body-political location of the subject that speaks’ (quoted in Ateljevic, 2009:278). Referring to Tribe & Airey’s (2007) comment that there is a real need for a more coherent picture to be made of the seriously dispersed field of tourism studies, Ateljevic contends that ‘positionality remains one of the least travelled roads of tourism scholars’ (Ateljevic, 2009:278). In an effort to redress this shortcoming I am, to extend Ateljevic’s metaphor, taking this ‘road less travelled’ and offering my thoughts and reflections on how I saw myself ‘located’—physically and intellectually—along with some personal insights into how I felt and realised myself as a researcher in the field.
While there were many things distinguishing me from the ‘locals’ (those whom I would estimate are resident within the vicinity of Paarl and within 20-30 kms of its environs, or those who would identify as being ‘local’), there were many others which saw me living as an unremarkable member of the Paarl community. My relative anonymity afforded me the opportunity to participate in ‘daily’ negotiations and to have impromptu discussions and conversations with many different people in many different environments—around a neighbour’s kitchen table, at an office, at a braai (barbecue), the beach, a café, a shebeen (bar in a Black\(^3\) township). All those conversations were in their own ways illuminating and were very much the source of my learning and understanding of the domestic issues and concerns which affected South Africans.

Living in a predominantly Afrikaans-speaking part of South Africa (with 76.7% of the population speaking Afrikaans as a first language in the Drakenstein Municipality, of which Paarl is its capital, while 18.9% speak isiXhosa and only some 3.4% speak English [Statistics South Africa, Census, 2001]) brought me into contact with many Afrikaans speakers and their passions and deep concerns for the place and role of their language and culture in today’s South Africa and into the future. In almost every encounter where I broached the subject, for those who identified as ‘Afrikaners’ (defined as those people of mainly Dutch, German or French Hugenot origins whose mother tongue is Afrikaans), the ongoing importance of the maintenance of their unique ethnic identity was a real and major priority. Along with those who might not have identified as being ethnically ‘Afrikaner’ but for whom Afrikaans was their mother tongue and their primary means of communication, there were real concerns regarding the ‘diminished’ role of Afrikaans in South Africa since 1994, and of the uncertain future for the language. Even for the

\(^3\) Throughout the thesis, the terms ‘Black’, ‘Coloured’ and ‘White’ are used to differentiate between the ethnically and socially-differentiated groups with which a majority of South Africans identify. ‘Black’ is a term used to describe people who identify as belonging to one of the Bantu tribes of Southern Africa. ‘Coloured’ (also known as Bruinmense, Kleurlinge or Bruin Afrikaners in Afrikaans) refers to those people who possess mixed Khoisan, Bantu, West African, Indonesian, Madagascan, Malay, Indian or Mozambiquan and European ethnicity. ‘White’ is used to describe those people who claim European heritage. To these groupings can be added ‘Indian’ for those people who are the descendants of indentured labourers and others who originated on the Indian sub-continent. During the apartheid era in South Africa, people were officially categorised as belonging to one or other ‘racial’ group. Even after the decades of ‘apartheid’s racial reasoning,’ writes Posel (2001:51), racial categorisation ‘has become a habit of thought and experience, a facet of popular “common sense” still widely in evidence’. The terminology today is much more fluid, however, and the manner in which people identify themselves is influenced by many factors including political, ideological, cultural and social, as well as ethnic perspectives.
youngsters who visited the ATM on primary and secondary school excursions, the Monument did not appear as an anachronistic vestige of some past era, but seemed to represent for them in concrete form an integral part of their identity, their language. It is hardly surprising, then, that for the South African Afrikaans speakers in their late teens and early twenties with whom I spoke at the Monument, something as fundamental as the ongoing relevance and status of their language was a very real but very sensitive and serious issue.

South Africans in general and Afrikaans speakers in particular were generally very curious to know the reasons as to why, in the first instance, an Australian—particularly one who has no South African ancestry nor any immediate affinity to South Africa—should have taken an interest in their language and culture and, just as curiously, why I should have taken an interest in the ATM to such an extent that I had made it the focus of my thesis. The interest and curiosity are evident by the fact that I had a number of small articles written about me and my research for local and regional newspapers, as well as for one of the most widely read Afrikaans language dailies, Die Beeld (see Appendices 8-12) and I was interviewed by radio station KFM in Cape Town.

My prior knowledge of South Africa made it impossible for me to arrive there as a ‘neutral observer’ (Crapanzano, 1985:22) without any preconceptions or perceived biases. Still, it was important to remain as culturally, socially, politically and morally open-minded as one might throughout the course of my research. Because I have lived, worked and travelled in many so-called ‘developing’ countries in Africa and elsewhere, I was certainly not unfamiliar with the sorts of things with which I could be directly confronted. I was prepared to see any of the vestiges of the dispossession and acts of inhumanity which many South Africans had suffered under the apartheid system and was well aware of the ubiquitous and potentially very real threats to personal safety of which I had been warned before embarking on my fieldwork.

My identity as an Australian researcher also created an ambiguity that was productive for my research. There was a tension of my own inclusivity and exclusivity within the research and more particularly in the ways in which I was perceived by community members. Even though I was an Australian, a foreigner, I was still a middle-aged male of clearly European decent living in comfortable accommodation in a middle-class area
of the city of Paarl, driving a car, shopping at the supermarket and the local mall. In the course of my daily life and through the activities of my research I, of course, came into contact with many Coloureds and (to a lesser degree) Blacks. Yet, as time went on, I reflected on my ‘Whiteness’—and the social and cultural ‘baggage’ which it continues to bear in a country such as South Africa—and realised that it very clearly accounted as a determining factor in the range of possible interactions I would enjoy during my time in South Africa. My enthusiasm and my willingness to imbibe in the panoply of mores, cultures and traditions which make up today’s South Africa was obvious to anyone to whom I spoke at any length. Yet, despite that enthusiasm, the reality was that I was only rarely invited to participate in activities which were instigated by non-Whites. There are, of course, any number of reasons as to why this might have been the case and this is not the place to make conjecture. Still, I believe that any restriction to access (in any of its guises) is an important limitation in any social study and needs to be fully acknowledged.

Immersing myself in and experiencing new cultures, largely spurred on by my desire to acquire as much of the local language as I can, is something which I have spent much of my life engaged in. For me, being embedded in the natural (‘real’ social and cultural) environment, being exposed to and becoming a part of the texture of the everyday experience of at least one sector of the South African population made me very conscious of my multi-faceted role of, simultaneously, visitor, tourist, some-time resident and researcher and, as time went on, acquaintance and friend. My position and role reinforced the constraints which, as an outsider and novice Afrikaans language learner, would necessarily limit my understanding of the people, their world, their past, their future and their consciousness and would have an impact on my attempts to come to terms with and make sense of the ‘cacophony’ of my South African experience.

I made a concerted effort at acquiring Afrikaans by watching and listening, having limited interchanges with native speakers, watching Afrikaans-language television and reading Afrikaans-language newspapers and magazines. My efforts did, I believe, afford me some opportunities to gain a deeper or closer insight into the minds and psyche of Afrikaans speakers and to read and hear about their concerns and the many issues which matter to them and which would have otherwise been denied to me had I not chosen to conduct fieldwork in South Africa.
I became quite good friends with some staff members of the Monument and was given a
closer entrée into their lives, being invited into their homes, to attend functions with them
and to be invited to attend the ubiquitous braai (barbecue), a vitally important social
occasion for most South Africans. As well, I was also included in various other
recreational activities such as attending rugby matches, social events, lunches, dinners,
coffee and being invited to visit various tourist sites. Through my contact with the staff
at the ATM and Afrikaanse Taalmuseum (the Afrikaans Language Museum, affiliated
with the ATM and housed in a building in central Paarl), I was invited to participate in
the annual five-day Museum and Heritage Expo, an event hosted by Paarl Tourism and
held at Paarl Mall. My participation there allowed me the opportunity to speak at some
length with members of the public about their experiences of the ATM. In preparation
for the Expo, I spent a sizeable amount of time with the two major organisers from the
Monument and Paarl Museum creating display posters for the ATM stall.

Throughout the period of the research, but most notably during the fieldwork stage, I
assiduously maintained a journal in which I recorded details of observations, made
fieldnotes about interviews conducted and where I included personal anecdotes, thoughts,
ideas and insights, and comments or remarks offered by those to whom I spoke. To that,
I included, amongst other things, newspaper clippings and copies of useful articles I had
stumbled across, recipes I wished to keep, cartoons which I had found amusing and
advertisements from newspapers or magazines which I thought were of interest, as well
as details of incidental conversations I had had with various people, the subject of which
I felt might be of value at some time later. Through the use of the journal, the conduct of
the fieldwork was monitored and constantly re-evaluated as the project unfolded. Any
‘lessons’ learned or insights gained were then fed back into the project and were used to
refine the methods and strategies employed in the project.

Whilst no specific entries were themselves included in the thesis text, the journal details
served as a useful and key tool when recalling specific incidents. As well, maintaining a
journal served as a cathartic tool to record concerns, insecurities, shortcomings in the
work and personal insights into some of the challenges and barriers faced. According to
archival material(2013): ‘diaries assume a more important role than acting as a mere
logging
device; they have the capacity to allow for personal reflection and to help with the
development of strategic responses to the inevitable challenges one would expect to face
when working far from the relative comfort of home’. From a more reflexive perspective,
to maintain a journal allows the researcher to explore the possibilities and limits of a
hermeneutic way of being in the world, more specifically being a researcher as a part of
human, embodied existence. Understanding existence as embodied thus highlights the
subjectivity of the researcher.

The journal became much more than simply the repository for every paper-based
document which I believed might bear direct or at least some peripheral relevance to my
research. It served as my own personal and private forum for (self-) reflection and
(self-) awareness and yielded useful insights into how the knowledge gained had been
constructed and how ‘beliefs, background, and feelings…affected that osmosis of
understanding’ (Hollinshead & Jamal, 2007:102).

4.3.2 Archival Research

Throughout the period of fieldwork in South Africa, many hours were spent sifting
through and examining pages of public documentation and newspapers relating to the
ATM held in print and on microfiche at the National Library of South Africa in Cape
Town, the archives of the Historical Society of Paarl, the main library of Stellenbosch
University and the archives of the local and regional newspaper, The Paarl Post. The
original design drawings and blueprints for the Monument had been bequeathed to the
Department of Architecture at the University of Pretoria (Jan van Wijk’s alma mater)
and, on a visit there, the Head of the Department, Prof. Karel Bakker, was kind enough
to organise for me to view and photograph the drawings.

The archives of the Afrikaans Language Museum, to which I was privileged complete
access, proved to be an invaluable resource for my research. Minutes of meetings,
memos, correspondence, records, documents, artefacts, photographs, architectural
drawings, designs and other archival material constituted an extremely valuable and rich
source of information and formed an important part of the repertoire of field research and
evaluation (Hill, 1993). The Monument archives, housed in the climate-controlled
basement of the Museum, are substantial and contain the complete records of the minutes
of the meetings of the various committees which were involved in the creation, construction and inauguration of the Monument. As well, there are numerous folders of newspaper and magazine clippings, photographs, and other related documentation, including bound volumes of local newspapers and South African magazines, all featuring material relevant to the Monument. Because the majority of the documentation, including all the minutes of meetings, relevant correspondence and other documents related to the Monument were all written in Afrikaans, it was necessary to persevere with translating much of the material, particularly those ‘key’ documents which have been quoted in this thesis. In order to safeguard any possibility of mistranslation of material, verification of the accuracy of my translations was generally sought from the Museum researcher or marketing manager whose bilingual Afrikaans/English competency have guaranteed their surety.

A great deal of this primary source material contained information without which I would have had a much poorer knowledge of the workings of the numerous Monument committees and their members, of the disparate attitudes and the tide of public opinion towards the Monument and what it was perceived to represent as expressed over the years in the printed media. As Patton rightly suggests, access to documents proves very valuable not only because of what can be learned both directly and ‘behind-the-scenes’ from them, but also the role they serve as providing ‘stimulus for paths of inquiry that can be pursued only through direct observation and interviewing’ (Patton, 2002:294). Much of the background knowledge provided by the various archival documents, in line with Patton’s comments, did prove extremely valuable in better preparing me for the discussions and interviews which I was fortunate enough to conduct with remaining Monument committee members and other community members who remembered people and events related to the inception and construction of the Monument.

Of particular importance was the access I was given to the unpublished manuscript, *Die Storie van die Taalmonument* [The Story of the Language Monument], written by the designer and architect of the Monument, Jan van Wijk and in the possession of his widow, Erna van Wijk. This manuscript was a very personal commentary of the trials and tribulations with which van Wijk had struggled in his efforts to design what was to become the winning entry in the language monument competition in 1965. The
document also contained many of the architect’s original sketches and, most importantly, provided me the opportunity to ‘hear’ first-hand the architect’s personal thoughts and ideas about the project.

As is the case in the analysis of any primary-source documentation, whatever their nature—public or private, official or unofficial—they cannot simply be taken at face value but need to be cautiously and critically assessed in terms of their historic-temporal and socio-cultural contexts. Being aware of May’s (2001:183) comment, ‘Documents...do not simply reflect, but also construct social reality and versions of events’ (2001:183), questions relating to the authors of the documents, their social, cultural, ethnic and linguistic ‘position’, their possible biases, the time when the document was produced, its audience, the context within which it was produced and any possible assumptions I could identify underlying its production, were always foremost in my mind when examining archival material.

4.3.3 Visitor Observations

Along with the series of interviews conducted, observation of visitors to the Monument formed one of the most important elements of the research. Ross & Lukas (2005:5) are adamant that in order to capture the complexity of experience, the most fruitful way in which ‘to unobtrusively measure the behaviour of visitors [is] through direct observation’. It was one of my primary objectives to capture the experience of visitors as they moved about complex—to observe what visitors actually did at the Monument. To that end, I was keenly interested in observing what visitors looked at, how they moved around and through the complex and its surroundings, their emotional (verbal and non-verbal) responses to what they were observing or doing as well as the length of time spent at various spots throughout the complex. Observations and interviews were sometimes conducted on the same day while on other days, I restricted myself to either conducting observations or a series of interviews. Whichever I chose to do was sometimes dictated to by such things as the number of visitors at the site, the weather or, in some cases, other research commitments I had. The observation component of the research required the astute, systematic and organised recording of those visitor activities so as to provide the depth of information which would prove most valuable for later analysis. To best observe the visitors, I decided to adopt an approach which would allow
visitors to conduct themselves in the most ‘naturalistic’ manner, without their direct knowledge of my presence or activities there. For my part as a researcher observing visitors’ behaviour at the Monument, I appeared, for all intents and purposes, as another tourist, albeit one making notes as he made his way around the Monument complex. Inherent in the observation of visitors are a number of implications specific to the conduct of this type of research strategy. The first of these relates to the matter of consent. Researchers have expressed a range of opinions concerning the ethics and morality of conducting the type of research where individuals are unaware that they are being observed—from absolute opposition to the practice to one that accepted any and all methods of research (Patton, 2002:269-270). In my case, in order to obtain ‘quality’ observational data where visitors’ actions and behaviours took place in as natural and unimpeded manner, unaffected by the presence the researcher, my abilities to conceal my activities from those being observed was of paramount importance.

The sensitivity associated with making discrete observations has led different researchers to express a range of opinions concerning the ethics and morality of conducting observations without the knowledge of those being observed. Patton (2002), for example, writes that knowing they are being observed can make people self-conscious and generate anxiety and that the effects of the observer on what or who is observed will impinge upon the validity and reliability of the observational data and that ‘[p]eople’, he writes, ‘may behave quite differently when they know they are being observed versus how they behave naturally when they don’t think they’re being observed’ (2002:69). Although this method of ‘covert’ surveillance suggests that such observations are clandestine or secretive, with the implication that some form of deception is involved, it would be fairer and more balanced to describe the type of observations made for this present study as being the more neutral ‘unobtrusive’ observations—those, more simply, ‘made without the knowledge of the people being observed and without affecting what is observed’ (Patton, 2002:292).

In practical terms, then, making such observations of subjects from a prudent distance were relatively straightforward to make and I was able to distance myself sufficiently from people so as not to impinge upon or influence the behaviour or activities of other visitors or how they experienced the Monument and surroundings. On the very rare (less than 1%) occasion when I was approached by visitors, I readily divulged the details of
my study there, as I did not want to deceive them. Furthermore, in an effort to ensure the anonymity of those observed for this study and any research publications which stem from it, no identifying characteristics were kept of people who were observed other than broad categories of gender, approximate age, ethnicity or nationality.

Because it was my intention to observe as representational a sample of visitors as would visit the Monument during the times I was present there, in the selection of my subjects for observation, I adopted a ‘purposeful’ or ‘purposive sampling’ strategy—one commonly used in qualitative, interpretive studies—in which participants are selected because they are the people who, (in the opinion and at the discretion of the researcher), can provide the greatest amount of insight to help understand the phenomenon under investigation (Patton, 2002). In the initial stages of the observations, I cast a wide observational ‘net’ and observed as broad a sample of visitors as I was able. To that end, I made calculated decisions based on certain criteria such as the language being spoken by the visitors (if heard), their mode of transport to the Monument (e.g. tourist coach, van or own car), the licence plates indicating the provincial or national origins of the vehicle in which they arrived, their estimated age, gender and their nationality and/or ethnicity so as to ensure that I had, in fact, observed a representational sample of visitors. Initially, then, the subjects of my observations were all ‘information-rich’ cases for study and it was only over time and as I drew closer to the ‘saturation’ point, when little or no new or relevant data seemed to emerge regarding visitor behaviour, that I became more discretionary in my choice of subjects. It was only after some time into the research period that I became sufficiently confident that visitors were demonstrating little variation on similar actions and activities observed at earlier times with other groups of people. At that point, little new observation data was emerging and the data gathering process focused on detecting unusual or ‘extraordinary’ behaviours or actions.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that people often modify their behaviour if they are aware they are being filmed or recorded, so a decision was made at the outset not to video visitors’ activities. Instead, I surveilled and tracked the movements of one group of visitors at any one time and wrote comprehensive hand-written notes of each set of observations which were later recorded in field notebooks. In order to build up a richer bank of observational data to demonstrate the similar and different behaviours which might be exhibited at the key ‘location’ points, I decided to concentrate my attentions
on different occasions on observing the activities and behaviour at single spots where
visitors tended to spend time. Throughout, details of observations included day, date
and time of observation, duration of the visit, weather conditions at the time, the number
of people in the group being observed, their sex, estimated ages, nationalities, the
language(s) being spoken, their circulation through and path taken around the Monument
and grounds tracked, the amount of time spent at various spots, and detailed notes on
their actions and behaviour as they made their way through the complex.

Often overlooked but potentially as equally as important as what is observed by the
researcher is what is not. There is, of course, a potential absurdity in speculating on
what actions and activities are *not* observed (Patton, 2002:295) and to comment on what
does *not* happen has the potential to open up for the observer a pandora’s box of near-
infinite occurrences which could potentially be identified. While Patton suggests that
‘[m]aking informed judgments about the significance of non-occurrences can be among
the most important contributions an evaluator can make’ (2002:296), to discuss the
notable absence of some particular activity or factor does require a degree of caution
and common sense on the part of the researcher. There were many instances when I
expected that certain actions or activities might occur. That on some occasions they did
not was, therefore, worthy of note. Prior to my conducting fieldwork, it had been my
‘hunch’, for example, that given the importance of the Monument as a tangible
representation of an integral part of Afrikaner culture and pride, what I envisioned was
that visitors would, on the whole, display a degree of ‘reverence’, ‘solemnity’ and a
strong degree of respect and speak in ‘hushed’ tones as they made their way through the
Monument complex. In the majority of instances, however, my expectations were quite
unfounded and I could not have been more wrong! Calling out and listening for the
echoes of their voices inside the large, hollow ‘Afrikaans’ column of the ATM was *de
rigeur* for the majority of visitors, for example. Children and adults alike climbed on the
domes and other features to be photographed and to play. From my observations of
visitors’ behaviour and activities in which they engaged, any preconceived sense which I
had had that the Monument was a sacrosanct place requiring some level of sombreness
or gravity could not have generally been further from the truth.
4.3.4 Interviews

As ‘one of the most common and powerful ways in which we try to understand our fellow human beings’ (Fontana and Frey, 2003: 61-2), the use of ‘open-ended’ interviews as a research methodology has been promoted as a rich source for gathering data (Schoenberger, 1992; McDowell, 1992; Herod, 1993; Nast, 1994; Katz, 1994, Kobayashi, 1994; England, 1994; Gilbert, 1994; Stacheli & Lawson, 1994). Patton very succinctly summarises the benefits of this method of enquiry, writing that ‘in-depth interviewing opens up what is inside people’ and although highly personal and interpersonal and potentially more intrusive, they involve ‘greater reactivity than surveys, tests, and other qualitative approaches’ (Patton, 2002:407).

A series of open-ended questions, related to objective (iii) of my thesis (visitor experience) were developed to direct the interview:

- what motivated visitors to visit the Monument;
- what meanings visitors gave to the attraction; and
- how visitors derived that meaning.

The pre-planned schedule of questions for each interview was used very loosely and flexibly, with the sequence of questions changed or elaborated to suit the tenor and flow of the conversation. Additional questions and prompts added where relevant to best attain a quality of interaction reaching what Mason (2002: 67) terms ‘conversation with purpose’. At times, however, it was necessary to exercise a certain amount of ‘discretion’ when it was apparent that the interview might have been heading in directions which, as interesting as the agenda or issues the respondent might have wished to pursue, were of little relevance to my overall aims and objectives. In such cases, efforts were made to steer the discussion back to something closer to my themes.

The style of interview conducted took the form of what has been described by Wengraf (2001) as a ‘lightly-structured depth interview’ (LSDI). The format of this type of interview allows for maximum flexibility and offers interviewees the freedom to answer within the general outline of the research theme (Wengraf, 2001). Questions were also devised so as to elicit as much data from participants as they were prepared to divulge.
about such matters as:

- their age, ethnic background, languages spoken, profession, place of residence and other personal details;
- prior knowledge of and previous visits to the Monument;
- their impressions of the Monument and its environs;
- what the Monument represented and what it ‘meant’ to them;
- details of their experience of the Monument;
- attitudes and feelings towards the Monument; and
- what they thought the Monument’s role to be in today’s South Africa.

People were only interviewed once they had undertaken their visit of the site. The interviews conducted with visitors at the ATM lasted anything from five minutes to approximately half an hour. A number of factors appear to have contributed to the variation in length of interviews, including the general tendency of participants to extemporise upon their experiences, the time of day when the interview was held, the amount of time people had ‘allocated’ to their visit, and their overall willingness to participate in the interview. In some cases, people interviewed who were short on time responded very generally in terms of the questions I posed. Some people I approached seemed rather hesitant to speak at any length while others, uninhibited by time or their capacity to discuss their attitudes towards and impressions of the Monument, relished the opportunity to talk. In total, some fifty interviews were conducted, all together providing approximately 22 hours of data for analysis.

So as to provide me with the richest and most diverse understanding of people’s ideas, thoughts and opinions about their Monument experience, it was important to obtain a balance of interviewees which would reflect the backgrounds of visitors there. In a similar vein to the one in which I chose relevant observational subjects, I sought to interview a ‘purposive’ sample of visitors (Patton, 2002:230) which would best reflect the different ‘types’ of people who came to the Monument. Even though it was ultimately my personal judgement which determined the appropriateness of prospective interviewees, my intuition and discretionary decision-making practices sought to locate interviewees who, in my opinion, best represented the various ages, genders, ethnic and
linguistic backgrounds and nationalities of visitors to the Monument.

Once potential interviewees had been targeted, initial contact was made. I introduced myself and offered my business card with its details of my academic affiliation, contact numbers and email address. Participants approached were requested to offer their verbal consent before the commencement of the interview. Once they had given their permission to participate, I advised interviewees that it was my intention to digitally record the interview, stored as .mp3 sound files in a password-protected file and that transcriptions of their interviews would also be saved in a password-protected file. I recorded the interviews using an ‘IPod Nano 8GB’. An advantage of using this particular technology for recording interviews was that the device is very small—thin and half the size of a credit card—and was visually, and thus psychologically, unobtrusive during the interviews, thus minimising any chance of what is known as ‘psychological noise’ intruding into the interview (de Vito, 2001).

The interviewees were under no pressure to divulge any information they may have felt uncomfortable with sharing. Interviewees were informed that the digital recorder could be turned off at any time during the interview if they so requested. If an interviewee preferred not to have had their interview recorded, I was prepared to take comprehensive notes which I would transcribe at a later time but, fortunately, in the case of those whom I interviewed at the Monument, no one refused to have their conversation recorded. As well, I advised potential participants that they could choose to withdraw from the study at any time without the need to account for their withdrawal.

The interviews themselves were generally conducted ‘on the spot’ at different places throughout the complex, often standing in the main courtyard but just as often sitting at one of the many picnic tables situated throughout the gardens, on the grass or on a bench, at the café or at one of the vantage points from where visitors often spent a fair amount of time taking photographs. Such ‘on-the-spot’ interviews, undertaken while the visitor was in final stages of the process of the destination experience, captured the immediacy of the experience before it has been filtered through self image, social image, distortions of memory or the impact of other, post-visit images (Braun-Latour et al., 2006; Jenkins, 1999; Sirgy & Su, 2000). Furthermore, by engaging the visitor during the destination experience at the time of interview gave certain insights into the immediate
impact of the experience and provided opportunities to better enable me to understand
the mechanisms visitors used in making sense of their experience, while offering me a
window into the formation and transmission of sense making (Guthrie & Anderson,
2010). A shortcoming of this type of interview is that it may be influenced by limits and
constraints of context. Because the interviews were conducted in public, often with
other visitors within hearing distance of the conversation, some respondents may have
been hesitant to express their attitudes or opinions which they might otherwise have
chosen to do in a different context or forum and so interviewees’ comments may have
been compromised.

The interviews themselves were conducted quite informally. The trajectory of each
conversation was informed by the research questions but was not impeded by any forced
adherence to a strict questioning regime. Overall, then, the complexities of each of the
interviews were driven by the depth of responses offered by those interviewed, by their
willingness to ‘expose’ their thoughts and opinions to a stranger to say what they
wished to, and by the degree of interaction between the researcher and the interviewee.
The success of the interaction (which I could subtly guide and affect) was arguably my
responsibility and heavily influenced by my efforts to create a conducive and
comfortable environment, free from risk or embarrassment for interviewees, in which to
conduct the interviews.

If it was apparent that interviewees were sufficiently interested to continue discussion,
follow-up questions were asked to encourage further detail. The guide I had formulated
(see Appendix 2) enabled me to frame the topics and keep participants on track, while
allowing participants to express their own observations, perceptions, and attitudes. The
overarching themes served as the basis for guiding the course of the interviews. The style
of interview conducted, which aimed to induce as unimpeded and fluid approach as
could be maintained, was sufficiently flexible to allow respondents maximum
opportunities to express what they wished, in their own ways and in their own time, with
minimal interjection from me. At times, however, this simply did not work for some
participants who, unsure of their ‘footing’ (Goffman, 1981 [1979]) or perhaps less
forthcoming in their responses, needed a somewhat more structured interaction.

Ultimately, my own ‘footing’—my position, role and status vis-à-vis the interviewees—
had to inevitably bear some degree of influence on what was and what was not said during interviews. While it can never be claimed that the power relationship in the context of a research project can ever realistically be ‘flattened’, the orientation of this study was such that it aimed to do so as far as possible. In an attempt to offset any power differential between myself and participants embedded in the methods of data collection and analysis utilised in the study, interviews were always conducted in a manner which sought to minimise the power structure inherent in the participant-researcher relationship by promoting equity between researcher and interviewee.

To alleviate any real or perceived discomfort interviewees might have been experiencing, I was always honest and personable in my approach, in my ‘style’ and in my general demeanour. I was as open as I felt necessary with a certain amount of personal information and opinion and about the research process. Interviewees were free to ask me any questions and a number did question me as to my origins and background, my interests in and reasons for conducting the research at the ATM, as well as my general impressions of South Africa. On more than one occasion, I was complimented for my openness and for the interest expressed in Afrikaans and Afrikaner history and culture. The use of humour, too, where appropriate, was a very useful tool to ease discomfort or awkwardness and to share aspects of my own experience. Not wanting to appear to be self-indulgent or wasteful of participants’ time, however, where people were genuinely interested in finding out a little more about me personally, I left this discussion until the ‘packing up’ and farewelling process, in the general social or ‘chitchat’ that often ensued at the end of an interview. In sum, taking such an informal approach provided me with the best opportunities to establish a degree of trust and rapport with interviewees which, in my opinion, made for much richer, more personal and more revealing interviews.

Recorded interviews were subsequently transcribed verbatim using ‘Dragon Naturally Speaking v. 10’ voice recognition software and transcripts saved as ‘Word’ documents. I discovered that converting discourse into written text, while trying to retain not only the content of the discourse, but the subtleties and nuances of expression, was much more than a clerical task and involved a deal of interpretation as well (Kvale, 1996:161).

It became quite apparent that spoken language has its limitations as a communicative
medium and that to best understand what interviewees wished to convey required more than simple transcription of the words they had spoken. Van Manen (1997), for example, recognises this issue, stating that language is inadequate in describing experience so a potential problem in the transcription of recorded sound files without reference to non-vocal communicative aspects such as body language, gestures and other expressions of non-verbal communication, including inherent subtleties of interviewees’ voice modulations, intonation and pronunciation, pauses, emphases, pace and accent may mean that the visual and aural aspects of the interaction are de-emphasised and could be ‘lost’. In my transcriptions, such things as disjointedness, hesitations, backtrackings, and inconsistencies of grammar, by contrast, were quite easily accounted for using punctuation or diacritical marks in the transcriptions, as were indications of interruptions or peripheral sound activities which had impacted upon the conversation and the recording of details. Details of actions such as gestures, hand movements, smiles, gazing up at sections of the Monument or out across the Berg River Valley—all of which conveyed a huge amount of meaning—were similarly captured and detailed in the transcriptions. Aspects of voice and emotion were, however, much more difficult to transcribe. Consequently, in order to elicit the fullest reproduction of an interview, recorded interviews were generally played in conjunction with the reading of transcripts so as to most fully and completely understand the subtleties of what was said and of any emotions invoked.

Interviews were conducted in English. Interviewees came from many distinct ethnic, linguistic and national backgrounds, and for many, English was not their native language. This meant that at times some respondents exhibited some difficulty with expressing themselves as best they might in English. Perseverance on both my and the interviewees’ parts meant that, as best as I could ascertain, my questioning was understood, as were interviewees’ responses. The job of transcription necessitated me listening to the recordings through headphones and then repeating what was spoken into a microphone which was then transcribed into a Microsoft ‘Word’ document through the voice-recognition software. This meant that the many different accents encountered required me to listen extremely carefully to what had been recorded, so that there could be little opportunity for error in the transcribing of the interviews. On a very small number of occasions, however, some words were muffled or inaudible, at times drowned
out by the background sounds of children playing or other visitors talking, people calling out, the sounds of birds chirping, or the wind blowing. In those instances, I made an ‘educated guess’ as to what the word might have been but flagged its uncertainty in the transcript as: [(word)??]. On those very few occasions when it was simply impossible to hear what had been said, I simply noted it as: [inaudible].

Transcribed interviews were carefully re-read as the interview was replayed, to ensure that the voice recognition software had recorded what had been said correctly. So that I could quickly recollect the people and the context of the interview, details of the place, time, conditions, person/people interviewed and their estimated age(s), ethnic and linguistic backgrounds were noted at the beginning of each transcribed interview.

There are many advantages to having transcribed the recordings of the interviews myself. Rather than having employed an independent person to transcribe the interviews, for me to transcribe the interviews meant that I was fully and directly engaged with the words and the accompanying nuances of expression as spoken in the interview, as a consequence of which I developed a very close ‘relationship’ with each of the interviews and, in its transcription, with the text as well. The need to listen carefully to the dialogue also gave me time to pause and to reflect upon what had been said—and what may not have been said. Furthermore, listening to the interviews and transcribing them myself allowed me the opportunity to critically appraise my interviewing skills and provided insights into the possible ways I might have improved my interviewing techniques to elicit the best responses from informants in the future.

Interview data were coded and compared across a number of themes and issues which emerged as a result of the careful analysis of the data. Motives for visiting the Monument, opinions and feelings about the Monument, aesthetically and otherwise, what they felt the Monument represented and what meaning it held for them as well as its continued role in the articulation of a particular social identity and ongoing relevance in today’s South Africa were just some of the many issues highlighted in the analysis of the interview data.
4.3.5 Focus Groups

The final phase of the case study involved conducting three focus group sessions. Previous experience conducting focus groups convinced me of their value in enhancing data quality as the interactions between participants who, in the case of those I conducted, were largely strangers, often make for a depth and breadth of discussion that is not always available in a two-way communication between an interviewer and interviewee.

Typically, then, each of the three focus groups comprised four to six people of different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds from the local community who had been contacted personally by staff of the ATM on my behalf and invited to Afrikaans Taalmuseum (Afrikaans Language Museum) to participate in a focus group of some one hour’s duration, the focus being to offer their perspectives and perceptions of the Monument. Questions asked were framed in terms of the aims and objectives of my research. For consistency, as best as I could, I maintained the same general questioning guide which I had used with interviewees at the Monument. As with the interviews conducted at the Monument and elsewhere, the focus group sessions were digitally recorded, stored and transcribed.

An advantage of the focus groups was that participants were able to hear each other’s comments and, in response to others’ contributions, make additional remarks beyond their own original responses (Patton, 2002). It was particularly enlightening to have had included a small number of Zimbabwean participants who had not, in fact, visited the Monument, although they were aware of its existence and broad significance. Insights gained in the focus groups were especially interesting, as what was revealed through their comments was that much of their understanding and impressions of the Monument had simply been formulated on the opinions of others.

4.3.6 Key Informants

In tandem with the interviews conducted with visitors to the Monument, the third component of the fieldwork involved individual meetings and interviews with ‘key’ tourism, government, municipal, political, academic and other interested community
members. As ‘one of the mainstays of much fieldwork’, writes Patton, ‘the use of key informants [serve] as sources of information about what the observer has not or cannot experience ... [Their insights] can prove particularly useful in helping the observer understand what is happening and why’ (2002:321). By engaging with a broad range of informed people to fill the many knowledge ‘gaps’ which I had, these meetings helped to improve my overall understanding of the past, present and ongoing role of the ATM in its broader social and cultural context, while bringing an added depth and texture to the research.

To illustrate this point, when travelling by train from Johannesburg to Paarl, I was fortunate enough to have met a man who offered me the name of my first ‘contact’ in Paarl, a woman who had been a tour guide in the Western Cape for some twenty-seven years and who provided me with invaluable information about the Monument as well as suggesting other individuals with whom she recommended I should get in touch. As well, the staff at the Monument and the Taalmuseum embraced me, my research and my enthusiasm for something which is very close to their hearts—their mother language. The staff provided me with every assistance and welcomed my participation at a number of their language-related functions, such as their display for Heritage Week at Paarl Mall mentioned earlier and a disadvantaged school language event, ‘International Museum Month Expo for Schools at the Centre for Conservation Education’ held in Cape Town. In signs of genuine friendship, some staff members opened their homes to me, inviting me to dine with them as well as inviting me to different cultural events which they felt would be interesting, entertaining and edifying for me and so provide me with some closer insights into the broader South African culture and society which would better allow me to better contextualise my research. Though somewhat peripheral to my study, I was invited by the Director of Die WAT (Die Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal) [The Afrikaans Language Dictionary] to spend the day at their offices in Stellenbosch, meeting with their staff and learning how they go about researching and gathering information in a project which has already been operating for some sixty years and which, once completed, will result in the most comprehensive dictionary of the Afrikaans language to date.

Over time, the network of contacts willing to participate in the study and to offer me
information or opinion ballooned during the period of my fieldwork, to the point that my presence was becoming quite widely known. I was quite opportunistic and only too willing to discuss my work with whomever might have been interested. Often, on the recommendation of someone I had spoken to or whom I had interviewed previously, contact was made with prospective informants by telephone and/or email and appointments made. In most cases, meetings were held at informants’ homes or workplaces. Because these interviews had been scheduled by appointment, interviewees had much more time to reflect upon and to prepare what they were going to say than those at the Monument who were interviewed ‘on the spot’, so interviews tended to be much lengthier than those conducted with visitors at the Monument, lasting from about half an hour to one which lasted some five hours. All but one of the interviews were digitally recorded and, as with the interviews conducted at the Monument, stored as .mp3 sound files and subsequently transcribed for later analysis. Of the one informant who requested that her conversations not be recorded, I instead took comprehensive notes which were subsequently transcribed. That Erna van Wijk invited me to spend four days at her home provided me with such rich insights into her late husband, his thoughts, reactions, uncertainties, insecurities and of the problems which confronted him as he dealt with and worked through each stage which led to the creation which is the ATM. She spoke candidly and openly of the events and people involved in the process of the construction of the Monument and was always willing to share her opinions of her husband and how his patience and perseverance were tested (but for which he lost no enthusiasm) throughout the ten years from his winning the competition to the Monument’s inauguration. As indicated above, being interviewed myself provided me with the opportunity to reflect upon how I felt about the relative importance and success of the research and also allowed me to talk about it in such a way that it could be accessed by a broad general reading and listening audience.

4.4 Data Analysis

The process of data analysis is essentially about ‘making sense of, or interpreting, the information and evidence that the researcher has decided to consider as data’ (Goodson & Sikes, 2001: 34). The analysis of data in qualitative research is a complex and intuitive process, requiring the researcher, guided by the original research questions underlying the study, to enter into a process of review, consolidation and interpretation.
of evidence and the ultimate production of new knowledge and insight. While this process is not an ‘exact science’, a number of frameworks and models provide a window on the systems used. Miles and Huberman, for example, conceptualise the process of data analysis as three interlocking ‘flows of activity’ (1994: 21), viz., data reduction, data display and drawing conclusions/verification, which occur not discretely nor chronologically, but rather as an iterative process where each component continually is informed by and impacts on the others. Bassey (1999: 83) construes the process as one whereby the researcher develops ‘data items’ from raw data, and iteratively and reflexively develops and ‘tests’ ‘analytic statements’ which in the final phase are drawn into ‘empirical findings’.

4.4.1 Analysis of the Visitor Experience

The analysis of visitor observation data, as with that of other research techniques, occurs as much in parallel as in sequence, so although the process may appear to be uni-linear or uni-directional, the analysis data frequently required me to ‘loop back’ on the process for purposes of clarification of detail or for further exploration of the material. Following the transcription of each episode of observation, the transcripts were read, in the first instance and, for each case, to gain some general ideas about visitor behaviour and experience. The transcripts were then re-read and margin notes and comments made to highlight any interesting and/or significant activities, behaviours or reactions made by visitors. Transcripts were then read again with greater detail, to form impressions of emerging themes, categories and behavioural patterns.

As a way of categorising the emerging themes, Tim Edensor’s four main areas of tourist performance—walking, gazing, photographing and remembering—as detailed in Chapter 4 of his *Tourists at the Taj* (1998), were employed as a framework for organising my themes and provided a set of analytical categories by which to visitors’ activities and experiences could be examined in this thesis. Edensor’s concept of ‘embodied performances’ (1998:105), however, fails to take into account visitors’ sensory engagement with a monument, particularly the aural and haptic senses. Consequently, in the analysis of visitor behaviour and experience in Chapter 6, I have supplemented Edensor’s categorisation to include a section headed ‘Visitor Embodiment & Sensory Encounters’.
4.4.2 Analysis of Interview and Focus Group Data

Interviews and focus group data were transcribed using a consistent format which identified the date of the interview, demographic details of each of the interviewees, the setting of the interview, the time of day and weather conditions and the duration. Each unique interview had been letter coded and each individual interviewee in that interview assigned a number following the interview code: e.g. ‘F3’ identified the third interviewee in interview, ‘F’. However, to give a more human quality to the interview data, names reflecting an individual’s ethnic or national background have been allocated to each of those people who have been quoted. As well, details of their gender, ethnicity or nationality, age decile and language background have been included. Transcriptions were made verbatim but it should be noted that interjections and other language fillers such as *um, uh, like* and *er* have generally been omitted for purposes of fluency of reading in quotations which appear in the text of this thesis. Ellipses (…), however, have generally been included to indicate where interviewees’ trains of thought may have changed mid-sentence, or to demonstrate that they had paused to consider their responses.

A major step in analysing the data into meaningful categories was to code the speech, enabling the recognition and organisation of the interview texts and to discover patterns that would be difficult to detect by just reading observer commentary. Always mindful of the research agenda, initial readings were made and general ideas were highlighted, data labelled and margin annotations made, generating numerous category codes. In the development of categories for data analysis, the aim is ‘to construct categories or themes that capture some recurring pattern that cuts across…the data’ (Merriam, 1998: 179). Key phrases and consistently repeated words were identified and colour coded. These colour coded words and phrases later served as a means for categorising the themes which were commonly and consistently repeated throughout the interviews. Notes were written and because the codes were not necessarily mutually exclusive but very much interlinked, a phrase or section might have been assigned several codes. This stage of category construction serves two purposes: in the initial phase, categories for use in analysis of data were constructed by the researcher, and in the second, the data were coded according to these categories. The categories needed to ‘speak to’ the research
objectives and questions. Categories for use in the analysis of data were constructed and later coded according to these categories. An initial list of eight broad subcategories nested within four categories was developed, based upon the research questions and visitors’ responses during the interviews.

This list was subsequently amended, added to and subtracted from during the course of data analysis when more focused coding was used so as to eliminate, combine, or subdivide coding categories, and to look for repeating ideas and larger themes which connected codes. ‘Repeating ideas’ may be understood to mean the same idea expressed by different respondents, while a theme in this context refers to a larger topic that organises or connects a group of repeating ideas. Each code was assigned an abbreviation and used when grouping quotations under thematic headings for possible inclusion. Identifying and selecting the most interesting, significant, unusual or representative quotations for inclusion in the thesis was a key process, as it was of particular importance to choose quotes which best illustrated and emphasised the idea, thought, opinion or theme which was being made. Thus, a good deal of subjectivity was involved in this process. In some cases, it seemed more apt to produce a conflated or reduced version of a number of quotes in order to summarise some generality or broadly expressed comment.

An attempt was made regarding the number of categories constructed and the balance between smaller numbers of categories and higher degrees of abstraction. For this reason, part of the coding process involved collapsing categories which were found to be overlapping into single categories in a search for conceptual congruence. The final stage of the analysis of the data involved the movement from concrete description to higher levels of abstraction.

At this point, the process of theorising, then, is about speculating upon the connections between categories and iteratively ‘building’ knowledge by realising that there is much more to be understood about the phenomenon under consideration (Merriam, 1998:188). Miles and Huberman (1994: 58) advocate the development of a ‘provisional start list’ and also recognise the importance of allowing categories and codes emerge from the data inductively. Such a process has been used here. Categories and codes were
subsequently amended, added to and subtracted from during the course of data analysis. Table 4.1 provides an example of one category of analysis used in this study, with associated sub-categories and category descriptors.

### 4.5 Limitations

Any interpretation of research findings is, of course, limited by the methods used and the representative sample of visitors observed and interviewed. The interview data gathered was often gleaned from visitors whose first language was not English. All interviews were conducted in English, so it needs to be acknowledged that a small number of interviewees found a degree of difficulty in expressing their thoughts, ideas, attitudes and opinions in English. With many years’ experience as an English as a Second/Foreign Language teacher, I drew on various strategies to ensure that interviewees with more limited English language abilities understood my questioning and that I understood their responses. I must stress that this situation was extremely rare and the vast majority of respondents were comfortable being interviewed in English. This research is not a discrete ‘event’ but is embedded in sequences and contexts. It has been woven together and built upon the scholarship which has preceded it. It is important, then, to recognise and to acknowledge, however, that there are potential limitations in the interpretation and analysis of the data gathered.

In terms of the observation of visitors’ behaviours and experiences of the Monument, the quality of the data gathered depended very heavily upon my powers of observation and social cognition and how well I could detect social relationships, emotional states and make sense of the subtleties of visitors’ behaviour to which I would assign meaning. The reliability of my judgement might be called into question with regard to the interpretation of observations of less concrete and more abstract behaviours evinced by visitors. Suffice to say that the observation of several hundred people’s behaviour afforded the greatest of opportunities to compare the observational results throughout the period of the study and provided me with what I believe to be much more than a superficial understanding of what people did at the Monument and how they reacted and interacted with it and each other. With regard to conducting the interviews and focus groups, the quality of the data elicited was very much dependent upon my skills as an interviewer to elicit the most ‘fruitful’ commentary which would provide the ‘richest’
data for analysis.

One further point about the analysis of the data and something which is true of all social research, is the fact that it is selective. Being selective and, indeed, partisan, is inevitable in research. Key elements which another researcher might uncover when conducting similar research may not have been identified in this study. In light of these comments, some researchers might argue that I have made spurious correlations which have ultimately ‘distorted’ my findings. If this be the case, then I can only hold myself culpable. Data are, however, anything but ‘raw’ (Gitelman, 2013:3) and we should not think of data as a natural resource or ‘disinterested’ piece of scholarship, but as a cultural one that is generated and interpreted and always structured according to somebody’s predispositions and values.

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the epistemological and theoretical foundations which ground this research. Those foundations have very much informed the methodological approach taken which, in turn, has directed the processes, practices and techniques adopted throughout the duration of the project to gather information and data for analysis. The study is founded within an interpretive, social constructivist paradigm which aims to document the process in which social reality is constructed through consideration of participants’ feelings, attitudes towards, and meaning made of the ATM and of visitors’ behaviour and actions within its precinct.

A ‘postmodern’ multidisciplinary approach has been adopted which arguably reflects the eclecticism of contemporary societies (Lyotard, 1984:76) and which will best serve the outcomes of this present study. This study, then, draws upon a range of research methods and methodologies in the process of constructing what others have described as the *bricolage* (Levi-Strauss, 1966; Becker, 1998; Denzin & Lincoln, 2005) of social research. This is not to suggest that my use of theory will simply be a ‘fragmentary’ mélange but, on the other hand, it does suggest that to adopt any one overarching theoretical perspective or philosophical principle would be to delimit the rich possibilities which can only be derived from examining issues and analysing data from a wide variety of outlooks and viewpoints, and employing a diverse repertoire of relevant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Super-Ordinate Category</th>
<th>Sub-Category</th>
<th>Category Descriptor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sense of pride and identity reinforcement as represented by the ATM and what it symbolises for visitors</td>
<td><strong>Strength of Afrikaans through its perseverance and sense of inclusivity</strong></td>
<td>Continued prominence of Afrikaans in South African society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of pride in origins, ethnicity and identity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Solidity of Afrikaner culture in South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ATM as symbol of Afrikaans language and culture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture unites—‘We stand together’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ATM as a symbol of exclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikaans language ‘embraces’ all ethnic groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ATM as symbol of exclusivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikaans language does not ‘belong’ to any single ethnic group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2  Example of one category of analysis used in this study, with associated sub-categories and descriptors
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methods. ‘[I]n practice,’ write Tribe & Airey, ‘most tourism puzzles are multi and interdisciplinary ones’ (2007:13), suggesting that their ‘solving’ will require a miscellany of methods. To solve my particular ‘puzzle’ has required a combination of observational and interview strategies, data collection and recording techniques, coding of material, its analysis and interpretation. A hermeneutic (interpretive) phenomenological methodology offers opportunities by means of which complex questions relating to visitor behaviour and activities at tourist attractions can be systematically and logically examined through the use of qualitative data. The results of the processes and practices which have been detailed here appear in Chapters 6 and 7, where the interplay between attraction, situation and context, the visitor experience and meaning made of the ATM are described and analysed. Chapter 5 details the context and setting for the ATM. The discussion is grounded in an overview of the origins and development of the Afrikaans language. Details of its contested history and background set the stage for an examination of the inception, commission, design, construction and inauguration of the ATM and for the analysis of the ATM as a visitor attraction.
Chapter 5

The Afrikaanse Taalmonument
(The Afrikaans Language Monument)

It is far better to capture the glorious spirit of the sea than to paint all of its tiny ripple. (Californian abstract expressionist artist, Jay Meuser (1964), writing about his painting, Mare Nostrum "MacArthur Art is Gift to Fort". San Pedro News Pilot:13)

5.1 Introduction

This chapter charts the development, construction and inauguration of the ATM and provides a comprehensive description of its component parts and the physical and socio-cultural context within which it is situated. In particular, the chapter demonstrates the importance of setting the analysis of a visitor attraction within its social, cultural and historical contexts in order to understand critically the ways in which visitors experience, interpret and make meaning of such an attraction. To disregard these contexts would be to suggest that an attraction is socially, culturally, historically and ‘ideologically neutral’ (McCabe, 2009:33). Furthermore, to ignore the implications of these contexts for the changing ways in which an attraction is received by visitors and to its continued relevance and significance would imply that attractions such as the ATM lack what might be termed ‘interpretative flexibility’, i.e., that the interpretations and meanings made of an attraction are not fixed but are fluid and dynamic.

The events leading up to the decision to hold a competition for the design of a monument to commemorate the Afrikaans language are outlined, details of the winning design and the motivations and inspirations of the architect, Jan van Wijk, the various features and component parts of the Monument, its construction, its location and surroundings, including its physical and symbolic relationship with the broader landscape and its importance as a tourist attraction are discussed. The Monument’s
role and function as a symbol, ‘text’, ‘narrative’ and visitor attraction are also examined in order to determine its significance and to demonstrate how the articulation of an example of intangible cultural heritage, i.e., language, has been transposed into a site of visitation and heated contestation.

5.2 Context & Setting

Monuments are evocative symbols of memory and representations of elements of history, culture and heritage. In a country such as South Africa, with its cultural diversity and extremely turbulent history, monuments have had and continue to play a very sensitive role. On the official South African Tourism website (http://www.southafrica.net), however, an article headed, ‘Commemorating those who shaped us’ celebrates the ‘many national monuments and memorials commemorating those people and events that shaped the country. Some of these, such as Robben Island, are World Heritage Sites; others point to the quirkier side of our national character’. The schism which exists between those supporters who argue in favour of retaining the monuments of the past and those who suggest that they be removed is very well demonstrated in the cartoon by well-known South African cartoonist, Charl Marais, which appeared in the Afrikaans-language daily newspaper, Die Volksblad in July 1998 (see Figure 5.1). This cartoon illustrates only too well the precarious position which the ATM was placed in after 1994 and of its continued contested nature as a residual symbol of the apartheid past or as something which could be seen as a legitimate example of cultural heritage in the ‘new’ South Africa. The cartoon highlights the tenuous situation in which many of the extant monuments in South Africa were found to be in after the election of 1994. It depicts Nelson Mandela, the first democratically elected President of South Africa, running towards the ATM, a trowel in one hand and a pick in the other. One of the bystanders, uncertain of Mandela’s motives or intentions, asks ‘Is he [Mandela] going to build or break it [the ATM]?”
After the demise of the apartheid regime, there was an (expected) community and political backlash which sought to wipe any monumental vestiges of the previous regime from the South African landscape, including calls for the dismantling of the ATM which was seen to belie the current nationalist project and, some would argue, stand the monument in an anachronistic past as an ongoing testimony to the previous authoritarian regime. To maintain such structures, it was argued, would continue to remind people of the oppression suffered by millions under the previous regime and would continue to grant ongoing legitimacy to the people who helped create, serve and maintain that regime and any painful memories it might invoke. According to Stengel (2010), who spent many hours interviewing Nelson Mandela, a sensitive approach was
called for on the part of the government, led by Mandela, who called for calm and rational consideration of these matters. This cartoon serves to highlight the fact that under the new government, the future of the ATM was not assured.

According to the minutes of the original Afrikaanse Taalmonumentkomitee (ATMK) meeting (ATMK, 1942), the ‘official’ and overriding intention for the design and construction of the ATM was to serve as a commemoration, in some tangible way, to something which is inherently intangible—the Afrikaans language. Yet, anecdotal comments offered by people with whom I discussed the issue of the motives and intentions of the original members of the ATMK and particular historical accounts (Giliomee, 2003), convinced me that their underlying intentions might have been otherwise, although no concrete evidence was available to corroborate or dispel my sentiments. Even since before its construction, then, the ATM appears to have been a site of contention. The difficulties associated with creating an attraction to a feature of intangible cultural heritage have been outlined in Section 2.5, so the task of creating a structure that purports to be nothing other than a symbolic representation of the Afrikaans language was, according to its designer and architect, Jan van Wijk, both contentious and fraught with problems, least of all being the way in which to transpose the abstract notion of a language into something concrete (van Wijk, 2000).

The initial proposal to build a monument to commemorate the Afrikaans language was not conducted in a social, political or ideological vacuum. The impulse for its creation was very much driven by the temporal backdrop of the day and by the social, cultural, economic and linguistic relationship between Afrikaners and other Afrikaans speakers and the broader South African community, particularly those English speakers of ‘British’ heritage. At a celebration in 1939 held at the Kleinbosch Cemetery in Dal Josafat, a suburb of Paarl, commemorating the life of S.J. du Toit, one of the founding committee members of the GRA, upon whose gravestone are written the words, ‘Vader van die Afrikaanse Taal’ (‘Father of the Afrikaans Language’), Dr P.J. Loots, a noted Paarl dignitary, put forward a proposal that a monument be built in Paarl to celebrate the Afrikaans language. In 1941, P.J. Schoeman, an anthropologist at the University of Stellenbosch, emphasised the link between Afrikaner nationalism, which remained ‘a
central theme in Afrikaner political thinking about survival’ by emphasising the importance of all Afrikaners to ensure the development and survival of an *eie volk* (‘own people’) and the enduring nature of the Afrikaans language (Schoeman, 1941, quoted in Giliomee, 2003:467).

So it was within this political climate on 26 September, 1942, that the real impetus for the construction of a monument finally came with the founding of the ATMK in Paarl whose major goal was to ‘collect funds for the construction of a worthy (*waardig* in Afrikaans, ‘worthy’ or ‘dignified’) language monument in Paarl. As with the vast majority of monuments erected worldwide, the location of the ATM on the southern slope of Paarl Mountain was chosen for strong historical, political, aesthetic and emotional reasons (Notules [Minutes], *Afrikaanse Taalmonumentkomitee*, 26 September 1942). Paarl is situated fifty kilometres north-east of Cape Town in the Berg River Valley of Western Cape Province. European ‘Free burghers’ were granted settlement rights in 1687 making Paarl the third oldest European centre in South Africa after Cape Town and Stellenbosch. The region around Paarl (see Figure 5.2 showing the Drakenstein Municipality and major towns) is often referred to as the cradle of the Afrikaans language in South Africa. Paarl is where the movement for the development of the Afrikaans language as a written language and for the translation of the Bible into Afrikaans had originated (Notules [Minutes], *Afrikaanse Taalmonumentkomitee*, 26 September 1942), where the first Afrikaans language newspaper was published (*Die Patriot*) in 1875, and it is also the place which saw the birth in 1875 of the *Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners* (GRA) (Society of Real Afrikaners), an organisation which, under the direction and leadership of notable local Gideon Malherbe, was to become a major player in the fight for the recognition of the Afrikaans language as an independent—and, later, official language in South Africa. Thus, because of its historical, cultural and social links to the Afrikaans language and its development, Paarl, was decided upon as the most appropriate setting for the construction of a monument.
5.3 Afrikaans Language—Origins & Development

It is important to explore a little of the linguistic and historical context which helped to give rise to the origins of the Afrikaans language and to demonstrate its pivotal role as the major *lingua franca* and unifying means of communication between the disparate ethnic and linguistic groups who were to make up the fledgling settlement and which helped to cement its position as an integral linguistic part of the South African landscape. (For a comprehensive summary of the origins, history and development of the Afrikaans language, see Appendix 6).

Under the auspices of The Council of Seventeen in Amsterdam who governed the far-reaching empire of the *Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie* (United or Dutch East India Company) (VOC), a refreshment depot for the provision of fresh water, vegetables, and meat for ships travelling between Europe and the islands of the Dutch East Indies was set up in what is now Cape Town (Walker, 1968). The first colonists...
who, under the command of Jan van Riebeeck as governor, arrived in 1652, comprised the Dutch employed by the VOC and Calvinist settlers from the United Provinces (later Netherlands) who were predominantly Dutch-speaking. As it grew, the settlement saw an influx of temporary and more permanent settlers from many diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, all of whom were employed by or engaged either directly or indirectly with the VOC which, of course, used Dutch in its everyday and trade dealings. Settlers of German, Portuguese, Scottish and French origin, the latter Huguenot refugees fleeing anti-Protestant persecution in Catholic France to the Netherlands, were offered free passage by the VOC to the Cape as well as grants of farmland to work (Viljoen, n.d.). Much of the physical labour in the settlement was provided by the VOC in the form of an imported indentured labour and slave workforce from southern India, the Malay Peninsula and from Madagascar, between 1652 and 1705, who spoke a variety of languages.

Being a VOC settlement, official language status at the Cape settlement was afforded to Dutch and there developed an uneven status between the many languages spoken by its different inhabitants. Since its establishment, issues around language and language usage were intimately entwined with the social, cultural, economic and political life of the fledgling settlement. This situation gave rise to a hierarchy of relations and the development of uneven statuses between different languages which reflected the historically evolved relations of domination and subjugation between settlers, visitors and the indentured and slave labour populations (Alexander, 2005). The linguistic diversity of the people living in such close proximity, including contact and interaction between the settlers and the indigenous Khoi-Khoi and San people of the region, meant that a single and sufficiently simple medium of communication was needed to enable efficient business and social transactions to take place (Alexander, 1989).

Gradually, contact between the Dutch spoken in the settlement at the Cape was demonstrably influenced by other languages spoken by people in the region. The dialect which developed became known as Kaapse Hollands (‘Cape Dutch’) and pejoratively as ‘African Dutch’, ‘Kitchen Dutch’ (kombuistaal), ‘geradbraakte/gebroke/onbeskaafde Hollands’ (mutilated/broken/uncivilised Dutch), or
‘verkeerde Nederlands’ (‘incorrect Dutch’). Developing independently for some two hundred years, by the nineteenth century the vocabulary and grammatical structures of this dialect which came to be known simply as ‘Afrikaans’ had diverged sufficiently from the Dutch spoken in the Netherlands that speakers began agitating for its recognition as a unique and independent language (Bradlow, 2008).

The earliest known written Afrikaans used Arabic script and was intended for use amongst Cape Town’s Muslim population. By the mid-1800s, however, more and more Afrikaans was appearing in Romanised print (Bradlow, 2008:173), with the first Afrikaans grammars and dictionaries published in 1875 by the association known as the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners (GRA) (‘Society of Real Afrikaners’). This society was established in Paarl on 14 August, 1875 in the house of one of Paarl’s most prominent figures, Gideon Malherbe. Amongst other things, the members of the GRA campaigned for the recognition of Afrikaans as an official language in South Africa through publications such as a journal in Afrikaans called Die Patriot (‘The Patriot’) (Figure 5.2) as well as a number of books, religious material and histories.

Agitation for linguistic recognition and language rights was sweeping Europe at the same time, so it is little wonder that similar efforts were being made in South Africa by proponents of Afrikaans. Judt & Lacorne (2004:4) note that in nineteenth century Europe, ‘one no longer said “the nation exists because it has a language”, but rather “the nation exists, therefore it must be given a language”’. In his book, Language and Politics (2006), Joseph argues that language has a deeply political dimension which runs to the very core of its functioning. Relevant here is his discussion of the political implications inherent in the connection between the use of a given language and identity and, accordingly, he suggests that identity is created, performed and above all reproduced through language (Joseph, 2006:49). Political and social agitation for recognition of the legitimacy of the Afrikaans language became known as the ‘First Afrikaans Language Movement’, but this was ‘much more than simply a language movement; it was a movement for the cultural, political and religious ‘deliverance’, self-determination and self-development of the Afrikaner people’ (ATMK, 1965:6, my translation). So integral in the minds of Afrikaners was the relationship between
language, country and identity that the explicit goal of the GRA was ‘to stand for our Language, our Nation and our Land’ (ATMK, 1965: 6, my translation). Moreover, the slogan on the organisation’s crest reads: ‘Vir Moedertaal en Vaderland’ (‘For Mother language and Fatherland’), more than suggesting that the Afrikaner people are the progeny of the language and the land in which they were born.

Any debate about the roles, functions and statuses of different languages used in South Africa, which have both structured and symbolised the nation-building project, remains a highly charged subject. ‘Language politics,’ Zhurzhenko (2002:17) writes, ‘can be seen as a fight for symbolic power’. Alexander, (a former revolutionary who spent ten years on Robben Island with Mandela and a long-time advocate for a multilingual South Africa), has argued that there is a very strong relationship between language usage and
language policy and economic, political-military and cultural-symbolic power in South Africa. In South Africa, Dutch, English and, later, Afrikaans, were considered ‘relevant’ and, thus, the ‘legitimate’ and ‘official’ or ‘national’ languages during different periods of the nation’s history. According to Alexander (2005), linguistic relevance and legitimacy have had little or no relationship at all to the numbers of speakers or breadth of usage of any language but has purely been the result of colonial conquest in the first instance and, then, by socio-political domination complemented and reinforced by increased structural hegemony. Rather, language prestige and power came about in South Africa through the ‘intuitively obvious’ (Alexander, 2005:2) role which language plays in the processes of economic production and in ‘its function as a transmission mechanism of “culture” or, more popularly, its role in the formation of individual and social identities’ (Alexander, 2005:3).

The uneven status of the languages came to a head when, under the apartheid regime, the Afrikaans language was proposed by the Afrikaans-controlled White political elite as the basis for national identity formation, to the complete exclusion of the majority linguistic and ethnic groups within the country. In the area of cultural policy, the federal and provincial governments assumed the promotion of the Afrikaans language at the expense of other languages spoken throughout South Africa. The political polarisation around language became so dramatic that it set off a series of ‘tremors’ which were brought to a tragic head in what is generally known as the Soweto Uprising of 1976 (Zhurzhenko, 2002:11) when some 1500 police tried to prevent up to 15000 mainly Black school children from protesting against the forced use of Afrikaans in their schools. Police opened fire on the protestors, resulting in a conservatively reported 172 deaths (many more, depending upon whose evidence is used) and several hundred injuries.

Afrikaans was the language Blacks felt to be that of the ‘oppressor’ (Tutu, n.d.) and protesting against Afrikaans was really protesting against the whole system of injustice and oppression. Ironically, however, Afrikaans writer, Willemse, voiced what he understood to be the ‘double identity’ of Afrikaans and stated that while ‘Afrikaans is at once the language of the oppressor’, it is, at the same time ‘the language of the
oppressed’ and argued for the continued use of Afrikaans as an instrument in the struggle against apartheid (Willemse, 1987: 239). Not everyone who speaks Afrikaans, however, chooses to identify with a wider Afrikanervolk (Afrikaner people) or Kleurlinge/Bruinmense (Coloureds/Brown People) ethnicity but, instead, prefers to identify rather as Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. Language, rather than ethnicity or ‘race’, then, becomes a major identifying marker for an individual.

Language tensions have not only been confined to the ‘colour’ line. The conflict and rivalry between English and Afrikaans speakers goes to the heart of the history of white South Africa. As has been discussed, the original European settlers in 1652 spoke Dutch, which eventually evolved into Afrikaans, but in 1822 the British gained control and proclaimed English as the language of the schools, churches and government. Enforced ‘Anglicisation’ through the banning of the use of Afrikaans in the education sphere, for example, resulted in social, cultural and political unrest amongst Afrikaans speakers resentful of British policies. The struggles for the official recognition of the Afrikaans language are deeply engraved on the Afrikaner character and ideology. The Afrikaners' language is a primary symbol of their sense of cultural distinctness and is an important source in the process of constructing the ‘Self’. The first Afrikaans language publication, Die Patriot (Figure 5.2) overtly saw its goal tied to a desire for the creation of a cohesive national (Afrikaner) identity which was dependent on land and language (Marks & Trapido, 1987).

The socio-linguistic history of South Africa has been dominated by the struggle for official recognition of only a minority of languages. In fact, up until 1994, official status had only been granted to three languages—English, Dutch and, more recently, Afrikaans. For the period from 1925 till 1994, only English and Afrikaans were deemed the official languages of the Republic. It was only after the first free elections of 1994 and under the new democratic Constitution that the government of South Africa opted to dispense with the then two official languages of English and Afrikaans, instead favouring the eleven most widely used languages in the country to serve equally as the ‘official’ languages of the new South Africa (See Section 6 of the South African Constitution [Act 108 of 1996] for details).
The Constitution of South Africa gives provincial governments the freedom to decide for themselves which languages they would choose as the ones for official usage at a provincial level. Such decisions have essentially been based on the dominant usage of particular languages within the provinces and status afforded those with the majority of speakers. Western Cape Province, for instance, with its 49.7% Afrikaans-speaking population, 24.7% isiXhosa speakers and 20.3% of English speakers (Census 2011, Table 2.6: Population by first language and province [percentage], p. 25) deemed Afrikaans, isiXhosa and English as its official provincial languages in its Languages Act of 1998 (Western Cape Government website, ‘Western Cape Language Policy’) which was then ratified by the provincial parliament in June 2004. (See Figure 5.4 showing the distribution of languages spoken as first or mother tongues in Western Cape Province). The aim of such legislation and supporting policy has been a response to the pre-1994 official two language policy and thus to assure that all widely used languages should enjoy formal equality, or ‘parity of esteem’ as it is described in the nation’s Constitution (Section 6.2), of use in the operations of the provincial administration and the wider public communication and other organisations and agencies.

Afrikaans remains one of the official languages of South Africa, as well as being an equal official language in six of the nine provinces and about 1.5 million people in neighbouring Namibia, where it is the common language of most of the population (Viljeon, n.d.). The South African Census of 2001 tells us that Afrikaans is spoken as a ‘first’ or ‘home’ language by some six million people, amounting to 13.3% of the total population of approximately 45 million and being the third most spoken language after isiZulu with 23.8% and isiXhosa with 17.6% (Census, 2001). Furthermore, Afrikaans forms the primary language of approximately 60% of White South Africans—those who identify as ‘Afrikaners’ including those who claim Boer heritage—and over 90% of the Coloured (mixed race, Kleurlinge or Bruinmense) population, while large numbers of Blacks, Indians, Asians and White English-speaking South Africans also speak Afrikaans as a second, third or fourth language.
5.4 Afrikaans & the Afrikaanse Taalmonument as Sites of Contestation

With the demise of the apartheid regime and the advent of democratic rule in 1994, South Africa has consciously set about rebuilding the country and seeking a sense of cultural unity (Hauptfleisch, 2006). In a nation characterised by a ‘tumultuous history which has left people scarred and deeply suspicious’ (Hauptfleisch, 2006:181), there are now eleven official languages as well as a diverse range of political, social, cultural, artistic, religious, economic and other value systems, and genuine attempts have been and continue to be made to resolve and reconcile differences while creating and maintaining a unified nation. This desire, frequently rendered by its popular image as the ‘rainbow nation’ to express the idea of unity in diversity, has been and continues to be much debated by academics, philosophers, theologians, politicians, strategists and others. Long associated with notions of oppression, restrictions and the barriers to liberty, the Afrikaans language was for many years much despised by a large proportion
of the South African population (Alexander, 2003). The language itself and its position in relation to other languages in South Africa, has stood—and continues to stand today—as a ‘site’ of contestation.

The ATM, like the language it represents, itself stands as a contested site. On an intellectual level, it arguably communicates a narrow vision of the Afrikaans-speaking and ‘Afrikaner’ social and cultural contexts. On another, more pragmatic level, it contributes as a local, regional and national tourist attraction. On yet another, more ephemeral level, it encapsulates an intrinsic but intangible feature of Afrikaner cultural heritage, and becomes a literal and symbolic place where important social issues are played out and where the challenges of the reconstruction, reconciliation and self-realisation processes now facing the country may be potentially confronted and contested. The ATM becomes a focal point, not only for understanding and reinterpreting the past, but also for coming to grips with the present and in shaping the future of the nation (Hauptfleisch, 2006:182).

According to (Beningfield, 2004:509), an analysis of the representation and iconography of the Monument ‘enables it to be read as a site in which “race” or ethnicity, language and meaning are contested’. What, strictly speaking, is the result of one man’s imagination also, according to Beningfield (2004):

> celebrates the perceived success of the *kultuurpolitek* (cultural politics) of the Nationalist project, through the construction of a piece of architecture through which the commitment to the Taal [*Afrikaans language*] could be ritually renewed, but also to inscribe a natural right to South Africa—through the mingling of land, nation and language—onto the landscape. (Beningfield, 2004:509)

Beningfield’s comment focuses on the ideological imperatives lying behind the Monument’s construction, its purpose and function, and of its identification with Afrikaner power and domination. Furthermore, much of this attention points to the period of enforced racial and cultural segregation and oppression during which time saw the ruling Nationalist Party’s drive to impose Afrikaans on the wider South African population in the period from 1950 to 1976 (Hauptfleisch, 2006). Certainly, during the 1990s, a new ‘language struggle’ took place during which time the Afrikaans-speaking
population began to fear the possible demise of its language and culture in preference for the use of English as a *lingua franca* for the country. Such a direct threat to the survival of the language would be sufficient impetus to celebrate, (re-)establish, empower, and maintain the cultural heritage of Afrikaans-speaking South Africans in the face of the now diminished official status of Afrikaans from a co-national language with English to one of eleven ‘national languages’ (Hauptfleisch, 2006:186), and it is the ATM which became the symbol of that linguistic fervour in its recognition and promotion of the Afrikaans language and culture.

In a speech delivered in Afrikaans on the occasion of his visit to the *Afrikaanse Taal en -Kultuurvereniging* (ATKV) [Afrikaans Language and Culture Organisation] on 17 August, 1995, Mandela, newly elected president of South Africa, enthusiastically argued in favour of the continued relevance of the Afrikaans language in contemporary South African society. Mandela insisted that the history and development of Afrikaans, along with its unique position and character amongst the languages of the world should be relished and celebrated with all due consideration and respect (Mandela, 1995). Furthermore, Mandela contended that the Afrikaans language encompasses all points of view and all the issues which are of concern to people in a modern South Africa. In that speech to the ATKV, Mandela alluded to the fact that he believed there was no homogeneous Afrikaner community (*die Afrikaner gemeenskap nie homogeen is nie*). Instead, he observed a community of different and divergent opinions and approaches (*uiteenlopende opinies en benaderings*). Rather than fracturing the coexistence of ‘White’ versus ‘Black’ versus ‘Coloured’ versus ‘Indian’ or any other racial or ethnic division, he stated that Afrikaans overcame those racial and other ‘fault lines’ and embraced and unified many South Africans, irrespective of ethnic background.

Previously, however, the position of ‘respect’ and regard for Afrikaans was promoted at the expense of the other languages and cultures in South Africa (*duidelijk dat dit ten koste van die ander tale en kulture van ons land plaasgevind het* [clearly that it has happened at the cost of the other languages and cultures in our country] Mandela, 1995; my translation), to the point that Afrikaans, as the primary vehicle for the promotion and administration of the apartheid system, divided the people and succeeded in turning
fellow South Africans into strangers (Dit is tragies hoe apartheid daarin geslaag het om mede Suid-Afrikaners vir mekaar vreemdelinge te maak. [It is tragic how apartheid has succeeded in making fellow South Africans strangers to each other.] Mandela, 1995; my translation). Yet, while the language was largely seen as a symbol of an oppressive political and social experiment which denied the majority of South Africans any real freedom, Afrikaans was itself the vehicle and an essential characteristic for the expression of the conviction of people who themselves struggled for freedom from oppression. It was born of domination and oppression but also made an important contribution to the freedom now enjoyed in South Africa (die Afrikaanse kultuur en Afrikaanse taal al hoe meer ‘n belangrike bevryende bydrae in ons land moet maak [that the Afrikaans culture and Afrikaans language should increasingly play an important liberating role in our country]; Mandela, 1995; trans. Isabeau Botha).

Certainly Afrikaans is now a ‘minority’ language—just one amongst the eleven official languages of the ‘new’ South Africa—and a language under threat, its ‘imageability’ being transformed to a position where its previous power, domination and authority are being severely curtailed.

That the ATM is a monument to an abstract concept or notion—language—and not, in essence, to any singular event or particular person or group, might suggest that it would engender less opposition to its presence than if it were a more blatant tribute to the Afrikanervolk. Opponents to its continued existence might argue that the Monument serves to exploit the everyday—language—to communicate an exclusionary, quasi-national identity whose original monumental iconography was dominated by the celebration of (white) Afrikanerdom. However the Monument might be viewed, recent attempts have been made to re-semanticise the Monument, by implanting the existing Monument with a new, ‘improved’ identity through a program of events and entertainment held at the Monument which holds a broad appeal to the broadest audience. To use Ockman’s terminology (2004:230, quoted in Smith, 2007:84), the Monument is having a radical cultural effect by entering into a ‘wider conversation’. The broadening of its iconography promotes and validates national identity and recognises the nationalist rationale that underpins its symbolism today. The Monument is today disseminating a new image, in contrast to its former incarnation, to exploit the
new-founded democracy and philosophy of inclusiveness and inclusivity, and to promote cohesiveness, linguistic, cultural and social interrelationships. The events and entertainment which organised by the staff of the ATM and held at the Monument draw very broad and eclectic audiences. Events range in scope from musical events, dancing performances, regular ‘star-gazing’ (astronomy) evenings, fun runs, and ‘full moon’ picnics, picnic concerts, Valentine’s Day, Mothers’ Day and Mandela Day events and celebrations, multicultural singing and dancing, hiphop and rap performances and appeal to different ages and interest groups (see https://www.facebook.com/afrikaansetaalmonument for full and comprehensive details of the various events held at the ATM). The frequency of such events and the fact that such events are being well patronised suggest that the Monument’s identity is changing. Point 1 of the mission statement of the ATM states that it is the role of the ATM ‘to build relationships with all South Africans through the medium of Afrikaans and in the context of multilingualism’. To this end, the vision of the ATM is ‘to operate the national Afrikaans language museum and monument in such a manner that Afrikaans may be respected and appreciated to its full extent and as inclusively as possible’ (http://taalmuseum.co.za/english/index.php/who-we-are).

This corresponds with the government’s re-evaluation of the role of monuments within a democratic nation and their ‘re-semanticisation’ (Smith, 2007:88) in order to ‘fit’ with current philosophies. To reclaim the ATM as a South African symbol, as an ‘institution of the state’ (Woodward, 1992), is a means by which the government can deploy monumental structures to communicate its political agenda and strategies as well as assist its political objectives in a synthesis of monumental and governmental aspirations. The ATM, then, plays an important role in the creation of a new national identity. Moreover, the ATM performs this function through its role as an important and viable visitor attraction.

5.5 Commission, Design & Construction of the Afrikaanse Taalmonument

Despite Loots having sewn the seed for the construction of such a unique monument, it would take another thirty-six years before the idea was finally realised. Funds for the
construction of the ATM were raised through a number of events which were held throughout the country from 1942. Funding was also received from the national government to assist in its construction (Beningfield, 2004). To prepare for the celebration of the semi-centenary of the official recognition of Afrikaans as one of the then two official languages of South Africa in 1925 and the centenary of founding of the GRA in 1875, the ATMK set about in April 1965, organising a national competition for the design of a monument in commemoration of the Afrikaans language. It was the intention that the monument would be built and inaugurated by August 1975 to commemorate these two important dates. Twelve of South Africa’s most notable architects were invited to contribute designs, the winner to be awarded a prize of R1000 and the contract to have his (there were only male architects invited) design constructed on land set aside on the southern slope of Paarl Mountain. The brief for the design, as set out by the ATMK, stated that ‘only [a] visual, symbolic monument outside the town [of Paarl] will be the subject of [the] competition’. The brief stated that the design needed to reflect the ‘wonder’ of the cultural and political ‘flourishing’ of Afrikaans and:

(a) should be visible from afar;

(b) should have strong lines and an abstract design;

(c) the visual aspect is of importance;

(d) the material used in the construction and the finish must be lasting; and

(e) the functional plays no role—in other words, it is purely symbolic in nature.

(Notules, [Minutes], ATMK Meeting, 26 September, 1942, my translation; my emphasis).

On 31 December 1965, Jan van Wijk, (1926 –2005) (Figure 5.5), an architect from Pretoria, was awarded the prize for his entry in the Language Monument competition. The design for the Monument had not been an easy project for van Wijk. In a speech given to the Afrikaanse Christelike Vrouveniging (ACVV) in 2000, he reflected on how he needed to deliberate over how he would go about designing something that would represent and symbolise a language. In that speech, he said that even though the ‘problem statement’ put forward by the ATMK was simple enough, it had been
‘tremendously deep: Design a monument for the Afrikaans language, which symbolises the wonder of our cultural and political flourishing. It had to be a symbol of a living language’ (van Wijk, 2000).

‘But,’ and this presented van Wijk with his greatest challenge, ‘what does a language look like? An architect can design anything he or she has seen before. To represent Afrikaans symbolically as a structure presented a problem’ (van Wijk, 2000). Van Wijk followed the direction provided to him by the brief presented by the ATMK. One of van Wijk’s most important design considerations was that the new monument should harmonise with and complement the natural environment (ATM, 2011). On an initial visit to the proposed site with his wife, Erna, van Wijk commented on the importance of creating a structure which would adhere to the integrity of its surroundings. ‘My wife and I first walked around here, and then we drove to Franschhoek and also to Klapmuts, to view the terrain from afar, because the monument had to be visible from a distance’ (ATM, 2011). Van Wijk felt that the lines and other

Figure 5.5  Jan van Wijk, designer and architect of the Afrikaanse Taalmonument (Permission, Erna van Wijk)
elements of the monument should reflect the natural lines and forms of the environment and that the building materials should blend in with the rocks on the mountain. Thus, Jan van Wijk’s design was inspired by the terrain as it existed on Paarl Mountain, with its round granite rocks and view over the Berg River Valley. In that speech given in 2000, van Wijk recalled part of a ‘conversation’ he had had with himself regarding his decision to use the natural granite for the construction of the Monument: ‘Jannie,’ he said, ‘you mustn’t come and mess around on this mountain. You must come to put here what must stand here. You must come and put here what is here already; it just has to be defined’ (van Wijk, 2000).

Van Wijk’s next step had been to look for a suitable image that could represent Afrikaans (ATM, 2011). In his unpublished manuscript, Die Storie van die Taalmonument [‘The Story of the Language Monument’], van Wijk expressed the bewilderment he faced in trying to come to terms with how a language could be realised in some tangible form. He asked himself the following questions during the design process:

Can a person see a language? Can you see Afrikaans? You can read it, write it, speak it, sing it, learn it, teach it, think in it, pray in it—you can love it—you can even hate it—but you cannot see it. But Afrikaans had to be able to be seen in order to be represented in a structure. What does it look like? She? Pretty? How do you build pretty? Strong? What does strong look like? (van Wijk, n.d.:16, my translation)

Still perplexed as to how to create a design which would reflect the ‘wonder’ of the Afrikaans language, van Wijk turned to his wife, Erna, for inspiration (van Wijk, 2000; pers. comm. Erna van Wijk, 13 April 2010). She suggested that he might look to the great Afrikaans writers in order to see what they might have written about the strength, the enduring nature and the effervescence of the Afrikaans language. In the end, van Wijk drew upon the writings of two distinguished Afrikaans writers, C.J. Langenhoven (1873-1932) and poet, N.P. van Wyk Louw (1906-1970), as the inspiration for his design.

Langenhoven was a strong promoter of the Afrikaans language and, in an address made before the Senate in Cape Town in 1914, he argued for the increased recognition for
Afrikaans. In that speech, Langenhoven drew the analogy between the growth potential in the usage of Afrikaans to the qualities of a rapidly-rising exponential curve or hyperbola. ‘Gentlemen,’ he said:

if we were to represent Afrikaans in respect of the relative written usage of the language, and we planted a row of poles down this hall now, ten poles, to represent the last ten years, and on each pole above the ground we made a mark at a height from the floor corresponding to the relative written use of Afrikaans in the respective year from the first here near the floor to the last over there against the loft, then the line would describe a rapidly rising arc, not only quickly rising, but rising in a quickly increasing manner. Let us now, in our imagination, extend the arc for the ten coming years from now. You see, sirs, where the point will be, outside in the blue sky high over Bloemfontein, in the year 1924. (Langenhoven, 1937, 10:51; my translation)

The geometrician in Van Wijk immediately recognised a mathematical hyperbola in the imagery used by Langenhoven to describe Afrikaans as a written language, as a ‘rapidly ascending arc’ (ATM, 2011). The image here is of an exponentially growing, geometrical conic section which never returns, never becomes a straight line and which forms the basis of van Wijk’s design for the largest (57m) of the Monument’s columns. Thus the idea of the main column was born, with an opening at the apex to represent continuous growth, rather than any sense of completion (see Figure 5.6). Van Wijk said to himself: ‘Wonderful – there you see your language – a nice shape. But it can’t be just a shape, it must also have definition’ (ATM, 2011).

To visually express this definition, van Wijk (again on the advice of his wife, pers.l comm., Erna van Wijk, 14 April 2010) consulted with Professor N.P van Wyk Louw, an esteemed Afrikaans poet, playwright and scholar who referred van Wijk to one of his books, entitled *Vernuwing in die Prosa* (‘Renewal in Afrikaans Prose’), in which he described Afrikaans as the language that connects Western Europe and Africa, like a bridge. Louw also described Afrikaans as a ‘gleaming tool’ and a ‘double-edged sword’. In the chapter titled, ‘Laat ons nie roem nie’, (‘Let us not boast’) which he wrote in 1959, van Wyk Louw had written that:
Figure 5.6 Bladsy 24—Eerste Skets van die Taalmonument,
(Page 24—First Sketch of the Language Monument)
showing the hyperbolic column suggested by C.J. Langenhoven’s writing and an initial sketch
(bottom left) of the possible connections and relationships between the parts as inspired by N.P. van Wyk Louw. Note the spiralling design reminiscent of the shape of a nautilus
(Unpublished manuscript, Jan van Wyk, Die Storie van die Afrikaanse Taalmonument; reprinted with kind permission from Erna van Wijk)
[i]t forms a bridge between the great lucid West and magical Africa … Both are great forces, and whatever greatness may spring from their union—that probably is what lies ahead for Afrikaans to discover. Afrikaans has been able to depict this new country as no other European language has done. Afrikaans is established as a glistening instrument, a double-edged sword. Afrikaans can remain vitally alive only as long as it continues to be the medium for communicating all our fortunes and our fate: as long as it expresses the concrete as well as the abstract; as long as both Europe and Africa are founded in its being … But what we must never forget is that this change to the country and landscape sharpened, kneaded and knitted this newly nascent language … And so Afrikaans was able to speak out from this new land … Our task lies in the use that we make and will make of this gleaming vehicle. (van Wyk Louw, 1961:136-137, 139; my translation)

Here van Wyk Louw echoed the belief not only in the ‘natural’ connection between Afrikaans and the South African landscape but also in the capacity for the language to ‘give voice’ to the still enigmatic land (Beningfield, 2004:513). In his design and in its construction, van Wijk was eager to translate van Wyk Louw’s lofty statements into architectural form. All of these concepts shaped the Monument in the mind’s eye of Van Wijk, and were eventually realised in its structure and symbolism. The verticality of pillars to the left of the entrance, representing the ‘Clear/lucid West’ (helder Wes) and of the two major columns representing the growth of the Afrikaans language and the Republic of South Africa may be associated with the activity of building, characteristic of the European—while the horizontal plane of the forecourt into which three rounded domes representing ‘Magical Africa’ (magiese Afrika) are partially submerged, presents a rather more static surface and suggests a much closer (primal) relationship to the land. The relationship between the ‘Clear West’ and ‘Magical Africa’, however, remains ambiguous (see Figure 5.23, p. 168). Beningfield (2004:523) argues that on the wider meaning of the verticality of the forms representing the European contribution to the creation and development of Afrikaans and the horizontal curving plane which represents indigenous Africa, there is a polarisation of the landscape, with ‘its mythical division into places of primitivism and civilisation’. A post-colonial reading of the representations in terms of structure and position could arguably attest to one which emphasises the continued European hegemony over the indigenous African. In view of the time when this interpretation was first put forward to describe the contributions of the West and of Africa to the development of the Afrikaans language, it is noteworthy here to briefly discuss the choice of language used
to describe the West and Africa. As discussed by Hall (1994:394), the representation of the ‘black subject’ and black cultural identity acknowledges the ‘critical points of deep and significant difference’ which constitute who ‘Africans are or, ‘since history has intervened—what we [Africans] have become’.

In line with Hall’s (1994) argument, cognizance must be taken of the ‘ways in which black people, black experiences, were positioned and subjected in the dominant regimes of representation’, these latter being the ‘effects of a critical exercise of cultural power and normalisation. Not only, in Said’s ‘Orientalist’ sense, were we [Africans] constructed as different and other within the categories of knowledge of the West by those regimes. They [Europeans] had the power to make us see and experience ourselves as “Other”’. Hall stresses that it is one thing to ‘position a subject or set of peoples as the Other of a dominant discourse. Certainly, the Monument is a spatial and material construction in which the uncertainties and tensions of politics and power become evident through the debates about the formal iconography of the architecture of the Monument (Beningfield, 2004:524). Yet, the uncertainties, tensions and ambiguities of its meaning rest as much on the ‘silences’ as they do on the more obvious, ‘official’ narrative which has been presented.

The modernist abstract design for the Monument suggests the wish to associate the development of Afrikaans with technology and a forward looking scientific modernity, rather than trying to embed the Monument in a rural, pioneering past. At the same time, however, in the design, the Monument captures the future life and spirit of the Afrikaans language in the ‘parabolic concrete curves’ (Beningfield, 2004:509), while simultaneously recognising and commemorating its history and development in the location of the Monument in the landscape that was considered to be the birthplace of Afrikanerland. The Monument, then, lives on as a tangible reminder of Wijk’s plea: ‘Afrikaans, create it, speak it, love it, learn it, teach it, carry on with it. Don’t let it die. Up there, at the very top, the spire forms a root tip that stands for growth, growth without ceasing, like Afrikaans’ (van Wijk, 2000) and remains a legacy to Jan van Wijk and his commitment to create an enduring symbol and celebration of his and one of South Africa’s ‘indigenous’ languages. Reading the motives and justifications for his design, it becomes quite clear that van Wijk’s intellectual interpretation of the brief presented to him is only surpassed by a personal pride in having been selected to
represent, for posterity, a monument which ultimately heralds the legitimacy of his language, not only to his South African confreres but to the wider world (pers. comm. Erna van Wijk, 13 April 2010).

5.6 Inauguration

The importance of the official unveiling of the ATM cannot be overestimated, as can be evidenced by the numbers of people who were assembled in the amphitheatre (Figure 5.7). ‘The inauguration,’ writes Beningfield (2004:521), can be read as the moment before the collapse of the myth, where the innocence of nation and language could still be pretended to or even, perhaps believed in’. In the months leading up to the inauguration, leading White Afrikaans writers threatened to boycott the occasion if Coloured writers were not invited (ATM, 2011). Consequently, several Coloured writers together with representatives from other sectors of the Coloured community were invited. Many attended the festivities, along with a large number of Coloured schoolchildren. The deliberations on the inclusion of Afrikaans-speaking people of other ‘races’ in the inauguration celebrations marked a shift in political stance and where Afrikaans was presented as the ‘adult language of Africa’ (O’Meara, 1996:181). However, certain White writers still stayed away and the Black community was generally excluded from the proceedings. In the end, over 40 000 people, invited guests and those wanting to celebrate the momentous occasion attended the inauguration of the Taalmonument on 10 October 1975 (Wallis, 2000) (see Figure 5.7). This date was of particular importance in the Afrikaner calendar as it commemorated the semi-centenary of Afrikaans being declared an official language of South Africa in 1925 as well as celebrating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the GRA. Furthermore, the date is also the birthday of Paul Kruger, the Afrikaner statesman and leader of the Boerevolk (Boer people) and President of the Transvaal Republic which, until scrapped in 1994, was celebrated as a public holiday throughout South Africa.

The official dedication speech was delivered by the then Prime Minister, B.J. Vorster. The inauguration program featured performances and recitations by well-known Afrikaans actors and voice-artists and interestingly (given that in those days apartheid was still flourishing), Coloured poet, Adam Small’s poem ‘Nkosi sikelel’iAfrika’ was recited (ATM Inauguration Program). One of the major highlights of the occasion,
however, was the arrival of eight torches (each representing a founder member of the
GRA), which had left the Voortrekker Monument in Pretoria on 14 August for Paarl.
The torches, which took various routes through the Republic, symbolically representing
the spread of the Afrikaans language to the furthest corners of the country and its return
to its point of origin on that day to reach Paarl, were finally received by the Prime
Minister, and seven descendants of the GRA founders together ignited the main flame at
the inauguration ceremony. As well, during the proceedings, a fly past was made
overhead by three jet fighters, each one emitting a plume of blue, white or orange
smoke, representative of the then South African flag, signalling the national importance
given to the event.

Figure 5.7 Inauguration Day, Amphitheatre, Afrikaanse Taalmonument, 10 October, 1975,
(Source: Afrikaanse Taalmuseum Archives)

The significance given to the Monument and its inauguration is reflected in the postage
stamps which were issued in commemoration of the centenary of the publication of Die
Patriot journal in Paarl and of the official opening of the ATM on 10 October, 1975
(Figures 5.8, 5.9 and 5.10).
Figure 5.8  South African Postage Stamps commemorating the centenary of publication of Die Afrikaanse Patriot journal (left) and the inauguration of the Afrikaanse Taalmonument (right)  
(Source: Google Images)

Figure 5.9  First Day Cover issue commemorating the inauguration of the Afrikaanse Taalmonument, ‘Dit is Ons Erns’, 10 October 1975  
(Source: Google Images)
The ATM, formerly known as a ‘cultural institution’ under the Cultural Institutions Act, 1998 (Act 119 of 1998), is now referred to as an ‘agency of the Department of Arts and Culture. The ATM receives a partial annual subsidy from the Department of Arts and Culture, while generating around 20% of its income through money exacted from entrance fees, rental activities (such as film shoots, commercial photography and wedding ceremonies), as well as _ad hoc_ donations and sponsorships from cultural organisations such as the ‘Dagbreek Trust’ and ‘Het Jan Marais Nationale Fonds’, other government institutions, e.g. the local Drakenstein Municipal Council, as well as corporate organisations like Naspers, a South Africa-based multinational mass media company.

The ATM is permanent in construction, static in form, geometric in shape and grandiose in style. The large, multi-faceted granite and concrete monument pays tribute to the various roots of the Afrikaans language through the tapering of its symbolic convex and concave dimensions. Designed in 1965 and erected in 1975, the ATM may be understood to be a supremely modernist sculpture which speaks the language of
‘Modernism’. Like so much of high Modernism, its iconography is perhaps less significant than the power of its abstract, minimalist form (see pp. 161ff.). In keeping with the modernist style, the ATM bears little or no ornamentation, makes use of manufactured materials such as metal and concrete and rebels against traditional styles (cf. other monumental structures in South Africa such as the VTM, the Burgersdorp Monument and the Women’s Monument in Franschhoek). As well, it includes the hallmarks of ‘minimalist’ architecture in that it is stripped of all but the most essential elements, the outline is emphasised, the floor plan is open and there are a number of open spaces, and the lighting is used to dramatise lines and planes. Ironically, however, whilst ‘modernist’ architecture emphasised function over form, to provide for specific needs, the ‘brief’ for the design of the ATM, as outlined by the ATMK (1965), categorically stated that the resulting monument should have ‘no function’. Van Wijk’s winning design arguably serves little practical function but it is in its capacity to insight visitors to interpret the ATM as they may and to elicit their various meanings that its social, intellectual, moral and aesthetic functions and values lie. At the same time, as well, in the methods and materials used in the construction of the ATM and in the unique technique used to create the surfacing of the structure, van Wijk has sought to reconcile the principles underlying architectural design with rapid technological advancement and the modernisation of society. As de Botton (2006) asserts, the architects of the modernist movement wanted to speak of the future, with its promise of speed and technology, democracy and science.

The Monument consists of a main column of 57 metres in height, a lesser column of 26 metres, some smaller columns, three ‘roundings’ or domes and walls. Each element of the structure symbolises the contribution to and influences of the various European, indigenous African and Malay languages and cultures in the dynamic formation, development and continued growth of the Afrikaans language. The columns are rounded but their erect verticality seems to set a masculine tone and many visitors commented on the fact that they present a virile, unornamented phallic appearance, suggestive of power, subjugation and domination of the land (Beningfield, 2004). Such comments were not uncommonly heard during my fieldwork but to suggest that the Monument is in some way an example of a recurrent trope of the masculine, dominating force is countered by the fact that, ironically, van Wijk referred to the Monument as his ‘meisie’ (girl) and spoke about ‘haar’ (her) rather than the neuter ‘dit’. 150
The ATM, then, with its melding of prominent spires, columns, domes, walls, a fountain and a pool is much more a complex than a single structure. As well as representing, in an abstract form and style, the origins and development of the Afrikaans language, its components, together, are said to reflect the local topography within which the Monument stands and mirror the steep and jagged Drakenstein Mountains which rise opposite the Monument from across the Berg River Valley (Figure 5.11).

Paarl Mountain, on the southern slope of which the ATM stands, is distinctive on account of its three enormous granite outcrops named Paarl Rock, Bretagne Rock, and Gordon Rock which together constitute the second largest granite outcrop in the world after Australia’s Uluru. In the middle of the site where the ATM is situated can be found a rocky outcrop consisting of piles of round granite rocks and a group of granite boulders. These boulders appear as small replicas of Paarl Rock and create the
impression that nature has repeated the same lines and curves over and over on the mountain. These boulders would prove to be a defining feature for van Wijk in his considerations for the design of and the material to be used for the construction of the ATM (pers. comm., Erna van Wijk, 14 April 2010). It was van Wijk’s intention, then, to appropriate, remodel and, thus, domesticate the terrain where the Monument would be constructed, although every effort was made to maintain a landscape sympathetic to its broader surroundings, including the unique vegetation, bird life and other fauna which inhabit Paarl Mountain (ATM, 2011).

The Monument was not to be seen as a product of machine technology, ‘but rather an object that was made with human ingenuity and care, which recorded the touch of nature and the hands that formed it (Beningfield, 2004:517). To that end, it was not enough that the Monument take on the appearance of the surrounding mountain but also that it should be constituted of the same material. The concrete mix used for the construction of the Monument consists of cement, white sand and Paarl granite. Because the architect wanted to reflect the colour of the rocks on the site, van Wijk insisted on using the greyish-brown outer layers of the granite as well as the bluish inner part. The texture of the rocks on the site was imitated by removing the outer cement layer of the hardened concrete with pneumatic hammers—a very lengthy and time-consuming process which required engineers to create a suitable tool for the purpose—so as to expose the granite chips embedded in the mixture, to better approximate the eroded granite boulders on the site. Van Wijk’s insistence on using a local indigenous African material for the construction of the Monument was important symbolically as well. Rather than simply being built on the land, the ATM, in metonymic fusion, became the land, just as the Afrikaans language similarly owed its origins to the land from and upon which it was born. That it was van Wijk’s intention to reproduce a surface which emphasised the tactile qualities of the local granite, reveals the extent to which he had anticipated that the Monument would be seen from close proximity and its surface touched.

The approach to the Monument is via a signposted route from the N1 freeway which leads through the suburb of Courtrai (Figures 5.12, 5.13 & 5.14). As can be seen in
Figure 5.15, the road leading to the Monument (*Gabbema Doordriftstraat*) winds its way some few kilometres at quite a steep gradient through the natural vegetation and up Paarl Mountain. As visitors ascend, the drive affords views of Paarl, the valley below and the Drakenstein Mountains on the opposite side of the valley. Visitors arrive at the ticket booth and boom gate where, upon paying the modest entry fee (R12 for adults and R2 for children), they receive a leaflet, translated into Afrikaans, English, isiXhosa and German, which gives a brief historical outline of the Monument and makes reference to each of its parts and their relevance to the development of the Afrikaans language. The leaflet (Figure 5.16) is the only interpretive device currently available to visitors, apart from tour guides who are employed at the Monument and who provide short guided tours for visitors on request and information found in guide books. No interpretive signage (other than an enlarged version of this leaflet fixed to a stand beside the path approaching the Monument) exists on or around the Monument itself (although I have recently been informed that new signage has been erected at the site).
Figure 5.13  Signposting to the Afrikaanse Taalmonument in the suburb of Courtrai  
(Source: author)

Figure 5.14  Signposting to the Afrikaanse Taalmonument, Courtrai ‘Afrikaanse Taal’  
(Source: author)
Figure 5.15  Aerial view of Courtrai, Gabbema Doordriftstraat and the ascent to the ATM  
(Source: Google Maps)
Figure 5.16   The Afrikaanse Taalmonument—Simoliek/Symbolism
(in Afrikaans & English; reverse side in German & isiXhosa) leaflet given to visitors upon arrival
at the Afrikaanse Taalmonument
At the southern edge of the car park is the ‘Volksmond’ Café, gift shop and amenities block. From here people can gain a spectacular view of the valley across to Franschhoek township to the south-east, and, on a clear day, can very easily see Table Mountain, some sixty kilometres away in Cape Town. The café has floor to ceiling glass doors which can be opened in fine weather, allowing customers to sit outside as well as indoors. The café provides breakfasts, snacks, tea, coffee and cake, lunches and, for occasions when events are being held at the Monument (such as the regular ‘Full Moon picnics’), prepares picnic baskets for visitors to purchase. The owners of the café have attempted to provide a number of traditional Afrikaner dishes on their menu, most of which appear on the blackboard menu at the entrance to the building. As well as tables and chairs inside the coffee shop, there are also a number of concrete picnic tables and benches along the southern edge of the carpark where visitors may sit, eat and drink from the café menu or what they may have brought for themselves, or simply sit and enjoy the view. On a terraced area below the café and accessible via a number
of steps is a safe, fenced children’s play area with swings, a slide and other children’s play things.

The topography of the site is such that the Monument dominates the whole area, an intentional feature common to monumental structures. The positioning of the Monument constructs a unique and powerful prospect position for its viewer. Arguably, the meaning of the Monument, then, is not necessarily so much bound up in the visitor looking at its component parts, but rather in looking at the way its spatial organisation facilitates the visual appropriation of the surrounding landscape. In other words, the Monument is both the object of the ‘gaze’ as well as a site from which a particular type of ‘gazing’ can take place.

From the entrance, from the car park and from the steps which lead from the café and curio shop up towards the Monument proper, glimpses of its various columns stand out against the skyline and tower above the surroundings and the approaching visitors, giving an initial impression not unlike that which a visitor might experience when standing at the entrance to a cathedral, for example (Figure 5.18). Quite intentionally, then, the vision governed by a particular protocol imposed by the positioning of the Monument and its architecture constructs its ideal viewer as a diminutive spectator who approaches it from below.

A visitor’s initial encounter with the ATM may baffle or confuse. The combination of its abstract design and its unusual subject matter do not make for easy interpretation or understanding. Visitors are guided by the brochure (Figure 5.16) and by the plaque containing the original words of van Wyk Louw and Langenhoven which served as Jan van Wijk’s inspiration (Figure 5.19). With the entrance stairway to the Monument in direct view, etched in bronze in the pathway leading up to the Monument, the visitor encounters the sentence, ‘DIT IS ONS ERNS’ (roughly translated as ‘This is our Concern/Earnestness’) (see Figure 5.20).
Figure 5.18 Approach to the Monument
(Source: author)

Figure 5.19 Plaque with original quotes from N. P. Van Wyk Louw & C. J. Langenhoven, set in one of the granite stones on the approach to the Monument. An English translation has been placed on a stand nearby
(Source: author)
Other than this sentence, the quotes by Langenhoven and van Wyk Louw on the plaque and the mounted enlarged copy of the brochure given to visitors, the Monument is otherwise completely devoid of any writing or any other graphic representation. Some might say that this is quite ironic for a monument dedicated to the celebration of a language. Van Wijk, however, rejected any consideration of the Monument being inscribed with any script or decoration but did, because of their particular significance in the history of the Afrikaans language movement, propose that those words be inscribed in the paving at the approach to the Monument to attract people’s attention as they ascend the stairs and to draw their attention to what the monument stands for (ATM, 2011). The power of these words lies not only in what they connote but, in terms of their relational and representational value to visitors, their capacity to separate people and histories (Beningfield, 2004). The words serve to divide visitors into one of two categories: that of ‘insider’, with knowledge of the language and the meaning of the words and the Monument’s historical and cultural context or, ‘outsider’, for whom the words have little or no meaning and for whom the Monument has little relevance other than as a site of curiosity.

As visitors begin their ascent, they pass on the stairway a single pillar (indicated by the letter, B on the leaflet, Figure 5.16) (‘Maleise taal en kultuur’) centrally placed between the European colonnades and the African domes midway up the stairway and
recognising the pivotal role played by the Malay people, language and culture in the
development of Afrikaans. The pillar is positioned equidistantly between the arcs of
Western Europe (A) and Africa (C) so that (being from the East), it is separate but yet
united with these two forces, which combine to form a bridge (D) symbolically
depicting the basis of Afrikaans (ATM, 2011). Here van Wijk is emphasising the
importance of the Malay language, more than any other single language, in the birth and
development of Afrikaans and recognising that Afrikaans was first written using Arabic
script to enable the Malay people at the Cape to read and understand it:

Between those two symbols stands the Malay symbol, since it is
neither from Europe nor Africa, but has its origin in the East. The
only two languages that are really mentioned are Afrikaans and
Malay; the others only refer to languages and cultures locally and
languages and cultures from Europe. (van Wijk, 2000)

On their left as they make their way up the stairway, visitors come into contact with the
first of the six separate components which constitute the Monument, the three
colonnades (A), described as the ‘Clear West’ (helder Wes), which are located to the left
of the stairway approach. These colonnades represent the languages and cultures of
Western Europe which have contributed to the vocabulary, grammatical and syntactical
structure of Afrikaans. Whilst there is no single column which represents any specific
language (ATM, 2011), there is, however, debate as to why three columns were decided
upon to represent the contributions of other European languages. The Afrikaanse
Taalmonument Information Booklet 2011 states that ‘the number three was used
because it is indivisible’ (ATM, 2011). In discussions with Erna van Wijk, however,
she said on one occasion that, being quite religious, ‘Jan thought of the religious
symbolism related to the number three’, whilst on another, that he simply ‘liked’ the
numbers three and seven (pers. comm., Erna van Wijk, 14 April 2010). The former
interpretation and the importance of the Holy Trinity and van Wijk’s Christian faith was
confirmed in his speech to the ACVV in 2000 where he stated that: ‘Three columns
were chosen, as three is indivisible and represents the omnipresence of a Higher
Authority’ (van Wijk, 2000).

The columns progressively diminish in height to express the diminishing influence of
the European languages on Afrikaans. ‘The columns start high,’ said van Wijk
‘reminiscent of the tall buildings and the lucid West, but they begin to descend, since none of those languages were [sic.] able to speak to this land like Afrikaans is able to speak to it’ (van Wijk, 2000). The columns, the tallest of the three being roughly 13.5m tall, begin as separate structures but then merge into an ascending arc to form part of the main outline of the monument.

To the right of the approach is a podium which represents the southern tip of Africa (ATM, 2011). Built into this podium or sloping courtyard are three round convex mounds or domes (C) of differing proportions, described as ‘Magical Africa’ (magiese Afrika), ‘consistent with the innocent “natural” forms of “timeless” Africa familiar from countless tourist brochures and from descriptions of traditional life’ (Beningfield, 2004:521). These domes represent the influence of the Khoi, Nguni and Sotho languages on Afrikaans. These three structures progressively increase in size, thereby indicating the increasing African influence on the language. The domes are positioned in an arc that connects with the monument’s main curve (symbolising Afrikaans), thereby connecting them physically as well as spiritually (ATM, 2011):

Small to large, to show that they grew. Europe shrank; locally the languages and cultures grew. The design aims to take the eye and to toss it back in Afrikaans, which is what it is all about. (van Wijk, 2000)

Despite van Wijk’s positive imagery of interaction and interdependence, debates at the time of the Monument’s construction were polarised with regard to the inclusion of the African references of the design. Ex-chair of the Monument working committee, P. J. Loots, for example, believed that any references to ‘Africa’ were inappropriate as the contribution of indigenous and Malay languages were extremely minimal. By including any ‘African motifs’, Loots argued, the ‘purity’ of the language would be tarnished (Beningfield, 2004:521) and the importance of the actions of the (White) heroes of Afrikaans diminished. Van Wijk’s response to Loots’ comments was to label the forms as ambiguous:

The forms of the three ‘roundings’ were inspired firstly by the rocks on the site, and secondly by building forms from ‘Magical Africa’, in their final relationship to fit in with the whole. (van Wijk, n.d., quoted in Beningfield, 2004:521)

The debate about the presence of the domes was itself a debate of mythologies. Loots argued that to include them would be to depict a false history. His was an argument
based on the not unfamiliar myth of the emptiness of the continent and the purity of the Afrikaner people and their language (Beningfield, 2004). The penetration of African forms within the Monument not only threatened the foundations of Afrikaner mythology but also exposed the contradiction of its right to the land being based on ‘naturalness’ and ‘exclusivity’ (Beningfield, 2004:523). Van Wijk, in contrast, invoked his own myth which saw the ‘transformation of place through the “speaking” of landscape in a new language’ (Beningfield, 2004:521). For van Wijk, then, the domes represented a romantic connection to the earth and to the rock of Africa. The ‘natural’ landscape within which the Monument was embedded became the signifier of the direct connections between the natural evolving language, its hillside site, and the architectural forms of the indigenous Africans, ‘where natural boulder and “native” dwelling share the same physical form’ (Beningfield, 2004:522)

The Bridge (D) (Brug) forms the link which unites the West, Africa and the Malay to the centrepiece of the Monument, the 57 metre (186 ft), exponentially fashioned Afrikaans column (E) which dominates the structure. Beside the Afrikaans column, at a height of some 26 metres, stands the hollowed out column which symbolises the Republic of South Africa (F). Whilst this free-standing column does not relate to Afrikaans specifically, it is an integral component of the whole structure as it contextualises the language in its national setting. Surrounded by a pool of water fed by the wellspring inside the Afrikaans column, this column is hollow and faces north, metaphorically open to embrace the rest of the African continent, some say in a gesture of welcoming to all the nations and people of the continent while others suggest that it is in a gesture of assistance and nurturing, indicating the continuous interaction and discourse taking place between the Afrikaans language and its speakers, the broader South African community and the rest of Africa (ATM, 2011). Of this column, van Wijk said:

The birth of the Republic in 1963 is symbolised by the free-standing pillar and calls to mind the lucid West, calls to mind the languages and cultures that came here and the political birth of the Republic. The pillar stands apart from Afrikaans and as such has nothing to do with Afrikaans, but has to do with the whole. It is half the length of the column symbolising Afrikaans. It stands in the same water, stands in the same soil and stands in the same sun . . . and it is part of this whole – South Africa. In 1965 I already had John Vorster's dictum in my mind: We must talk to Africa; we must give
and take. That is why the pillar is so hollow – it gives and it takes; it wants to talk. As NP van Wyk Louw puts it: 'But what we must never forget, is that this change of land and landscape, polished, as it were, kneaded, tempered this new language-in-the-making; giving birth to new words, new representations and new images, causing old words and representations to disappear so that the new language began to fit like a good glove, could enclose every furrow and fold of the new world view. (van Wijk, 2000)

The ATM was designed as a structure which would be both seen from a distance and penetrated and experienced from close proximity, with careful attention being paid to material, scale and light which would envelop the body of the visitor ‘in an enfolding internal world’ (Beningfield, 2004:515). Its imposing position on the side of Paarl Mountain makes it visible from some kilometres away as well as commanding a panoramic view over the landscape far below. From the connecting bridge, visitors are drawn to the unfettered views south towards Cape Town, the city of Paarl and other outlying settlements and across the valley, cultivated with vineyards and farms, to the Drakenstein Mountains before being drawn into the main column. Most visitors spend time looking out over the view from their position at the top of the stairway. From there the landscape, at some distance below, appears ‘empty’ or devoid of humanity and creates a reflexive, liminal space from within which visitors may attribute their movement as one of escape from the pressures of urban life below and into a temporal liminality of experience as well. (See Chapter 6 for an analysis of visitor experience at the Monument).

The covered, undulating walkway (D)—the bridge between the helder Wes and the magiese Afrika—leads the visitor to the interior of the Monument and into the darkened interior space of the hollow Afrikaans column which is lit by a series of holes punctured into the rapidly elevating curve, ending with an opening at the top (Figure 5.21), the symbolic and diffused light from which recalls God’s blessing on the Afrikaner volk [people] (Bunn, 1995).
The space of the Monument is progressively more of an enclosure. The design is such that it is not a space which easily allows the subjects once in it free and easy passage according to their whim. As with the progression to the Monument, movement through the Monument takes a particular linear trajectory. Through the entranceway which dips slightly downwards and is unlit, the approach is through what might be best described as something akin to a mysterious cave entrance and it is only once inside the entrance that the visitor starts to walk upwards again but in an arc to the right before stepping fully into the cavernous, hollow column. Inside, the column encircles the body and the movement of bodies is controlled and guided by the curved shapes of the inside of the column. Beneath the halo of light emanating from the open top of the column is the life-giving pool of bubbling water which forms the inner sanctum of the Monument and, positioned on the centre axis of the Monument which folds around it symmetrically.
The visitor has been propelled to this spot, the epicentre of the Monument and is brought face to face with the wellspring of the Afrikaans language (ATM, 2011). Instead of a leisurely circuit, then, there is a teleology, a goal or endpoint for the visitor. The fact that the fountain is the only part of the Monument constructed of a different material (red quartz) indicates its importance and is intended to direct the visitors’ thoughts and attentions to it and to what it might represent. It is important to note, however, that any deliberate intention in terms of meaning or symbolism of the ATM may not necessarily be similarly perceived by visitors (see Chapter 7). The bubbling of the water in the fountain (Figure 5.22) which flows over the dome-like shape is most clearly a reference to the constant and unfaultering birth, rejuvenation and development of the Afrikaans language and symbolising its effervescence spring of new ideas. Beningfield (2004:519) writes that the fountain represents ‘fertility and growth ... through the analogy with a newly fertile earth, a spring flowing from the dry soil, which was represented quite literally in the monument by the bubbling fountain beneath the attenuated parabola that represents the graph of the growth of Afrikaans’.

Figure 5.22 ‘The Wellspring of Afrikaans’ Fountain inside the Afrikaanse Taalmonument (Source: author)

The sharp lines of the spire suggest Van Wyk Louw’s ‘double-edged sword’. The spire is approximately 57m (186 ft), with its tip blunt and open, to indicate continuing
growth. The play of light inside the monument is caused by the reflection of the light from the holes in the bubbling fountain, suggesting a wellspring and continual effervescence and a number of small square openings reaching to near the top of the main column, suggesting that the language is a ‘gleaming tool.’ One guide was, in fact, overheard mentioning to a group of visitors that this line of light formed a luminescent ladder, creating a sense of a metaphorical stairway to Heaven. Of these features, van Wijk has said:

Now take the shining tool: At any time of the year, any time of the day, in any kind of weather, you can watch the play of light taking place in there. You will see that every ripple of the water is a play of light, every pebble here a word, every line a singing sentence . . . a shining tool in there. That is what it is about. (van Wijk, 2000)

From within the hollow interior, the visitor moves out through an arch to exit to what is possibly the most contentious part of the Monument, the forecourt where we find the three ‘African’ domes (Figure 5.23) and from where the broader landscape across the valley to the Drakensberg Mountains can be contemplated. Van Wijk (2000) was forthright in emphasising the fact that the monument he had designed was representative of the Afrikaans language and not of any particular ethnic or cultural group but more simply of a language whose origins lie both in Europe and in Africa: ‘This is a living symbol for a living language – Afrikaans,’ he stated, ‘and here we are referring to the language and not to a particular group of people ... we must find practical solutions to preserve both [European and African] heritages of Afrikaans ... it will remain vital only for as long as it remains the bearer of our full fate, of our bidirectional knowledge; for as long as it can think both concretely and abstractly; for as long as both Europe and Africa live inside it; Africa indeed, yet always Europe too’ (van Wijk, 2000).

In the middle of the site where the ATM is situated can be found a rocky outcrop consisting of a group of granite boulders (Figure 5.24). The simplicity of the shapes and the extreme roughness of the concrete-granite composite of the Monument are in sharp contrast to the openings and entrances and the quality of direct, reflected and diffused light and of the extremely well-maintained gardens immediately around it. All attempts have been made to stock the gardens and bushland with plants native to the region. The vegetation is lush and, beyond the Monument podium, a winding paved
Figure 5.23  African ‘roundings’ or domes, with ‘European columns’ to the right
(Source: author)

Figure 5.24  Granite boulders found throughout the site
(Source: author)
Figure 5.25 ‘Inviolate Zone’, gardens and native foliage
(Source: author)

Figure 5.26 Amphitheatre and seating
(Source: author)
walkway weaves its way around some of the large rocky outcrops and boulders and through the bushland, past an amenities block and around to a more formal lawned area with some secured picnic tables and benches below the podium area, where many picnickers and those seeking some sort of solace in the serenity of the location enjoy the sweeping views and the relaxing atmosphere (Figure 5.25). For visitors with physical disabilities or confined to a wheelchair, access is available to the Monument via the road which skirts the southern side of the Monument and which connects to a paved walkway which leads to the Monument.

Situated some 200 metres down the mountainside to the north-west of the Monument is an amphitheatre (Figure 5.26). It is here where the inauguration of the Monument took place in 1975 and subsequently where various entertainment events have been and are held throughout the year. The amphitheatre is constructed of concrete and houses underneath it a number of change rooms and amenities areas for performers. Audiences of up to 5000 people can be seated on concrete terraced seating while the surrounding grassed area can accommodate many more visitors. There is a secure gravel car park for vehicles with easy access to the amphitheatre and seating.

The ATM, then, is much more than a monument which pays tribute to the origins and development of a language. Increasingly, it is becoming a multi-layered tourist attraction which functions on many different levels for a growing number of different and diverse purposes and catering to diverse groups of people. In order to evaluate the Monument as a tourist attraction, it is useful to compare its material reality with pertinent literature on tourist attraction structures. The early work of Gunn (1979, 1988) and his concentric zone model and Pearce’s (1991) work on tourist attractions, will provide points of discussion in terms of how consistently the ATM ‘fits’ into the theoretical frameworks presented by these scholars. In addition, MacCannell’s (1976) sight sacralisation process will form the basis for analysing the way in which the Monument has ‘become’ an attraction.

Despite the particular vision outlined by the ATMK in its architectural brief (n.d.: 7) that ‘the visual aspect [of the Monument] is of importance [but] the functional plays no
role’ (‘Die visuele aspek is van belang; die funksionele speel geen rol nie’, my translation), the Monument has always functioned in some capacity, be it as a visual and tangible symbol or simply reminder of the Afrikaans language, as a sign of repression and exclusion, as a piece of abstract architecture to be admired or abhorred, as a gathering place, a place of leisure and relaxation or a site of visitation. The Monument has been a site of contestation even since before its construction, it seems, where its ‘intentional’ use, as presented in the ATMK brief and its ‘actual’ use have been and continue to be at variance. For visitors to the Monument trying to come to terms with its meaning and significance, impressions and comments demonstrate that contestation is still quite evident today in the many different ways in which visitors relate and respond to it.

From a purely structural and design perspective, the layout of the Monument site is a classic rendition of Gunn’s (1988) concentric configuration. Gunn recognised that attractions involved more than sights so he used the term ‘nucleus’ to denote the central component (the ‘raison d’être’) of a tourist attraction. Around that nucleus is an ‘inviolate belt’, or the setting within which the nucleus sits, which itself is encircled by a ‘zone of closure’ to make up his three elements which together make up an ‘attraction’. Figure 5.27 demonstrates the clearly defined ‘zone of closure’ which includes the boundary around the site, the car park and the commercial area which includes the café, curio shop, children’s play area, picnic tables and visitor facilities. Enclosed within that area is the ‘inviolate zone’ (‘a complimentary landscape setting’ [Gunn, 1988:56]) where we find the gardens which surround but help isolate the Monument which forms the ‘nucleus’ (Figure 5.25).

At one level, this area operates as a location of great beauty and solace, providing those fortunate enough to live within a reasonable proximity a place of leisure, recreation or of refuge from the everyday aspects of life. It provides an informal space where friends and family can meet to share time together, where families can picnic in the well-maintained grounds, where children can play and explore, where individuals can relax in a safe and secure environment, from where visitors may take advantage of the sweeping views and the landscape. It appears that the original intention was that the
Monument would be considered somehow separate from its surroundings and, as the members of the ATMK understood it, the Monument would have ‘no real function’. Clarification was sought with the Researcher employed by the Monument who explained that, as far as the Afrikaans suggests, the Monument itself should not have any functional use (‘die funksionele speel geen rol nie’) but that they saw the surrounding grounds (‘terrein’) being used for family picnics and other leisure activities.

According to Gunn (1988), this inviolate belt is integral in framing the nucleus and serves as the buffer zone through which visitors must pass to reach the central attraction. Gunn goes on to say that this belt ‘has a much more powerful function than has previously been attributed to it’ (Gunn, 1988:55) as it serves to both physically and psychologically condition visitors to the major attraction by influencing their ‘mindset’ or ‘anticipation’ and how they will receive it. Evidence provided through the observation of visitor behaviour and comments in Chapters 6 and 7 will demonstrate the powerful affective and physical effects this zone has on visitors coming to the ATM. ‘The combination of the design [of the Monument] and the natural surroundings are the
motive for visiting,’ said one interviewee, who also added that it was the beauty of the setting and the environment rather than the Monument itself which were the major drawcard for her. The surrounding grounds in the majority of cases are spoken of in superlative and quite emotional terms: ‘beautiful’, ‘well-maintained’, ‘brilliant’, ‘impressive’, ‘a beautiful setting from which to contemplate the development of Afrikaans...’ and because the surroundings are ‘inextricably of the land’ (Gunn, 1988:57) they ‘ground’ the visitor in the space and place as well as establishing for the visitor a sense of space, calm, relaxation and repose which was evident from the general demeanour of visitors to the site. The ATMK members also envisaged a restaurant would be built in the grounds, in other words more or less what is there today, and the positioning of the café/curio shop, toilet facilities, children’s playground and parking facilities are in keeping with Gunn’s third aspect of an attraction, the ‘zone of closure’ (1988:56) which sit on the periphery of the ATM site.

The Monument, itself, adheres very much to the cathedral-like design with which many of the visitors would be familiar. The external design with its steeple-like columns, the statuary lining the stairway, the entrance to the interior, winding its way to the ‘inner sanctum’ is represented by the fountain above which rises the imposing interior with its sacralised qualities and connotations. For visitors, movement through the site takes them on a spiritual journey from the profane to the sacred, to return once again to the profane world. The closer the visitor comes to the ‘core’ of the Monument, the fountain, the greater the conflation of space and time. Movement is from the lit exterior world into the darkened world of the interior of the Monument where the visitor is cocooned within the curves of the column and temporarily detached from the outside. Insulated from the exterior world, visitors are offered an opportunity to inhabit a space which stands in opposition to everyday lived (or ordinary) experience. As well, this movement and transition defines the experience in terms of its liminality by taking the visitors and separating them from the everyday before returning them to their quotidian world. Visitors are taken on a journey through a narrative, which tells one man’s version of the story of the origins and development of the Afrikaans language and of his perceptions of the importance of the various linguistic contributions to its creation.
From its beginnings, then, the intention was to build a symbolic structure surrounded by
grounds which would attract visitors (ATMK, n.d., Section 22, p. 7; see Appendix 4 for
details in Afrikaans, with translation). Gunn’s (1988) analysis of the elements shared
by a number of popular built and natural attractions is relevant here. Of the six features
he lists, it is in those areas relating to the clarity of the symbolism to reveal the purpose
of the structure, the depth of public understanding and the activities available to visitors
where the ATM is lacking. His four elements referring to an attraction’s setting and
environment, however: the physical beauty in the setting and its design, the
environmental sympathy between the physical setting and the supporting built facilities
and the environmental protection of the setting have, without a doubt, been successfully
achieved.

Dean MacCannell’s site sacralisation theory (1976:43-45) offers valuable insight into
site development and provides a useful means by which to assess a site’s ‘status’ as an
attraction. Using MacCannell’s conceptualisation as an analytical lens through which to
investigate the ATM reveals that, in terms of his model, the Monument meets his five
criteria, viz. ‘naming’, ‘framing and elevating’, ‘enshrinement’, ‘mechanical
reproduction’ and ‘social reproduction’, yet it fails to attract the numbers of tourists
which might be expected from a site which so readily meets MacCannell’s conditions.
The implication here is that other factors are at play which might impinge upon the
Monument’s ‘attractiveness’ and which MacCannell has not adequately addressed.

MacCannell’s first stage of ‘naming’ or ‘marking’ occurs when a site is ‘marked off [by
society or institutions within society] from similar objects as worthy of preservation’
(MacCannell, 1976:44). As discussed earlier, for MacCannell (1967:110) a ‘marker’ is
‘information about a specific site’, which may take the form of signs or signage which
delineates and defines a site, or information found in travel books or brochures which
includes a name, a picture, a plan or a map. From the time in 1942 when the idea was
first mooted to build a monument to the Afrikaans language, the structure has always
been known as the ‘die Afrikaanse Taalmonument’ (‘The Afrikaans Language
Monument’) or more commonly, simply as ‘die Taalmonument’ (‘The Language
Monument’). There is no confusion for South Africans when it is being spoken of.
Philip Pearce (1991:46), in his operational definition of a tourist attraction, states that ‘a tourist attraction is a named site with a specific human or natural feature which is the focus of visitor or management attention’. In line with the importance to which Pearce places the attachment of the name to a site, for some South Africans, the name of the ATM is a unique and important signpost, societal marker or symbol. There is no other language monument of this scale in South Africa, nor is there one which is so widely known or which has had so much media attention. As such, its name conjures up a mosaic of images and attitudes in people which reflect its historical and political associations and which have a powerful effect on how the Monument is received by individuals. For non-South Africans, however, the name, ‘die Afrikaanse Taalmonument’, and its promotion through highway signs and other local signage, presents a comparatively indefinite and indistinct message. The ATM logo (Figure 5.28) gives no indication as to the purpose or function of the attraction, nor do the graphics offer any clues to what it is or what it represents. The difficulty here stems from the same challenge which Jan van Wyk faced when he first contemplated submitting a design for the ATM competition—how can something as intangible as Language be represented in tangible form?

For many non-South Africans, however, because the official name of the Monument always appears in Afrikaans, to what the name refers is often totally unknown. Signage to the Monument from the freeway (N1) is posted only in Afrikaans (5.12) and, although the Monument is mentioned in various travel guides and regional tourist guides.
brochures as well as on a number of websites, not all visitors would necessarily correlate what they have read with the signage.

If visitors read the leaflet provided on arrival to the ATM, (Figure 5.16), they will see that each of the sections of the Monument is individually named: the ‘Republic of South Africa’, ‘The Growth of Afrikaans’ and so on. The power associated with the naming process becomes evident when we consider the connotations associated with the particular names. The ‘European’ contribution, for instance—the three columns on the left as you begin your way up the steps, (A)—are elsewhere together referred to by the words used by van Wyk Louw and Langenhoven as the helder Wes (‘clear/bright West’) while the three domes in the forecourt, (C), are collectively known as the magiese Afrika (‘magical Africa’). It is no coincidence that the sense of clarity, certainty and openness suggested by the term, helder is juxtaposed against the word magiese, with its undertones of the mysterious, the unknowable and the power of the supernatural. Each term has clear iconic associations and characterises an abstract quality or feature suggestive of something inherent in the ‘West’ and ‘Africa’. Such labelling gives certain legitimacy to the terms and it is more than likely that the terminology could not help but influence, at least to a small degree, visitors’ interpretations of these component parts of the Monument.

MacCannell’s (1976:44) second stage is ‘framing’ and ‘elevating’. Framing (analogous to Gunn’s ‘inviolate zone’) is defined as the ‘placement of an official boundary around the object’, while elevation refers to the putting of an object on display or opening it up for visitation. The grounds surrounding the ATM are very well defined. The architectural competition brief outlines the nature of the terrain very clearly and details reasons for the choice of the particular piece of land on the southern slopes of Paarl Mountain: ‘The entire site is beautifully overgrown with heath and natural shrubbery and offers a delightful view over the Franschhoek, Wagenmakers and Paarl Valleys, while it can be seen from Du Toitskloof Pass and the highway from Cape Town’ (ATMK, n.d.: 7, my translation). (‘Die hele terrain is pragtig begroei met heide en natuurlike struik en bied ‘n verruklike vergesig oor die Franschhoek-, Wagenmakers-, en Paarlvallei, terwyl dit ook van Du Toitskloofpas en die nasionale pad vanaf
Kaapstad, gesien kan word.’) The perimeter of the site is completely fenced off and there is a boomgate at the entrance. Again, the architectural brief called for the design of a monument which would be visible from some distance away: ‘The monument, or part thereof, must be strongly defined so that it is visible from far away. The visual aspect is of importance…’ (ATMK, n.d.:7; my translation) (‘Die monument, of ‘n deel daarvan, sal sterk belyn moet wees om van veraf sigbaar te wees. Die visuele aspek is belangrik.’) and the site chosen for the Monument provides an excellent vantage point from which it can be seen from many different directions and from some kilometres distant. Whilst accessibility to the Monument is difficult except by private transport or by tour bus, the road is well made and well maintained and, since it was inaugurated in 1975, the site has always been open to the public to visit. This is a significant fact deserving special mention. The ATM was not designed and constructed as a celebration of ‘Afrikanerdom’ but rather as an acknowledgement of the Afrikaans language and in recognition of those peoples whose contributions helped in its creation and development. The Coloured population has formed, and continues to form the majority of Afrikaans speakers in the Western Cape.

Throughout the site, there is a noticeable absence of interpretive signage to ‘frame’ the Monument’s individual elements. Other than the bronze plaque beside the path approaching the Monument (and its English translation nearby), where visitors can read the excerpts from van Wyk Louw’s and Langenhoven’s works which Jan van Wijk used as the inspiration for his design, the only other signage which appears at or near the Monument is the sentence ‘Dit is ons Erns’ inscribed in bronze in the path leading up to the Monument (Figure 5.20). This phrase, translated into English as ‘This is our concern/earnestness’, is originally attributed to a politician, J.H. Hofmeyr, who made a speech in Stellenbosch in 1905 opposing the British anglicisation policy but which was also used by Dr D.F. Malan, chairman of the Afrikaans Language Union and later member of the House of Assembly, in a speech in 1908 in which he made a powerful plea for the recognition of Afrikaans. However, as I will argue later in this thesis, for many visitors, any interpretation or meaning made of the Monument was hampered, to some extent at least, by a lack of interpretive signage. Pearce (1991:48), in his 1991 study of a number of well-known attractions, found that criticisms were raised with regard to inadequate visitor information and insufficient interpretative signage provided
for visitors, resulting in ‘truncated or very short visits’. ‘Visitors,’ Pearce continues, ‘need to be informed, by whatever means, of the content, theme and significance of the attraction’ (1991:50). In his article, Pearce (1991:51) makes reference to Canter (1975) for whom a successful tourist attraction is one ‘in which the public has clear conceptions of what the place is about, it is one where the activities in the setting are understood, accessible and excite public imagination’. It is in the interplay between the physical attributes of the setting, the activities engaged in by visitors and the conceptions which visitors bring to the setting which will allow for the fullest understanding and appreciation of an attraction (Canter, 1975).

In partial response to the current lack of interpretive signage and to improving visitor knowledge of the Monument, a new Orientation Centre is due for completion and opening in 2013. The Centre, which will orientate visitors more effectively to the Monument, will include an exhibition area where visitors can interactively learn about the origin and development of Afrikaans through the use of audiovisual exhibits. As well, the story of the Monument, from the time of its instigation, through its construction period, its inauguration and on up until the present will be told through words and pictures. Visitors will also be provided with an explicit interpretation by way of a scripted narrative to frame the Monument. A model of the Taalmonument, built by the architect Jan van Wijk, will also be displayed, while the centre will also include offices for staff members as well as a lecture hall that will be used for educational programmes and small conferences.

In terms of its ‘elevation’, the Monument quite literally sits unimpeded from view elevated high above the valley on the slope of Paarl Mountain. With the major part of its construction being the column soaring 57 metres, the ATM can be seen from many kilometres away and, at night when it is lit, it stands out very conspicuously against an otherwise black backdrop. In addition to its physical elevation, the Monument is ‘electronically elevated’ or enhanced through its website (www.taalmuseum.co.za), its Facebook page (http://www.facebook.com/afrikaansetaalmonument) and on local and regional tourism sites and in brochures, including the South African Tourism Board official website which has an image of the ATM heading its page on Paarl (http://www.southafrica.net/za/en/articles/entry/article-southafrica.net-paarl).
Figure 5.29  Naming and marking the ATM: Directions to the ATM
(Source: ATM website)
The grounds around the Monument have always been intended as an attraction in their own right—as a picnic and recreation area with a play area for children, as well as a place from which to gaze out over the surrounding landscape. Over time, there has been an emphasis on the planting of local flora in the site grounds and groups of visitors come specifically to wander through the gardens, familiarising themselves with the native flora and fauna, particularly the bird life of the area. Clearly, then, the ‘boundary around the object’ (MacCannell, 1976:45), the gardens, becomes a named entity and serves as a viable attraction and destination for visitors other than the Monument itself and exemplifies MacCannell’s third stage in the evolution of attractions: ‘enshrinement’. Any improvements to the grounds at large could further contribute to the ATM’s enshrinement as a tourism destination and any positive results in terms of those improvements demonstrate the importance of a good symbiotic relationship between a ‘site’, ‘nucleus’ or ‘core’ and its periphery for elevating its status.

The fourth stage in MacCannell’s theory is ‘mechanical reproduction’. This includes the re-creation of prints, photographs and objects or other souvenirs associated with an attraction which become valued by visitors and which may be displayed when taken home. The owner of the Volksmond Café & Curio Shop at the ATM has sought to expand the range of curios and souvenirs available for visitors. The most popular items are post-cards, books, diaries, magnets, key holders, Afrikaans CDs, monument souvenirs (mugs, t-shirts, aprons, information booklets, pens, and a reissue of ‘Die Patriot’ newspaper as well as teaspoons, and products featuring Afrikaans poems and sayings.

The amount of media coverage given to the Monument since its inauguration in 1975 has been extensive and includes numerous newspaper reports and opinion pieces (‘Vox Pop’, Die Suid-Afrikaan, May 1995, for example), references in academic publications such as Hermann Giliomee’s (2011) The Afrikaners: Biography of a People, academic journal articles (Benningfield, 2004; Marschall, 2010), the subject of theses (Pieters, n.d.), radio reports (including Radio Station, KFM in Cape Town interviewing me about my research at the Monument) and as the backdrop for a number of fashion shoots.
The Monument has also been the subject of various photographic projects (such as a final year Stellenbosch Academy student’s photographic project, December 2010). ‘Social reproduction’, the final stage in MacCannell’s (1976:45) theory occurs ‘when towns, schools or even people start to name themselves after famous attractions’. MacCannell (1976:45) writes that social reproduction occurs ‘when towns, schools or even people start to name themselves after famous attractions’. He continues by writing that it ‘derives from the relationship between the original object and its socially constructed importance’ (1976:48). Arguably, the ‘original object’ in this instance is not the ATM itself but, instead, the Afrikaans language. The erection of some 17 other monuments to the Afrikaans language suggests that people living where the monuments have been constructed are identifying with and stressing the importance what the ATM stands for and celebrates. It might be the case that MacCannell, in his taxonomy, had not given due consideration to the idea that the ‘sacred object (1976:45) could be a part of a society’s intangible heritage. Reference to the Afrikaans language points to the symbolic sites, themselves sacralised as sights by the presence of the monuments.

Since its construction and inauguration in 1975, there has been extensive social and mechanical reproduction in relation to the Monument in the form of some 17 monumental structures to the Afrikaans language throughout South Africa (see Appendix 1 for a comprehensive list of the whereabouts of these other Monuments). Whilst each differs in appearance, scale and grandeur to the original Monument, they are directly related to the ATM and reinforce its perception as a significant heritage site.

As has been demonstrated, the description of the development and structure of the Monument as a tourist attraction fits well with the conceptualisations or models of visitor attractions forwarded by MacCannell, Gunn, Pearce and Canter. Using MacCannell’s model as a measure leads to the conclusion that the ATM has successfully moved through all five stages to achieve site sacralisation status.

In terms of representation, the Monument is composed of two elements: the conceptual and the narrative. Visitors’ movement around and through the Monument guides the gaze or line of communication which directs the visitor to the narrative being presented in the construction and which is explained to the visitor in the Monument leaflet (Figure 5.16). Each component to which the visitor is directed forms a signpost for the
interpretation process. In tandem with some informational marker (the leaflet, guidebook or guide’s words, for instance) which ‘frames’ the attraction, a relationship is formed between the Monument, the visitor and the marker (cf. MacCannell’s [1976] conceptualisation) to provide a solid foundation of contextualisation in which interpretation and meaning-making can take place. Conceptual representations, however, are much more socially and culturally embedded. For some visitors, any similarity between the Monument and a cathedral-like structure may be non-existent while for others, there may be a very clear and direct relationship between the two. Some would suggest that there is a direct link between the foundational myth of Afrikaner Christian mythology, which conceived of the volk as an organic unity, a separate racially ‘pure’ nation which was created by God (O’Meara, 1983) and the resultant design of the Monument. It might be argued that the positioning of the African domes, separate and unattached to the Monument proper might be a literal and metaphorical attempt to distance the African contributions which may otherwise threaten the foundations of an Afrikaner mythology and, thus, strengthen the notion of an exclusive Afrikaner identity which had directed the course of South African politics since 1948 (Beningfield, 2004:523).

5.8 Conclusion

This chapter has provided a rich description of the ATM site as well as examining its constituent features in order to see how adequately it meets theoretical criteria to establish its effectiveness as a visitor attraction. The chapter also contains some conclusions about the rich historical context of the ATM, its design processes and challenges, and the role the Monument plays in the wider socio-cultural context of the ‘new’ South Africa. The chapter has demonstrated that other complex factors, some of which are beyond the direct scope of a tourism investigation, need to be taken into account when gauging an attraction’s status and to acknowledge the important influences any underpinning or influential socio-political, cultural and economic factors may have on an attraction’s evaluation. As a monument, the ATM has been designed and constructed to convey certain information as a site of ‘ideological narrative’ (Oha, 2000:33) which is interpreted and given meaning by visitors through their interaction with and experience of the site. The important place of people in the environment described is what gives an attraction its humanity. After all, according to both
MacCannell (1976) and Leiper (1995), an ‘attraction’ comprises a triadic relationship between a tourist, a site and a marker in MacCannell’s case and a tourist, a nucleus and a marker in Leiper’s. This chapter has concentrated on the latter two components (nucleus and marker) but in order to strive for something more holistic or comprehensive, a scheme which enables visitors to be located and identified in a site needs to be formulated.

A critical addition to MacCannell’s and others’ conceptualisations must also involve input related to the visitor experience. To that end, a more inductive approach will be taken in the following two empirical chapters which looks to the visitor experience, first (in Chapter 6) from the position of observer and from where visitor’s ‘performances’ (Edensor, 1998) are described and discussed, to bring into focus the processes and practices of tourist experiences as they unfold within particular spatial parameters and ideoscapes. As has been established in the course of this thesis, any meanings given to monuments are rarely fixed or certain and are, thus, potentially contested by different individuals and social groups. This contention of meaning is a central theme of the modern discourse around monuments (Oha, 2000) and is certainly extremely important in the case of the ATM. Chapter 7 then probes further into the visitor experience by drawing on visitors’ responses about the Monument to better understand what interpretations and meanings they attributed to it and to gain a deeper appreciation of the ATM as a visitor attraction.
Chapter 6

Visitor Experience at the Afrikaanse Taalmonument

I do not see the world simply in color and shape but also as a world with sense and meaning. I do not merely see something round and black with two hands; I see a clock ... (Vygotsky, 1978:39)

6.1 Introduction

Observing, detailing and interpreting the many ways in which visitors make use of the space in and around a tourist site provide an empirical foundation to our understanding of how people interact with, interpret and make meaning of visitor attractions. The description and analysis of the visitor experience at attractions is not new to the discipline of tourism studies. As early as 1975, Canter summarised the literature related to the sites and locations visited by tourists and the features required for them to gain a sense of place. If the unique sense of a particular location is to be properly understood and fully experienced, Canter’s (1975) elements: the physical attributes of a setting, the activities one performs in a setting and the conceptions people bring to a setting all need to be present. I draw upon these elements in my analysis of the ATM.

This chapter explores the physical and spatial attributes of the ATM and describes and examines the behaviour of visitors to this site and how they interact with it. By identifying and detailing how people conduct themselves at the site and the activities they undertake there, a deeper insight into the types of behaviours exhibited by visitors to the Monument is presented. Direct observation of visitor behaviour is, of course, limited, and any interpretation of activities and behaviour is influenced by established a priori attitudes or understandings of the researcher and the emic nature of the exercise.
The findings detailed in this chapter form one important facet of the research project in the investigation of how visitors engage with the Monument by observing their behaviour. The performative nature of ‘embodiment’, too, where visitors are considered to take part in the encounter or experience much more as participatory performers than in spectator roles is examined. To make of the data something more theoretically meaningful, the chapter then makes use of the Goffman-inspired dramaturgical view of social life ‘where actors perform both publicly and privately’ (Pearce, 2005:140). Here Edensor’s (1998, 2000, 2001, 2006) notions of visitor role and performance are used to address the notion that visitors’ actions are themselves ‘staged’ and that the quality of ‘performances’ and the enactment of roles is shaped, at least in part, by the standard of presentation of the ‘stage’ (Pearce, 2005). To that end, Edensor’s (1998:105) ‘embodied enactions played out in four main areas of performance—walking, gazing, photographing and remembering’ will serve as the basis for framing the discussion in this chapter.

To Edensor’s (1998:105) four ‘performative configurations’ will be added a fifth, ‘visitor embodiment and sensory involvement’, which is absent from his formulation. Whilst he does, in part, address the notion of embodiment through his four main areas of enaction, he does not touch on the idea of ‘sensory involvement’. An examination and evaluation of sensory involvement cannot be overlooked as it lies very much at the heart of any evaluation of visitors’ experiences at attractions. Reference to the actual sensory experiences of visitors is made in an effort to explain the importance of those experiences in the meaning-making process. The analysis does not, however, adopt a positivist approach in its analysis of visitors’ sense experiences. Rather, the perspective adopted is interpretive, grounded in a social constructivist epistemology which maintains that all meaning and knowledge are human constructions created through social interactions (Vygotsky, 1978). This perspective recognises the importance of individual meaning making and makes it a central tenet of practice (Hein, 1999). Constructivists argue that ‘people construct new knowledge and understandings based on what they already know and believe’ (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 1999:10). In other words, people make meaning based on experiences and how these fit into what
they already have in their minds (Hein, 1999), an argument which this study will, it is hoped, provide evidence to further substantiate.

6.2  The Lived Experience

By considering a more engaged set of experiences and imaginings which incorporates all the senses, this study seeks to contribute to a more sophisticated and nuanced understanding of the many facets of visitor experiences, perceptions and activities beyond one more simply concerned with a 'disassociated’ gaze (Urry, 1990; de Certeau, 1984). The study is very much concerned with the 'lived dimensions' of tourism (Wearing et al., 2010:3) where tourism is seen as an 'arena of interaction' in which visitors encounter and engage with spaces and places. No longer is the tourist simply seen as the observant but detached, gazing flâneur. Rather, the tourist today is more appropriately characterised by Wearing et al. (2010:5) as an 'interacting choraster'—a person who occupies, makes use of, interacts with and participates in a given 'space' (chora) (Grosz, 1995:51).

The ATM might best be described as a multi-purpose or multi-functional visitor attraction, even though it was created as a monument to celebrate a particular language. As such, it presents itself to visitors as much more than a heritage site and, often simultaneously, serves a number of different, and arguably, contested roles. The Monument site provides a range of experiences and opportunities for visitors who choose the activities most appropriate to their motives for visiting. A recreational visitor, for example, may choose to sit under a tree in the grounds and admire the view or read a book while someone more intrigued by the construction or engineering of the Monument may spend their time closely engaged in examining its structural features.

The ATM, as with all enduring sights/sites will, inevitably and over time, develop different uses and engender different meanings. This has important theoretical considerations when analysing attractions and people’s encounters with them. As with all social phenomena, both the object of visitation and the visit itself are developed within specific social and historical contexts. Any qualities which are bestowed upon an attraction or any meaning given to it are not, as some earlier researchers (Gunn,
1979; Schmidt, 1989) would have it, ‘inherent’ or ‘intrinsic’. Their significance and relevance are dependent upon contingent variables of our human social selves in and through time rather than on any inherent quality that the attraction may possess in itself. The multiple roles, multiple functions and, with that, the multiple ‘realities’ which are created by individuals of a site or attraction such as the ATM accords with postmodernist thinking, ‘which has tended to emphasise the subjective, multiple and negotiated characteristics of individual’s experiences over more reductionist and rigid conceptualisations’ (McCabe, 2009:34). This chapter, then, translates these conceptualisations into empirical research, by focusing on visitors’ experiences and behaviours.

The initial architectural brief for the Monument’s design and construction stated quite categorically that the Monument should have ‘no function’ (ATMK, n.d.:7). The site set aside for its eventual location allows the Monument to stand out, both as a beacon and reminder of the Afrikaans language to any observer or visitor as well as being a place from which to admire the magnificent views over the surrounding area. The site consists not only of the Monument and its component elements but also a walking trail, a coffee shop/restaurant, a souvenir shop, a play area for children and fixed picnic tables. A pathway meanders through the site along which native flora has been planted and where local birdlife and other local fauna can be seen. There is a large grassed area for relaxation and recreation and the amphitheatre where many different performances, including concerts, are staged throughout the year (Fig. 5.26). It is clear from the evidence that the Monument and the site serve a host of roles and functions.

In terms of visitation, what role or roles the Monument plays is very much dependent upon the visitor and his or her reasons for visiting. The Monument is an attraction or ‘place’ and, very much depending upon the background and personality of the visitor and of their motives for visiting, the site of ‘a complex relationality between places and persons connected through both performances and performativities’ (Hannam et al., 2006:13); in other words, a node of reiterated performatory acts (Cohen & Cohen, 2012). The ATM is, thus, not so much a fixed ‘place’ but is a ‘relational’ site of convergence between the complex networking of its constituent parts and their multiple
interconnections with the multiple interactions of those visitors who perform certain performances there.

In the case of the ATM, visitor behaviour, interaction and participation in the ‘space’ is influenced by the very nature of the site, in its topography and in its design. As well, the influence of a number of individual demographic, physiological, affective and psychological variables will be shown to impact upon their behaviour at the ATM. These variables may serve to temper the activities in which the visitors are engaged or in which they intend to engage. In order to organise and detail the ‘micro-level’ observations—the timing and tracking of individual visitors—and the on-site observations of general patterns of visitation made during fieldwork, I have drawn on a body of literature which is not often used in conventional tourism studies—museum studies.

As early as 1928, Robinson conducted a study which was perhaps the first systematic observation of museum visitors. In that study, Robinson gathered together credible data on experiences of visitors in exhibitions or museums, and introduced a method for tracking and recording the movement of visitors, as well as understanding the effects of architecture and design on visitors. Melton (1935, 1936) similarly tracked visitor circulation in museums and where within an institution or specific exhibition a visitor went. It is demonstrated in this chapter how the simple observation of visitor movements has evolved into something more complex, involving the observation and recording of the actions and activities of visitors (Yalowitz & Bronnenkant, 2009).

6.3 Visitor Profile

Records maintained by the ATM authorities vary in the ways in which they have categorised and recorded visitors. For the years 2006 to 2009 inclusive, records simply divide visitors into two broad categories—overseas and domestic visitors—each of which is then subdivided into adults and children (see Appendix 6 which presents a breakdown of the total number of visitors to the ATM for each month for the years 2006-2012). Statistics for 2010 and 2011, however, are more detailed. These statistics include categories for students, the numbers of adult, children and student visitors for special events held at the Monument, such as the monthly Full Moon Picnics held
during the spring and summer months, the Stargazing Evenings, various special days, such as Mandela Day held in July each year, and the various concerts and performances which have been staged regularly since January, 2010 in the grounds of the ATM.

Statistics for 2012 are even more detailed than 2010-2011. For example, they include categories for overseas and domestic pensioners, school groups on excursion as well as other groups on excursion and visitors with hiking or bicycle permits. The increasingly specific details about visitors to the Monument aids the ATM staff in gaining a much greater understanding of the characteristics of the visitors in order to, amongst other things, improve services and to gauge the popularity of the site and that of the special events it presents. Table 6.1 lists the overall numbers of overseas and domestic adult and child visitors for each of the years 2006-2012. What is evident is an overall decline in the number of visitors to the Monument for that period, particularly with overseas adults, while the figure has grown markedly for children, generally visiting as school groups. According to Isabeau Botha, communication manager of the ATM, vice-chairperson of the Paarl Tourism Association and a member of the recently formed Drakenstein Local Tourism Association, the major reason for the decline in the number of international visitors to the Monument is the result of the decline in mass tourism in South Africa generally and the closing down or merging of some of the country’s largest tour operators. ‘This means a decline in bus tourists to the Taalmonument, which formed the backbone of our overseas visitor numbers for many years,’ (pers. comm., 13 March 2013).

Of the 401 individuals identified in the tracking process, 168 (41.9%) were domestic visitors while the remaining 233 (58.1%) were from overseas. As can be seen in Appendix 4, however, the origin of the majority of visitor groups tracked in my study were South African (51 or 58.6%) as opposed to 32 or 36.8% of ‘overseas’ groups and 4 (4.6%) comprising mixed domestic and overseas visitors. Based on the very similar numbers of both overseas and domestic adult visitors for the year 2010 when fieldwork was conducted, this discrepancy in numbers can be attributed to the fact that observations made of the individuals or groups tracked overwhelmingly comprised small numbers or people (between one and eight people in each group). This means that I tended to
observe domestic, rather than international visitors, the latter of whom were more likely to arrive as part of larger tour groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Number of Visitors</th>
<th>Overseas Adults</th>
<th>Overseas Children/Students</th>
<th>Overseas Visitors Percentage of Total Number</th>
<th>Domestic Adults</th>
<th>Domestic Children/Students</th>
<th>Domestic Visitors Percentage of Total Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>46 406</td>
<td>25 328</td>
<td>1467</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>11 709</td>
<td>7902</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>53 337</td>
<td>26 196</td>
<td>2073</td>
<td>53.0%</td>
<td>17 951</td>
<td>7117</td>
<td>47.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>50 388</td>
<td>22 581</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>19 220</td>
<td>7337</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>43 583</td>
<td>16 869</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>19 085</td>
<td>6716</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>43 084</td>
<td>14 156</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td>14 645</td>
<td>13 572</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>36 802</td>
<td>10 531</td>
<td>2972</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>12 051</td>
<td>11 248</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30 775</td>
<td>11 145</td>
<td>2038</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
<td>10 058</td>
<td>7534</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1 Total Numbers of Overseas and Domestic Visitors, 2006-2012
(Source: Afrikaanse Taalmonument, ‘Besoekersgetalle—Monument’ ['Visitor Numbers—Monument'])

Appendix 4, Characteristics of Visitors Observed, details demographic information about individuals and members tracked and observed. The gender, national or ethnic origin, age, language heard spoken, arrival time at the Monument, departure time and duration of their visits were recorded, as were the overall numbers in each of the groups. Table 6.2 clearly shows that the majority of visitors, as might be expected came in pairs, threes or small groups, with the median group comprising two people and 72.1% of visitors being in groups of between two and eight people.

Of the visitors tracked, the gender disparity was minimal. Of the 401 visitors observed, 192 (47.8%) were female and the remaining 209 (52.2%), male. Estimated ages for adult visitors ranged from early 20s to their 70s, with the largest proportion of visitors falling within the 40-60 age brackets (70.5%). It is not surprising, given the fact that those in the ‘older’ age brackets tend to have more readily available disposable income and are more prone to visit cultural heritage sites in preference to those attractions which might be considered riskier or more adventurous. This claim is supported by Silberberg (1995) who provided a common pattern of cultural/heritage tourists. His
study identified the cultural/heritage tourist as one who earns more money and spends more money while on vacation, someone who spends more time in an area while on vacation, is more highly educated than the general public, is more likely to be female than male, and tends to be in older age categories. Similarly, in its Briefing Paper on ‘Cultural Tourism in South West England’ (2012:3), the South West Cultural Agencies Network states that heritage attractions generally attract an older audience who, as ‘cultural tourists’ are characterised as being ‘relatively older tourists, as levels of interest in culture are assumed to increase with age … The proportion of older people visiting cultural attractions,’ it is also noted, ‘has been showing an upwards trend which is consistent with the ageing population’.

Table 6.2 Size & Number of Groups Tracked

![Chart showing the distribution of group sizes and numbers tracked. The chart has a y-axis labeled 'Number of groups' and an x-axis labeled 'Number of people in group.' The distribution is skewed towards smaller groups with a peak around 15 people in a group, and a sharp decline as group sizes increase.]
Silberberg’s claim seems to be further substantiated by the details in Table 6.3. Visitors to the ATM are not spread evenly across the age categories. The largest number of visitors falls within the middle-aged bracket. There were very few solitary visitors, suggesting that a visit to the ATM is primarily an experience to be shared, often with family, with friends or members of a tour group. Many of the groups formed family clusters with children in their 20s or under 18 years of age. Rickly-Boyd (2010) found that for most visitors an outing was very much a family experience, confirming the notion that ‘companions are one of the social benefits of tourism experiences’ (2010:271). This importance given to shared experiences within tourism can be noted through the work of Urry (1990) who refers to the ‘collective gaze’, which is characterised by its anti-elitist sense of conviviality, high level of participation in popular pleasures necessary to give atmosphere to the experience of place which then becomes a shared process of visual consumption. Haldrup and Larsen (2003) take the notion of the ‘tourist gaze’ and apply it to families’ photographic practices which they term the ‘family gaze’. It is their intention to bring the performing family into visitor studies through this notion, which captures the ways in which family photography practices are socially organised and systematised. The ‘family gaze’, they argue, is important in producing social (familial) roles, shaping personal memories and self-conceptions, and becoming a primary instrument means by which to continue and perpetuate family memories. Both types of ‘gaze’ were very much evident in the constitution of the groups observed in this study.

6.4 Walking & the Primacy of Movement

The remainder of this chapter concentrates on examining the four broad dimensions of performance identified by Edensor (1998) in his seminal study of visitors at the Taj Mahal, to which is offered a fifth, that of ‘visitor embodiment and sensory encounters’. Walking, gazing, photographing and, although not enacted at a site, remembering constitute the major activities enacted by visitors at sites and attractions. These ‘performative configurations’ are not discrete but are interlinked and informed by particular conventions and constraints, to create what Edensor defines as ‘tourism’. For Edensor, ‘tourism’ is a set of embodied, social forms of practice (1998:105):
Tourism intimately concerns movement, that of a journey from an everyday situation to an extraordinary location. Tourism, as a set of embodied practices, is distinguishable from other social forms of practice. This passage through material space, as opposed to virtual movement, requires the activation of particular embodied techniques, dispositions and epistemologies which are enacted *in situ*.

Table 6.3 Afrikanse Taalmonument, Estimated Ages of Visitors Tracked

In Edensor’s (1998:105) description of a visitor’s movement as ‘a journey from an everyday situation to an extraordinary location’, the implication is that an attraction is anything but ordinary. It is, instead, something unusual, unexpected, astonishing, surprising, exceptional or remarkable which invites enquiry and investigation. A fundamental aspect to any definition of a visitor or tourist attraction must arguably include its capacity for exploration and the importance of the total ‘corporeal’ (Markwell, 2001:55) experience to best fulfilling that need or desire. Markwell’s study of Borneo nature attractions, for instance, demonstrated how there seemed to be:

a greater “congruence” of mind and body...during those times when tourists were experiencing places relatively free of the mediation provided by the tourism industry, when imaginative interpretations of place were evoked. (Markwell, 2001:54)
Walking is one such form of corporeal movement which is, Edensor (1998:105) affirms, ‘an activity central to tourism’. ‘Walking and moving through space,’ he continues, ‘partly constitutes places’. This perspective is very much in line with de Certeau’s (1984) argument that a place is only created through the experiential activity of walking in and around it (cf. Augé’s interpretation of ‘place’ as merely a collection of inanimate elements ‘coexisting in a certain order’ [1995: 80]. ‘Space’, according to Augé is only brought into existence once a person moves across and through this ‘place’ [1995:79]). The modalities of walking—the amount of time spent walking, the paths and different directions taken, the speed at which visitors move about an attraction—coupled with the diverse constitutions of place cannot be overlooked as their influence helps to shape visitors’ experiences of attractions. As equally important as visitor movement must be a consideration of its converse: placement, positioning or stasis. Where visitors stop, why they stop and what they otherwise do at a particular location are important elements when examining visitors’ experiences. Amongst many other reasons, some visitors will pause for reflection, some for consideration of the surroundings and some may stop for more pragmatic reasons, such as to enable them to think over alternatives to make a decision as to what trajectory to follow next. It is through movement and stasis, then, that visitors engage sensorily and cognitively with an attraction and its environment and it is the sensory and cognitive engagement which, in turn, forms the basis for the interpretation and meaning made of an attraction.

An attraction such as the ATM was built to be explored. For visitors to gain the greatest appreciation of its features, its positioning and its surroundings requires visitors to move in through and around the Monument. In strong defence of Edensor’s contentions, movement should be considered the primary driving force which influences and, both directly and indirectly, helps to determine and direct the ‘gaze’, the (later) ‘memories’, the interpretation and the meanings attributed to an attraction. Whilst the path designed by the architect tends to direct visitors to follow an essentially singular, linear, unidirectional route, there is still always an element of human agency in how visitors choose to walk around the site. Decisions are still made by visitors to take a particular path, to move in a particular direction, to move at a particular pace, to stand in a particular place or to move on will have a marked impact upon theirs and other visitors’
overall experience of an attraction and what they take away from that experience. Ultimately, movement in and around the ATM is driven by visitor motive and purpose. It should be noted, however, that individual movement may also be affected by group decisions which may themselves be further affected by such factors as accessibility, agility, time constraints, personal insecurities, concerns for safety and security or traits such as inquisitiveness and curiosity. At one and the same time, but as a consequence of any movement made, visitors will view an attraction and its surroundings from a particular perspective which will change once visitors move again. That visitors linger in a particular spot is indicative of some sensory, affective, physical, cognitive or aesthetic reaction which impels them to remain in that particular place for some length of time.

6.4.1 Visitor Conduct

The observation of visitor conduct at an attraction is but one way to ‘capture the corporeal reality, creativity and social dramas’ (Larsen, 2005:254) which make up the reality of the visitor experience. Contrary to much of the extant tourism literature (Fuller et al., 2005), it is through an understanding of the conduct of visitors at an attraction that we realise that, rather than being consumers of a site or attraction, visitors are, in fact, their producers.

Reference to conduct is, in the first place, suggestive of the general demeanour and manner in which visitors move about an attraction or site. Visitors’ conduct frames their actions and the activities which they undertake, and influences the directions and momentum of their visit. Their conduct also serves to mediate their experiences and forms an important part of the complex theatricality which Edensor (1998) describes as the visitor’s performance at an attraction. Normative codes of behaviour and frames of reference do exist when visiting attractions. Edensor (1998:126) writes that, ‘tourist performance is typified by an entrenched set of codes which circumscribe which enactments and dispositions are appropriate’. Thus, to conduct oneself ‘appropriately’ at a tourist site requires the visitor to follow certain accepted rules and discourses (Munro, 1997; Taussig, 1993) or as Edensor (1998) and Larsen (2005) describe them, ‘choreographies’. These ‘choreographies’, Munro (1997) would argue, are
discretionary but while not mechanically reproduced, an understanding of appropriate practice firmly locates visitor action within a particular stream of conduct.

For the most part, visitors to the ATM conducted themselves in a very similar manner. The general demeanour could best be described as composed, considerate and respectful of others. At no time was any tension or confrontation between individuals or groups observed. Numbers at the Monument were never so great that visitors would have their experience impinged upon by others, so the general tenor or mood of visitors to the site could be judged as overwhelmingly casual and relaxed. Few groups or individuals interacted with each other, irrespective of whether they were independent travellers or part of a larger tour group. Edensor (1998) points out that opportunities for dialogue between themselves and other travellers means that interpretation and meaning can be negotiated and shared but, at least in the case of the ATM, this was not seen to be a priority amongst visitors.

Visitors’ general conduct, however, was far less reserved at the ATM than that which might be expected at a more ‘formal’ (indoor) attraction (such as a cathedral or a museum, for example) where activities and behaviour might be restrained by certain expectations or protocols, or a site which required more ‘reverential’ conduct and behaviour (e.g. a war memorial, a shrine or a mausoleum). The ATM structure and site makes few ‘demands’ on visitors to conduct themselves in any particular or required manner which may contribute to the relaxed atmosphere which the site seems to engender. The site is free of obstacles which might impede or complicate visitors’ movement and there is minimal information or signage around which visitors might congregate to form a degree of congestion. The ATM site, therefore, held few constraints and allowed for certain individualistic pursuits. The forecourt space, for instance, proved to be the place of playfulness at the Monument. Emerging from inside the main column, where the visitor is subsumed in the semi-darkness by a structure of much greater than human proportions, it is quite a liberating sensation to emerge through the arch into the air and light once again. Whilst the more ‘traditional’ play area near the carpark provided swings and other children’s play equipment, it was in the
forecourt and on the large grassed area below the forecourt where people—both young and old—were seen to be most actively and spontaneously playful.

People often looked up in surprise at the height of the columns of the Monument. The three ‘African’ domes, by contrast, presented something on a much more human scale, so it was no surprise that, especially for children (although certainly not restricted to them), ran and climbed them (Figure 6.3). To be able to stand atop the largest of the domes seemed to present visitors with a real sense of triumph, as evidenced by the display of triumph which was often displayed through hand gestures, emotional cries and corresponding facial expressions of achievement (Figure 6.1; cf. Figure 6.2). On more than one occasion, children and teenagers were also seen to be sitting and playing on the rise above the entrance into the Afrikaans column from the Bridge. Adults were sometimes seen to share in the same playful behaviour, although there was less obvious risk-taking by adults. Children also sometimes climbed unimpeded over other parts of the Monument, where they played or used the space as a vantage point to look down on other visitors. This forecourt area was also the backdrop for two fashion shoots observed where the playful nature of the models and their whimsical poses were juxtaposed against the more firm, solid and hard texture and features of the Monument (Fig. 6.4).

Van Wijk had created a monument to a living and continually evolving language. As such, it had not been his intention that the Monument would be viewed as a sombre place of solemnity or formality but a place of vitality and enjoyment (pers. comm., Erna van Wijk, 12 April 2010) and this vision was very clearly articulated by the visitors who, while being respectful of the site, engage with it informally. They used the low-rise wall of the forecourt as a place to sit and chat; they leant on the walls of the Bridge to gaze out at the view; they consistently called out inside the Afrikaans column to hear the echoes of their voices. They ran and played in the forecourt, on the domes and all around the large grassed area where families or groups of friends could be seen kicking or throwing a ball, chasing each other around the trees and bushes or boisterously calling out and playing other games.
Figure 6.1  ‘I’m the King of the World!’
(Source: author)

Figure 6.2  Mount Everest Summit Climb
(Source: www.mount-everest.net)
Figure 6.3  Group of schoolchildren on the ‘African domes’
(Source: author)

Figure 6.4  Fashion Shoot
(Source: author)
Such activities suggest that the form and function of the many parts which go to make up the Monument invite multiple uses, experiences and emotions. There are no signs anywhere within the Monument grounds barring people from any particular activities. This allows for a much more ‘active’ and tactile visitor interpretation of and interaction with the Monument and provides for visitors’ own discretionary decision-making about the range and degree of their activities and behaviours rather than being subject to restrictions or resultant sanctions imposed by the Monument management. People are not prohibited from walking, climbing or jumping anywhere throughout the grounds; yet, for the most part, whilst uninhibited by regulations and proscriptions forbidding certain behaviour, visitors tended to act and behave in a very regular and predictable manner, as if following a conventional tourist ‘script’. Consciously or unconsciously, once upon the attraction ‘stage’, visitors seemed to ‘perform’ their role-as-visitor. Even though it was highly uncommon for any of the groups of visitors observed to interact with others (an area which, to my knowledge, has thus far received no attention in the tourism literature), Edensor (2001:71) argues that even if visitors largely self-regulated their visits, ‘[p]erformers are also subject to the disciplinary gaze of co-participants’.

As such, because they are under both the direct and indirect scrutiny and surveillance of other visitors, this may account for their reasonably ‘tight adherence to scripts, roles and direction’ as they make their way around the site and ‘which purvey notions about what actions are “appropriate”, “competent” and normal’ (Edensor, 2001:78).

Analysis of the visitor experience at the ATM overwhelmingly suggests that visitors adopt a tourist role or ‘persona’ once they are within the ‘territory’ of an attraction, irrespective of whether they are ‘regulated, directed or choreographed’ (Edensor, 2001:59), coerced or voluntarily act in a particular manner. Behaviour and activities undertaken were largely uniform and, somewhat surprising for me at the time, after only a small number of days’ observation, largely predictable. In line with Edensor’s and others’ (Bagnall, 2003) theorising which postulates tourists’ active ‘performance’ as a key social practice at tourist attractions or sites, visitors were seen to play out their socially-scripted behaviour in a metaphorically theatrical performance which has been theorised as stage-able (Edensor, 2000, 2001; Goffman, 1959).
Within their roles, visitors negotiated their way around the ATM, performing what seemed to be (unconscious) scripted processes which determined the sequence of visitors’ movements and actions, or what Edensor (2001:60) more broadly describes as ‘the ongoing (re)construction of praxis and space in shared contexts’. De Certeau (1984) argues that people, in their capacities as ‘users’, are provided with an abundance of opportunities to subvert institutionalised norms imposed on them and individualise their activities. This may be true to an extent when looking at the activities of visitors to the ATM, but even those resisting the ‘script’ formed a very small minority of visitors. Of those, the most ‘resistant’ would have been children and this resistance may be explained by the fact that they were possibly less familiar with the socially and culturally-dictated conventions of visitation than the adult visitors.

The predominantly unidirectional progression of visitors around the site, coupled with their regular and ritualised behaviours, expressions and comments serve to further endorse the growing body of research which stresses an awareness of the importance of the physical and of learned behaviours (Edensor, 2001) when trying to better understand the ways in which visitors navigate through attractions or sites (Bagnall, 2008). For visitors on packaged tours, their movements and behaviours are largely shaped and directed by guides or tour organisers. Since their visit to the ATM was normally only one of a number of places on their itineraries, packaged tour visitors’ time there was highly managed and organised (Edensor, 1998), and so in order to minimise disruption to their tours, visitors were required to obey the instructions of their guides or organisers. In terms of the behaviours and activities of those on packaged tours, Edensor (1998:107) notes that instructions are normally directed to discourage lingering or exploring, and that visitors should follow prescribed paths, to move towards certain key locations and not others in a disciplined choreography which ‘constitutes a quite precise and predictable “place ballet”’. ‘Bodies are tutored and disciplined,’ he argues (1998:107), ‘kept together and directed by assumptions about what is deemed “appropriate”, by group norms, and principally by the orders of the guide’. According to Edensor (2001:71), this is the ‘work’ of tourism, the ‘collection of commonly understood and embodied practices and meanings which are reproduced by tourists through their performances’.
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The ‘work’ of tourism should, at the same time, however, give equal consideration to those less commonly understood or embodied practices as they are enacted by visitors at an attraction. The observation and detailing of unusual behaviour and activities may draw attention to the different purposes and uses to which an attraction may be put and serve to broaden our understanding of the possible changing nature of attractions. In the case of the ATM, for instance, a group of eight African American visitors who were inside the main column, standing near the fountain, sang a traditional ‘Negro spiritual’. The spire shape of the major column, whilst suggesting the parabolic and exponential development of the Afrikaans language, is also very clearly reminiscent of the spires of Christian churches and its cavernous design served the singers well as their voices could be heard resonating throughout the site. When I asked them why they launched into song there, one of the group said that they thought that the main column resembled a pipe organ and, given the acoustics and the resonance inside the column, it seemed appropriate that they should sing there. If there were any ‘deeper’ significance in their gesture, nothing was mentioned. On at least two other occasions, groups of German visitors were heard singing ‘Happy Birthday’ to a member of their group, while on numerous occasions, attempts at yodelling could be heard coming from the interior of the Afrikaans column.

Another example of unusual or less common practices observed was a German fashion magazine shoot for swimwear (Figure 6.4). The director for the shoot explained that the choice had been made to use the Monument as the background setting for the photographic session because of its aesthetic qualities. The director of the shoot explained that he had been drawn to the Monument largely because of the appeal of the contrast of textures which the ATM provided, in what he described as the hard, sharp and solid grey concrete and granite of the Monument, juxtaposed against the femininity of the models and their colourful swimwear. Such activities serve to demonstrate how atypical behaviour or activities can transform not only the function or purpose of an attraction but the meaning which can be attributed to it as well. In the first case, what is understood to be an abstract construction is turned into a soundscape for visitor performance; in the second case, the Monument becomes the textural backdrop for a fashion shoot.
6.4.2 Circulation Pattern

As has already been alluded to, for the visitors observed, a relative homogeneity was found in the pattern which they followed around the Monument complex. This homogeneity can be largely attributed to the structural design of the Monument and of the topography of the site. Van Wijk was intrigued by Fibonacci numbers\(^4\), the construction of the ‘golden spiral’ and of the structure of the nautilus which exhibits logarithmic spiral growth (pers. comm., Erna van Wijk, 13 April 2010; image of a nautilus on the noticeboard in van Wijk’s study). The Monument was designed to direct visitor movement around the Monument following the design of the ‘golden spiral’ (Figure 6.5).

![Figure 6.5](image)

**Figure 6.5** The ‘golden spiral’, formed by the sum of the width of each square following the Fibonacci sequence, demonstrating how van Wijk’s design directs visitor movement through and around the ATM

The predilection for most visitors to follow a similar clockwise pattern of movement is testament to van Wijk’s design and confirms the right-turning principle espoused by Melton (1972) and much earlier by Robinson (1928) and Porter (1938) in their examination of circulation movements of museum goers. How visitors circulate ‘determines what visitors will see, where they focus their attention, and, ultimately,

\(^4\) The ‘Fibonacci sequence’ refers to a series of whole numbers in which each number is the sum of the two preceding numbers. Beginning with 0 and 1, the sequence of Fibonacci numbers would be 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, etc. The Fibonacci numbers were originally defined by the Italian mathematician, Fibonacci, in the 13th century to model the exponential growth of rabbit populations.
what they learn and/or experience’, writes Bitgood (2007:1). However, despite the fact that there is no signage or other directional notation to direct them, the majority of visitors followed the same route. A very small minority of visitors chose to make more random movements around the site. Any lack of apparent consistency in visitor circulation patterns could be, as Falk (1993) suggests, because visitors are fulfilling their own agendas and, because of a lack of familiarity with the site, would be more inclined to follow the movement of other visitors or in what seemed to be the most ‘natural’ direction. Visitors interested in finding a spot for some recreational pursuit such as picnicking, simply relaxing or otherwise socialising, for example, would not follow the same trajectory as someone visiting the Monument for the first time who is interested in exploring it as an attraction. Those visiting for purely recreational reasons were observed moving to find a suitable spot on the grassed area or at one of the picnic tables provided, for example.

Visitor circulation and the direction of ‘traffic flow’ of those who came to the Monument with little prior knowledge or no familiarity with the site were, therefore, heavily influenced by the architectural characteristics of the Monument and the design and layout of the traffic patterning which directs visitors through the complex and the open spaces surrounding it. The overall success of the circulation pattern may be evidenced in the fact that extremely few visitors observed strayed from the paths provided, even to wander along the dirt walking trail down to the amphitheatre or even to the limits of the grounds behind the Monument. There is a clear interactional correlation between the design of the Monument and the pattern of circulation of visitors in and around it. In relation to patterns of visitor behaviour, Huang & Wu (2012) argue that such behaviour is considered to be continuous. In their opinion, visitors ‘are considered to be rational, and are assumed not to turn back or return the same way unless necessary’ (2012:637). Thus, in accordance with Huang & Wu’s (2012) findings, the direction and sequencing of locations which is encouraged by the layout and design of the Monument, its surroundings and ‘the topographical relationship between different areas’ (Huang & Wu, 2012:637) allows visitors to encounter and interact with each of its many features in sequence without any need to backtrack. The visitor is thus guided through the influences on the development of the Afrikaans
language, the symbolism associated with it and expressed in the architecture, as detailed in the brochure given to each visitor as they pay and enter the site.

6.4.3 Temporality & Stopping

Together with space and context, time is considered to be one of the three most important domains of the visitor experience (Knapp, 1997). Although it can be argued (Knapp, 1997, for example) that the time spent at an attraction is important for the development of a deeper or more complex meaning of that attraction, there is no conclusive evidence to suggest that there is any real correlation between the time spent at an attraction and the meaning created. The motivation or purpose for the visit, activities undertaken at the site, the conditions helping or hindering movement, the perception and interpretation of the site and the experiences and opportunities which might be offered the visitor whilst at the site are, in themselves, all factors assisting in developing a sense of place and in constructing meaning. The climatic conditions at the time and the composition of groups visiting also appeared to have a direct effect on the trajectory followed and on the average duration of visits.

During the months of my fieldwork (March-June 2010), the majority of the visits to the Monument occurred between the hours of 9 a.m. and 2 p.m. Because of its location, the Monument bears the full brunt of the elements, so it is quite understandable that visitors would have chosen to visit in the cooler hours of the day in autumn and in the brighter daylight hours during the winter. Also, if a visit to the Monument were to be included as part of a broader package Cape Winelands tour for visitors coming from Cape Town, it was logistically appropriate to slot the visit into a suitable, mid-morning time (between 11 a.m and midday being the most popular time) before making their way to wine tastings and lunch at one of the nearby wine farms in the area.

One observed visit lasted only some five minutes while the longest recorded visit was one hour thirty minutes. The average duration of visits was 26 minutes, with approximately 56% of visits lasting between 20 and 30 minutes, the largest proportion (28%) being of 20 minutes duration. Such an amount of time appeared to be ample for visitors to spend time walking, observing, photographing and engaging in certain
activities in and around the Monument, as well as providing a brief period of time to explore the gardens as well. Sitting, reflecting or contemplating the Monument—its structure and surroundings—or a ‘sweet moment of inactivity’ (Gál & Donaire, 2010:3), did not seem to register very highly in the majority of visitors’ experience. Evidence provided by visitors interviewed about the amount of time they had spent exploring the site seemed to suggest that the length of time for a visit did seem to have had at least some bearing in terms of visitors’ level of engagement with the Monument, their interpretation of the attraction and meaning given to it. Evidence, however, could not be provided to substantiate any claim that a longer visit equated with a deeper understanding of the Monument and its symbolism. Interviews held with visitors who spent only twenty minutes, for instance, often produced richer data with regard to the depth of discussion than others who might have spent much longer at the site.

Most visitors did not hurry but ambled their way around the Monument and gardens, although visitors on guided tours, including larger tour groups, burdened by tight time schedules and packed itineraries spent, on average, approximately fifteen minutes at the Monument before heading off to their next destination. As Edensor (1998:106) observes, ‘since these tours are usually organised to fulfil the imperative to see “as much as possible”...the range of places to see and explore is paradoxically limited by a pre-determined, condensed itinerary’. Members of tour groups were generally ‘shown’, rather than being allowed time to explore and discover the site for themselves, although a small number were seen to be given a brief period of ‘free time’ (up to about 15 minutes) by their tour leader or guide to wander around the complex before returning to a central designated spot ready for departure. Once they moved from the coach up to the bottom of the steps leading up to the Monument, the tour groups were given an overview of the history and symbolism of the Monument by tour guides accompanying the groups. Listening to much of what was being told to visitors by accompanying (and in most instances, officially affiliated) guides, it became evident that few guides had anything approaching a comprehensive understanding of the background, the origins and intentions, form and function of the Monument or of its features. This is not to suggest that the credentialling organisation is remiss in its assessment of guides and qualification processes, but rather to identify the importance of tour guides
in their correct presentation of information and offering visitors some clarity as to what is significant about the attraction or site and the control which they exercise over the enhancement of visitors’ knowledge of sites and attractions. It can be seen, then, that for packaged tour visitors, their experience of the Monument was very much directed and determined by the guide whose personal interpretation of the ATM was the only one provided for them. Their experiences of the attraction, thus, differed from that of independent visitors who either chose to take an official tour, not to take any tour, chose to read the information sheet or not or used a guide book with some explanatory detail about the Monument. Experiences of different groups of people necessarily varied. Consequently, it would be inaccurate to try and ‘homogenise’ visitor behaviour at the Monument but rather more realistic to differentiate between the different groups and their behaviours and activities.

Time spent inside the Monument was, on average, much less than that spent outside. The interior is unlit except for the light entering from either exit and from the chain of small rectangular holes leading their way up to the open top of the main column. For someone visiting on a cloudy day or late in the afternoon, the interior appears quite dark and dank. The interior is also completely undecorated except for the small fountain near the exit to the forecourt, so most visitors were seen to make their way quite briskly through the Bridge, through the major column, for a brief stand (one to two minutes) near the fountain, before moving out into the forecourt.

The contributions provided by museum studies demonstrating the strong link between the examples of the observation of visitors and patterns of behaviour are very useful to the investigation here. Melton’s (1988) methods, for example, using the two behavioural indices of duration and spread of movement to measure the degree of visitor ‘interest’ whilst visiting an exhibition or gallery can be readily adapted when examining visitors’ behaviour in and around a tourist attraction. One particular feature which Melton failed to take into account in his discussion, however, was what Huang & Wu (2012) describe as to how ‘stay time’ at various ‘stay [or ‘key’] points’ showed a clearly decreasing trend with the time devoted or allocated to visits to an attraction. Constraints on visitors’ time at the ATM meant that stopping times at key points were,
at least potentially, shorter than those visitors perhaps less inhibited by time restrictions. Overall, time spent at ‘key’ locations was clocked at between 15 seconds and upward of two minutes, depending upon the particular location and on the ‘mental activity’ (Hooper-Greenhill, 2000:113) or what might be termed ‘cognitive engagement’ of the visitor with the site or with others at that location.

On arrival, once having moved from their vehicle, the majority of visitors were immediately drawn by the view and in many cases would make their way to the view point which commands a view from the east to the south-west. This specially-designed spot has a telescope from which people are able to look more closely at the surrounding landscape and an orientation plaque which points out various features and places and their distance away from the Monument. Not only are visitors shown the place of the Monument in relation to its surroundings but additionally it serves to give a human dimension to the otherwise ‘natural’ landscape by indicating the number of kilometres each feature or place is situated from that spot. Within the Monument complex itself, visitors generally paused at four ‘key’ stopping points—the top of the stairs at the beginning of the Bridge (A), inside the main column (B), at or on the domes (C) and at the corner point of the forecourt (D), from where they stood and gazed out at the surrounding landscape and took the ‘obligatory’ photographs of the view and/or of themselves and those in their group or, in the case of the interior of the Monument, made some sound which echoed through the cavernous interior.

It is important to note that one of the most important stopping points at the Monument turn the visitor’s gaze outward and from where visitors are not drawn to the actual structure of the Monument itself, but rather to the view/sight that it affords. By far the most popular ‘gazing’ spot was to be found at the top of the set of stairs of the Monument, providing visitors with a very commanding position over the surrounding landscape. From there, visitors often leant on the ‘Bridge’ walls and gazed out across the view of the Berg River Valley which is framed by the Drakenstein Mountains to the north, over the city of Paarl, towards Franschhoek and Stellenbosch to the east and, on a clear day, to Table Mountain and Cape Town to the south-east, and into the valley below. In a physical and affective partnership with the topography, then, visitors are
situated at the Monument, high above the valley below. Whilst the position of the
visitor at this spot might instil a sense of command, control or dominance over the
landscape, the position at the same time emphasises a perception of smallness or
insignificance, for the visitor him/herself and of the objects far below in the valley.
Any feeling of command or dominance by the visitor is overshadowed, however, by the
presence of columns of the Monument behind, which tower over the whole site and far
into the sky. From a semiotic and symbolic perspective, the Monument, in its design
and location, exudes a sense of strength, power and dominance over the landscape and
people.

The Monument, then, it could be read, is involved in some kind of metaphorical
dialogue with its environmental context. Its site and location mean that it actively
participates with the physical and social landscape within which it sits. The location for
the Monument was a very deliberate decision on the part of the ATMK. As mentioned
in Chapter 5, the Monument is constructed of locally-sourced concrete and local granite
and its texture and finish designed to reflect the well-known, nearby Paarl Rock. The
landscape which is seen from the Monument is the physical and spiritual birthplace of
Afrikanerdom and the Afrikaans language. Hooper-Greenhill (2000:113) has argued
that visitors’ bodily responses work in partnership with their mental activities and
emotions. This is very much borne out by the reactions and responses from certain of
the visitors who spend time looking at the landscape. For many Afrikaner visitors, the
importance to them of the landscape was suggested by their awe-inspired comments, the
time they spent inspecting the view and having their photographs taken at that spot.

For others, the panoramic view appealed more to the aesthetics and their appreciation of
the beauty ‘expressed’ in the landscape. Not dissimilar to the reactions of some
Afrikaner visitors, such aesthetic judgements may be linked to emotions as they are
embodied in our physical reactions. As well, in reaction to the view of the landscape as
seen from the ATM, most visitors’ responses frequently included expressions of
surprise, awe and amazement, which were manifested verbally in exclamatory
comments overheard such as ‘gorgeous’, ‘amazing’, ‘breathtaking’ as well as
interjections such as ‘wow!’; ‘ohhh!’, and in physical gestures such as pointing to
features in the distance. Reasoned argument would conclude that what constitutes the meaning of an experience is heavily influenced by reactions and aesthetic judgements which are culturally conditioned and, it would be fair to surmise, linked to judgements of social, cultural, economic, political, moral or aesthetic values. Although writing specifically about visitor experiences at museums, Annis’ (1994) model has equal currency when examining visitor experiences at the ATM. Writing about the ‘multivocal’ and ‘polyvalent’ museum as a place which gives rise to a variety of experiences and as a staging ground for symbolic action, Annis proposed an experience model which includes three levels of engagement—the affective (the emotional response to the experience), the physical (the location, surrounds and sensory experiences) and the cognitive (the knowledge and understanding)—to which can be added a further dimension, the aesthetic (judgements as sentiments of taste or appeal). His findings suggest that it is the combination of these various levels of engagement, heavily influenced by aesthetic judgements, which help to determine the quality of the visitor experience. Comments and responses of visitors to the ATM would tend to suggest, then, that there is an overall appeal for the site.

Having spent time viewing the landscape, visitors then moved along the ‘Bridge’ leading into the interior of the Afrikaans column. The interior is quite dim, lit only by natural light and, because of the material from which it is constructed, the temperature inside is much cooler than that externally. The cool, cavernous nature derives from the combination of these elements and provides for an atmosphere not unlike that experienced when entering a church or cathedral of similar proportions. It was highly intentional on the part of the architect (himself a deeply religious man) and in his design that the Monument might in some respect be considered hallowed or sacrosanct (pers. comm., Erna van Wijk, 12 April 2010), though only very few of the visitors interviewed indicated any sense of the spiritual or the sacred in their experience.

As seemed to frequently occur with reference to the columns, visitors responded with hand gestures implying height and magnitude as well as expressing their sense of surprise or astonishment verbally. Reactions, of course, varied in kind, specificity and intensity, ranging from indifference to curiosity, to awe and amazement.
Regularly, though, visitors commented on ‘how high’ or how large the Afrikaans and Republic columns were and all visitors observed took time to look up, many expressing surprise as their scale or appeal: ‘Dis hoog, dis mooi! (‘It’s high, it’s pretty’) being a term frequently used by Afrikaans visitors. According to Hooper-Greenhill (2000), it is at this emotional level that visitors respond to attractions and, irrespective of whether they are connected to the attraction, are familiar with it, like it, have an understanding of it, or are alienated from it, it is at the unspoken level of feelings where visitors’ attitudes and behaviour towards an attraction influenced.

Once inside the main column area, visitors were met with tracts of light formed from small rectangular holes which climb in a ‘ladder’ formation along one side of the main column, their existence unknown to anyone who had not visited the attraction before (Figure 5.21). At once both metaphorical and contiguous, this ‘ladder’ of light leads to the top of the column which has been purposefully left open. The fountain which is found inside the ‘Afrikaans column’ is another of the ‘key’ stopping points for visitors. The importance of the fountain in terms of meaning and symbolism is evident in the fact that it is made of a different stone to the rest of the Monument. Because it is also constantly bubbling, this lively movement stands in contrast to the otherwise very stark and solid light greyish-coloured construction. The small size of the fountain and its subtle, extremely simple, and understated design, encourage visitors to stand and admire it. Its gentle ‘babbling’ offers a gentle, soft echoing inside the column to make visitors aware of its constancy and, in terms of its intended symbolism and the dominant narrative, it represents the vitality of the Afrikaans language in its constantly bubbling wellspring.

Having emerged from the main column into the courtyard, visitors make their way either immediately to their left, to view the pool in which the ‘Republic’ column sits or, more generally, towards the three ‘African’ domes. The domes were by far the most popular place from which visitors were photographed and their activities here very clearly testified to the casual and informal attitude which most displayed towards the Monument.
As has been discussed above, depending upon their motives for attending the Monument, visitors generally followed a very similar pattern of behaviour. Those visiting the Monument as a visitor attraction more often than not followed a very similar trajectory or path as others with the same intentions. Those visitors who were there to relax and enjoy time to read or for contemplation, sought out areas on the grass or sat on one of the many shaded benches and gave little attention to the Monument itself. Those who were socialising with others either installed themselves at one of the many picnic tables near the carpark or elsewhere around the grounds or otherwise inside or outside (depending upon the weather) at the Volksmond Café. The social function of a visit to the ATM is reinforced by the recommendations by visitors that it is a good place at which to meet others, to enjoy the spectacular views, to enjoy the reasonably priced and very good food and coffee at the café.

It has been mentioned before that the Monument sits in an extremely exposed position on the side of Paarl Mountain and there is minimal cover or protection from the elements provided for visitors. Because of its situation, the climatic conditions play a very important role in the style and manner of visit for many visitors. Depending upon the season, the ATM is subject to extremely variable meteorological conditions such as strong winds, heavy rain, fog and scorching heat or gentle breezes, fresh, brisk air, clear skies, or very mild, temperate conditions. The weather conditions, the month, season, day and time of week all have a particular bearing on the number of visitors and their activities at the Monument. The Monument’s exposed position, in my experience, meant there were very few visitors on cold, wet or extremely hot days and, because there was little shelter around the site, the different atmospheric conditions impacted upon visitors’ activities at and experiences of the Monument.

6.5 Gazing

The visual dimension dominates our experience and this is reflected in our language, when we talk of going to see an attraction. The primary inference of a question such as, for example, ‘Have you been to the Eiffel Tower?’ is whether or not you have physically seen it. Beyond that, however, it also implies a number of other sensory or affective connotations as well: ‘Have you stood in awe of its size and marvelled at the
intricacies of its construction?’ ‘Have you touched the metal framework?’ ‘Were you excited waiting in the queue to catch the elevator up the Tower?’ ‘Have you felt the gusts of wind as you stood and gazed out at the Parisian skyline on one of the observation decks?’ ‘Has a night time visit to the Tower instilled in you some sense of romance?’ ‘Did you learn anything about the history or construction of the Tower?’ (Questions inspired by comments by visitors on the official Eiffel Tower website.)

According to Edensor (2006:25), the visual forms ‘the pre-eminent sense engaged in cultural and heritage tourism much of the time’ and it cannot be denied that in the specific case of the ATM, the visual dominates. For Edensor (1998), visitors’ gazes are enacted performances. These gazes, however, ‘are performed in different ways and are directed to a range of objects’ (Edensor, 1998:120). Thus, different visual performances may be enacted at the same place. ‘Vision’ is what the human eye is competent in seeing, while gazing refers to the ‘discursive determinations’ of socially-constructed seeing (Foster, 1988:ix). How our eyes see is socio-culturally framed and gazing is a performance that orders, shapes and classifies, rather than necessarily reflects, the world. Consequently, ‘rather than gaze upon a place or object in any pure or natural form’, each ‘gazer’ ‘confronts a series of cultural discourses that distinguish places in terms of particular values’ (Edensor, 1998: 121). Visitor interest and expectations, ‘proximity’ or ‘distance’ to the attraction, context and other variables including such things as level of interest, knowledge of the attraction and attitude towards it, for example, each has its own bearing on the gaze afforded the visitor and each will contribute to the interpretation of and meaning given to what is gazed upon.

For visitors on guided tours, condensed schedules mean that their gaze of the ATM was necessarily limited and directed towards only specific features which have been indicated by the accompanying guide. Because of such limitations, Edensor (1998:121) argues that ‘it might be difficult for tourists to incorporate [this] sight into an epistemological framework’ and, as a consequence of that difficulty, their interpretation of the Monument or of its meaning may have been superficial at best. For independent visitors, there were greater opportunities to spend extended periods of time ‘gazing’. If gazing is, as Foster contends above, the ‘discursive determinations’ of socially-constructed seeing, then the process of gazing requires that any determinations will be
formulated as the result of internal, mental dialogue either with oneself or with others or as a result of discussion with people experiencing the same visual encounter.

For visitors interested in the architecture, for example, the gaze concentrated more on the ‘aesthetic’ or structural characteristics of the Monument:

You get the curves and you get the straight lines and you get the vertical lines and when you look at this you get a nice curve going... there’s beauty in it.’ (Jan, male, South African, 40, Afrikaans speaker).

Ute (female, German South African, 30, German/Afrikaans/English speaker) commented that:

Architecturally, it’s just really interesting and very beautiful as well.

For Liezel (female, South African, 20, Afrikaans/English speaker), herself an architect, her gaze was very much influenced by her knowledge of the field:

I think [commenting on the arch which forms the exit to the Afrikaans column in terms of its shape] he’s obviously kept the proportion of the arch above it as acknowledging that arch ...you see, it’s keeping the same distance but there’s definitely a cut and then down ... For me it makes sense because it keeps the gap the same.

For her partner, Michael (male, South African, 20, English speaker), by contrast, what influenced his gaze elicited a completely different response, one grounded much more within the realm of the emotions and the psyche:

I find it quite imposing. I mean, to me, I suffer from vertigo looking up like that and I find it in a spiritual sense but in a sense, scary isn’t the right word ...

This is not to suggest, of course, that there is but one, single gaze which a person experiences at an attraction. Turning her direction away from the Afrikaans column, Liezel (female, South African, 20, Afrikaans/English speaker) then gazed upon the African domes which she contrasted with the European columns:

To his [van Wijk’s] mind, he’s presented the African languages or African cultures totally different to the European influence, where these are round and sort of sitting on the earth whereas those are more like reaching up to the sky. Obviously, he’s defined the European and the African influence differently quite well, I think.

From what had been an affective and spiritual perspective had, for Liezel, become one where she was contemplating the shapes and positioning of representative parts of the
Monument and their relative success in contrasting the different contributions various languages had made to the development of the Afrikaans language.

Movement around an attraction and the time taken in that movement for further contemplation and reflection allows the attraction to be viewed from different (physical, cognitive, affective and aesthetic) perspectives. Such a change in perspective invites further consideration and, thus, in the accumulation of perspectives, insights, knowledge and understanding, we evidence the growth and development of a visitor’s interpretation of an attraction, the outcome of which will be the meaning attributed to it by the visitor. The ‘depth’ or ‘intensity’ of the gaze—of the visual performance—it has already been suggested, is in many respects dependent upon such things as the availability of time, the space for contemplation and consideration and the improvisational nature of visitor movement around the Monument.

For the majority of Afrikaners who visited the Monument, they shared a ‘gaze’ which physically and metaphorically celebrated and reinforced their collective identity. Upward of 95% of Afrikaans speakers interviewed associated their vision of the Monument with a sense of pride (‘trots’). For many, the ATM is a symbol of pride in the Afrikaans language and culture. Furthermore, their presence at the Monument physically demonstrated a dialogic relationship they assumed between themselves and what the Monument represented for them. As well, their visit to the Monument helped inculcate feelings of a heightened sense of solidarity between themselves and other Afrikaans speakers which is represented in a discussion with a group of local university students who said that the primary reason for their visit was their sense of affiliation with the Monument and a sense of pride and a deep-rooted perception of the strength and vitality of the language and of the Afrikaner culture. Speaking to me but glancing up at the Monument, the students said:

Susann (female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaker): It’s nice if you speak Afrikaans and it’s nice to have a monument to your own language, I think.

Simone (female, South African, late teens, university student, Afrikaans speaker): They [English speakers] won’t have the same feeling that we are having when we are here.
Schalk (male, South African, late teens, university student, Afrikaans speaker):
It would be different.

Simone: Well, I’m proud if I come here.

Schalk: Yeah, exactly the same word I thought of ... exactly the same.

Susann: It’s also, it’s in you ... honoured and united ... like a culture that’s uniting everybody. We stand and we look at this, we think, yes, we stand together, we work together ... there’s a lot of things you can actually say about it [the Monument] ... I think, it’s like, it’s strong, feels strong and all that stuff but the most important one I think is being proud ... trots ... ja

For the international visitor or for the visitor with much less personal ‘investment’ in the Afrikaans language and culture, it could be argued that the gaze is much less intense and comments about the Monument tended to refer to the general satisfaction gained from their visit. ‘Outsider’ status, affective distance and an insufficient understanding of the socio-cultural and historical context of the Monument may be factors contributing to a lack of intensity, although it would be dangerous to generalise as international visitors were able to offer interpretive insights equal to those of domestic visitors. Spontaneous and reflective impressions alike were at times both positive and quite critical of the Monument, particularly in terms of what it represents for those visitors. In some cases, criticism arose because the visitor was unable to ‘connect’ with the aesthetics and symbolism of an abstract structure. Pieter (male, Dutch, 50, Dutch/English speaking ) was adamant about his inability to relate to the Monument:

Symbolism ... doesn’t make sense. I don’t see the link to the language. The Monument itself doesn’t speak to me, let’s put it that way.

Neil (male, Australian, 40, living in Scotland, visiting friend in Paarl) was more philosophical in his assessment of the Monument:

I must admit I didn’t quite understand that one [the idea of a monument to a language] ... but, well, why not?

Expectations and dispositions of visitors differed for visitors, depending upon their backgrounds, age and gender, and it was evident that these factors could not help but have a bearing upon how a visitor engaged with the Monument. Nationality, ethnicity, linguistic background, the depth of understanding or appreciation of the relevant
historical circumstances, empathy, sympathy or antipathy towards the Monument and what it represents or symbolises each played their role in influencing how the visitor’s ‘gaze’ would be interpreted and the meaning attributed to the Monument.

6.6 Photographing

Of the various activities in which visitors to the Monument participated, by far the most popular for visitors involved taking photographs. Photographs have been described as the embodiment of sociability (Robinson & Picard, 2009) and visitors to the ATM appeared to spend an inordinate amount of time photographing others in their group or being photographed themselves, as well as images of the Monument. It was as if, in Edensor’s (1998:129) words, ‘the imperative to photograph [was] almost a duty’. Details of the different activities engaged in by visitors were noted down, tabulated and their frequency presented as a percentage (Table 6.4).

| 1. Photographing each other in front of the ‘African domes’ | (90%) |
| 2. Photographing various parts of the ATM structure | (85%) |
| 3. Photographing the view over the valley | (75%) |
| 4. Listening to and following a guide | (70%) |
| 5. Photographing each other in front of various sections (other of the ATM than the domes) | (70%) |
| 6. Standing at or on the ‘African domes’ | (70%) |
| 7. Discussing or explaining impressions of the structure to others | (65%) |
| 8. Reading the leaflet, outlining the features and symbolism of the Monument | (65%) |
| 9. Calling out, singing or making noises inside the Monument | (60%) |
| 10. Visiting the coffee/curio shop | (60%) |

Table 6.4 Most Frequent Visitor Activities (in order of frequency) to the ATM and percentage of visitors involved in the activities

Of the ten most frequently engaged in activities, four involved photography. According to a range of authors, (Markwell, 1997; Garlick, 2002; Bærenholdt et al., 2004, Larsen, 2005; Robinson & Picard, 2009), whilst photography is not strictly the preserve of tourists, it is nevertheless one of the most important practices or markers defining what it is to be a tourist and ‘has become a constituting factor in the social
practice of tourism’ (Larsen, 2005:115). ‘Photography has become synonymous with tourism,’ writes Edensor (1998:128). A number of theories have been put forward to explain the propensity for visitors to sites to take photographs. Susan Sontag, for instance, suggests that photographs are accumulated during a trip to provide indisputable evidence to represent and signal the genuineness of the experience, that ‘the trip was made ... and fun was had’ (1979:9). Urry (1990b) argues that photographs authenticate as a ‘true’ reflection of actual places, people and events and as something tangible to provide proof to show people at home, to trigger personal memories and serve as a focus for narratives of the experience (Markwick, 2001:421).

In terms of its role as a constituent element of the tourist ‘performance’ (Robinson & Picard, 2009:1), to take a photograph is to capture and record in situ encounters with some significant tourist object or experience in digital or material form. Besides providing evidence of a visit to an attraction, photographs create visual narratives of experiences, places, peoples and objects to be preserved in time. As such, they offer an important tangible, material or digital record of an experience which, once over, belongs to the intangible domain of memory.

Photographs, as well, collectively and individually, comprise the tourist gaze (Urry & Larsen, 2011:211) and as such, as early as 1972, Carpenter (1972:6) is quoted as saying that for a visitor ‘that photograph reaffirms his [sic.] identity with that scene’. Photography is acknowledged as having an important role in the determining of tourist places and spaces, the construction and re-construction of identities, and the invention and re-invention of histories (Robinson & Picard, 2009). In the preface to their Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory (1997:i), Urry & Rojek point to the importance of the role of the photograph in the construction of the tourist experience. In Urry’s chapter with Crawshaw, ‘Tourism and the Photographic Eye’, they discuss (1997:176ff.) a number of issues such as how photographic practices and discourses, as variants of more far-reaching and influential themes within Western social thought, serve to represent tourism and travel are shown to be, as well as how the desire to photograph came to be historically established. They point out (1997:176) that while there has been much speculation about the relationships between tourism and photography, but there has been little empirical investigation into their connections.
The processes involved in setting up and framing a photograph and the resultant digital or printed image can at one and the same time both empower or disempower the subject of the photograph, represent, misrepresent or even essentialise people and places. In the act of taking photographs, visitors are also taking part in the social practice of representing the world as they choose, while creating a tangible reminder of their experience. In their capacity to represent a person, place or event, photography and photographs are potentially and inherently quite powerful. Photographs serve to ‘negotiate the world’ (Robinson & Picard, 2009:2) and to mediate between the tangible, experiential encounters and the world of human memory and recollection. In terms of their notion of the ‘family gaze’, Haldrup and Larsen (2006:24) argue that tourists’ photographs are about ‘producing social relations rather than consuming places’, suggesting that the actual setting of the attraction visited is secondary to the social interaction which comes about from the experience.

Visual images chosen for photography by visitors to an attraction are often selected and reproduced from the perspective of images that might have already been seen in travel brochures, guidebooks, postcards, other people’s personal photographs or via some other medium (Jenkins, 2003). Because of its size, it is difficult to capture the Monument in its entirety unless photographed from some distance, so in order to give it a more human scale, most people chose to have themselves or members of their group stand near or beside a particular feature to offer a human scale to something the size or scale of which would otherwise be lost. For the most part, visitors were content to take what I came to regard as the ‘standard’ photograph of the Monument, the one which captures a number of its features and which is most widely representative of images of the Monument which have been taken for publicity or webpage purposes (Figure 6.6) (ATM website; ATM ‘Facebook’ webpage; South African Tourist Association website).
Figure 6.6  ‘Standard’/most popular image of the Afrikaanse Taalmonument
(Source: author)

This notion of the reproduction of similar images, described by Jenkins (2003:308) as a ‘circle of representation’, formulates the ‘hermeneutic circle’ (Urry, 1990a:140; Crawshaw & Urry, 1997) where images are tracked down and recaptured and the resulting photographs displayed at home to show ‘their version of the images that they had seen originally before setting off’ (Urry, 1990a:140).

In many instances, taking certain shots of an attraction indicate ‘proof of the visit’ (Jenkins, 2003:308), while others, with members of a visitor’s party included, add a human dimension to demonstrate, amongst other things, the relative size of the structure or the other people present at the time. MacCannell argues that Urry’s (1990a; Crawshaw & Urry, 1997) formulation is a deterministic model and that as well as his (Urry’s) ‘institutionalised tourist experience’ (or ‘the dumb tourist gaze’), there is what MacCannell (2001:36) describes as a second freer gaze which ‘looks for the unexpected, not the extraordinary, objects and events that may open a window in structure, a chance to glimpse the real’. Albers & James (1988:150) state, however, that the idea of a photograph as a ‘window on reality’ is an illusion. Rather, they argue that a photograph is a symbol of reality through the manipulation of imagery and through the processes involved in framing and taking photographs.
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For visitors to the Monument, the ‘African domes’ formed the major backdrop for photographs. While the domes as objects of attention—in their shape, design and symmetry—are unique and stand in stark contrast to the larger-than-life columns and the more angular features of the Monument, it is arguably the human element and the human interaction with the domes which merit most attention. Because of the scale of the domes, little effort is required to walk up even the largest of the domes, although less agile visitors tended to prefer to stand beside the domes rather than try to climb on them.

A large proportion of younger visitors seemed ‘compelled’ to climb up onto them while the older and less nimble used them as an unusual ‘prop’ beside which they could be photographed. As a practice, the notion of taking of photographs ‘extends beyond ideas of collection and record and into the realms of self-making, authentication and socialization processes which are bound up with the embodied doing of tourism’ (Crouch & Lübbren, in Robinson & Picard, 2009:1. See also Crouch, 2000, 2002). In other words, photographs do not just evidence the tourist site but the visitor him/herself in the form of expressive self-creation as well (Crang, 1997). As has been previously argued, visitors are performing the attraction and producing the attraction and photography is one means of doing this. To this act of self-expression could be added the more emblematic notions of ‘possession’ or ‘dominance’. To be photographed beside or atop one of the domes or with the backdrop of the Drakenstein Mountains or, as highlighted earlier, the Berg River Valley south to Cape Town, or even parts of the Monument itself, may be interpreted as a form of metaphorical ‘possession’ or to demonstrate some sort of control over what is being photographed. One function of the camerawork of visitors, Urry (1995) argues, is concerned with consuming places, although it could be claimed that, in the process of creating an image of a site or attraction, a visitor is actively ‘(re-)producing’ an attraction.

‘Most tourists express a simultaneous desire to make pictures of and at destinations. They are looking out for “physical settings” such as monuments, viewing-stations, beautiful spots and views’ (Urry & Larsen, 2011:213). ‘However, the photographing of such physical settings, Urry & Larsen (2011) contend, serves only to ‘frame’ the human
element—oneself, one’s family, partner, friends, co-travellers and so on. The act of photographing, then, is seen to be as much a ‘performance’ as is walking around an attraction, and is typified by a set of complex social relations between the photographer, the poser and an audience. For the photographer, it involves establishing or setting up a shot, choreographing bodies to be photographed, the taking of photographs and the reviewing of the photograph to determine its suitability as a keep-sake of the visit and for future audiences. For the person being photographed, posing for the camera becomes a public performance and forms an important part of what Haldrup & Larsen (2003) describe as self-presentation and strategic impression management. The purpose of the visit, and for the photograph, will also play an important role in whether people are included in the photograph and, if included, their demeanour. For the family outing or for a group of friends, the ‘happy snap’ reinforcing the social aspect of the visit may be the most important consideration in the taking of and posing for photographs, so the attraction may simply form the backdrop for the images taken. A more ‘focused’ photographer, however, whose intention it is to photograph the attraction and its surroundings, may employ any number of strategies in order to avoid taking images which might include the human element, ‘attempting to enframe as few tourists as possible so that the building may retain its aura...uncluttered by the mundane’ (Edensor, 1998:133). One such visitor who reviewed a recent visit to the ATM on the ‘Tripadvisor’ website on 12 February 2012, emphasising the aesthetics of the site, headlined the comment with: ‘Great for Photos’, and went on to say:

Set against the brilliant blue sky, we found this monument to provide tremendous opportunities for some artistic landscape photography.

(‘Southern Pacific’)

The absence of any human element in the three photographs which accompanied his commentary demonstrates how the motives and purposes for taking the photographs will have a marked impact on the type and content of the photographs taken. A similarly self-described ‘serious’ photographer, ‘John K’ from Cape Town, again posting a comment on the ‘Tripadvisor’ website, (6 October 2012), said:

We were driving around one rainy day looking for a photo opportunity and decided to stop at the monument. The wet granite and rock makes for interesting contrasts.

Interestingly, both of these comments highlight the importance of the climatic conditions to the different ways in which the Monument can be viewed and to the
different ‘moods’ which can be generated around it. As has been mentioned earlier, the site of the ATM means that it is constantly exposed to the elements. The combination of those conditions, the Monument and the visitor are what Leiper (1995) argues together create the ‘atmosphere’, a perception in the mind of the visitor, of a place.

For the visitor with limited time (e.g., packaged tourist or group tour), photographing the Monument may constitute little more than the collection of what Edensor (1998:130) describes as a ‘visual mnemonic’ aid to help recall the attraction and scene at a later date. Being part of a larger group, it may be unavoidable to photograph elements of the Monument without the presence of other members of their group. As well, the social aspect of the visit may be what is of primary importance, so again images may be choreographed to ensure that members of the group are included. Even for the less time-strapped visitors, the majority of those observed taking photographs did not stray far from the established key stopping locations to attempt any greater photographic exploration of the site. Whilst people took photographs of the major components of the Monument, much of the photographing was outer directed, in that the Monument served as the vantage point from which to take photographs, rather than as its central focus. Given the fact that the majority of Tripadvisor reviews of visits to the Monument talk more of the views available from the Monument than of the Monument itself, it is unsurprising that the primary locations for taking photographs were those which offered the best panoramic views and scenic appeal over the valley, across to the Drakensberg Mountains and as far south west as to Table Mountain in Cape Town.

For the most part, individuals or groups of people who were observed being photographed adopted ‘ritualised stances’, with some presenting ‘highly formal posting with gravitas’ (Edensor, 1998:132) and the accompanying ‘solemn gaze ... celebrating the social relation and the attraction’ (Urry & Larsen, 2011:214). Others presented those being photographed in much more ‘playful’, mocking or self-consciously aware poses, particularly in the case of photographing people on or near the domes or in front of the Afrikaans column.

Photographs at the Monument also mark occasions, and on a number of occasions, I was asked to photograph pairs or groups of people who wished their time together at the
Monument to be recorded for posterity. As well, on two occasions I witnessed family portraits being shot by professional photographers. Asked why they had chosen the Monument as the backdrop for their family images, on both occasions its aesthetic qualities were emphasised. I was told that the hard lines, texture and matt colour of the Monument served as a ‘nice contrast’ to the warmth and affection exhibited by family members in the images.

The Monument also forms the backdrop for photographs of numerous wedding parties. Again, the juxtaposition of the unsympathetic, harsh lines, hard texture and structural shapes of the Monument against the gentler, softer lines of the wedding party’s clothing makes for a striking contrast and interesting photographic potential. The same reason can also be extended to the two fashion shoots which I saw being photographed there, the Monument had been selected as the backdrop for the fashion images because it either complemented or contrasted the designs and materials used to create the fashions.

6.7 Remembering, Reminiscing & Recollecting

The tourist practice of remembering cuts across the areas of performance which have been discussed so far in this chapter. Recollection of the past and ‘the particular organisation and reproduction of collective and individual memories’ (Urry, 1992:182) are integral to the visitor experience which does not end once a person has left a site. The being there, the doing there, the feeling there, who one was with, who one met, what one saw, what one learned—all form part of the visitor experience which, once over, is relegated to the memory. ‘Remembering’, Edensor (1998:135) states, ‘is socially constructed, communicated and institutionalised’: memory ‘can be activated, transmitted and concretised through the performance of specific actions’. These actions can take many forms: travel journals and diaries, photographs, drawings or paintings, videos, stories and narrations, lecture tours, memoirs and the telling of stories. It is these practices of recording people, times, places and events which constitute what Edensor (1998:137) calls the ‘work’ of tourism and it is often the attraction which provides the material and mental foundation upon which forms of remembrance and reminiscence are built.
Photography is integral in any consideration of remembrance, reminder or commemoration. Just as photographs confirm and provide the tangible evidence that a person was ‘there’ and that an experience had taken place, they also act as the central tool through which experience can be converted into an image (Sontag, 1979:7) to evoke a memory. Along with stories told and re-told of visits, photographs act as ‘mnemonic devices’ and provide a ‘shorthand’ means for explaining details of a site, what it was ‘like’ and who was ‘there’ at the time. Whether they take the form of holiday ‘snaps’, a photographic study of an attraction and its surroundings, family portraits or wedding photographs, photographs are one of the means by which people are prompted to recall events, experiences and feelings as well as people and places.

Dominant histories and myths are perpetuated through stories as well. Many people told me how they ‘remembered’ that funds raised for the Monument came only from Afrikaner contributions and how (erroneously) Coloureds had been excluded from attending the inauguration of the Monument in 1975. Anecdotal comments by informants and others to whom I spoke over the time of the research said that the Monument had been built as the exclusive domain of the Afrikaner but ‘official’ records state quite categorically that the Monument was built for all speakers of the Afrikaans language. The longtime Director of the Monument, Mnr Jack Louw, said that he could not recall having seen any documentation excluding anyone from entry to the Monument or grounds (pers. comm., 15 May 2010). Memory ‘is a reconstruction of events. And like any reconstruction, it's a mixture of actual and subsequent memories filtered through our beliefs and influenced by the recollections of others’ (McConkey, quoted in Rose, 2010). As previously mentioned, the narratives and mistaken recollections told by guides from elsewhere accompanying visitors to the site, for instance, are often erroneous. Such misinformation and inaccuracies can only help visitors to formulate misguided opinions and create ‘false memories’, of which many about the ATM abound.

Although outside of the scope of this study, it is important to make mention of the face-to-face and written stories or blogs which people tell about their experiences of the Monument, and of the importance of personal anecdote or narrative in unravelling a visitor’s impressions, interpretation or meaning attached to the Monument. Poynton &
Lee (2011:640) speak of ‘the centrality of evaluation as a defining characteristic of narrative’. ‘Evaluation’, they suggest (2011:640), ‘can be understood in moral terms but also in more overtly affective terms’ (my emphasis), where the expression of the evaluation ‘can also be read in terms of its capacity for affective contagion’ (2011:640). In other words, what Poynton & Lee are implying is the affective power of the spoken or written word in influencing others’ impressions, providing a ‘marker’ (in MacCannell’s terminology) for that attraction or site.

Some 60% (240) of the 401 visitors observed ended their visit to the Monument with a brief wander around the gift shop attached to the Volksmond Café (Figure 6.8). The souvenirs available for purchase there included a range of curio and lifestyle products, the ubiquitous post-cards, books, diaries, magnets, key holders, Afrikaans-language CDs, and Monument souvenirs such as mugs, t-shirts, aprons, information booklets, pens, teaspoons, and products featuring Afrikaans poems and sayings, as well as a reissue of Die Patriot newspaper.

![Figure 6.7 Volksmond Curio and Coffee Shop, ATM](Source: ATM website)

### 6.8 Visitor Embodiment & Sensory Encounters

The tourist ‘gaze’ has been the subject of much analysis in the tourism literature. However, the affective and sensory experiences of visitors have not been given the
consideration they are due (Galí, 2010). Edensor (2006:23) argues that ‘tourists are inevitably embodied’; they are never ‘merely a pair of eyes’ (Saldanha, 2002:43). ‘The tourist body’, Edensor (2006:23 continues, ‘like all phenomenal bodies, is active and experiential ... consumed by a world filled with smells, textures, sights, sounds and tastes’. Visitor encounters with an attraction are informed by multiple sensory practices and experiences. Classen, an academic and member of the Concordia University Sensoria Research Team and Centre for Sensory Studies, who has written extensively on the cultural life of the senses, contends that ‘[W]e not only think about our senses, we think through them’ (Classen, 1993:9, emphasis in original). Classen (1993) argues that our senses, being culturally shaped and imbued with cultural values, frame our experience. Relationships with external beings and objects occur through the body and it is through specific embodied configurations, postures, exercises, stances, meditations and observations that people communicate those relationships.

In the discussion in this chapter, we have seen how the body is configured and presented for the taking and production of photographs. Walking around the Monument, up and down the series of stairs, running on the grass or climbing onto the domes are much more than simply a somatic response to a haptic sensation. Movement in and around the Monument is very clearly integrated into a complex amalgam with other contiguous sensory experiences. Running up and reaching the top of one of the domes, for example, provides an excellent example of the amalgamation of verbal, gestural and emotional responses as they were expressed simultaneously. This type of gesturing also has certain social implications, such as the demonstration of a sense of triumph or achievement in attaining a goal, for example. The correlation here between affect, knowledge and practice fits very closely with Poynton & Lee’s (2011:633) argument that ‘[a] new conception of affect has been emerging as both embodied and social’ and that the two are intimately connected. In the same vein, as visitors make their way around the site, they encounter different but simultaneous sensory experiences: the wind which emanates in the valley below blows through the trees and shrubs and the fragrances of the different plants waft through the air. There is an audible and continuous drone of traffic which can be heard in the distance as vehicles speed along the N1 freeway. There is a constant, unavoidable sound of birds and cicadas chirping and bees buzzing. The weather conditions also have an important
impact on visitors’ embodied experiences of the Monument. The changing weather patterns can have a direct effect on people’s perceptions of the Monument. A ‘brilliant blue sky’ or a grey and rainy outlook presents different impressions of the Monument to visitors. The bodies of the visitors are themselves similarly subject to the weather conditions which directly impact upon their experiences of and at the site. The obvious lack of cover particularly affects visitors in the extremes of heat and cold and unless they come equipped to deal with such extremes, their degree of enjoyment of their experience visibly diminishes.

It is not surprising, however, that only two visitors were observed intentionally running their hands over the roughly-hewn surface of the Monument. At least for those brought up in Western cultural milieus, people are disciplined not to consciously touch, so this might in part account for visitors deliberately avoiding contact with the structure. At the same time, however, a large majority of visitors quite readily leant on the wall of the ‘Bridge’ and so, at least unconsciously, came into contact with its coarse and uneven texture. Ironically, however, mention was made to me on several occasions of how harshly-hewn and hard the surface of the structure appeared. Such comments seem to provide evidence to support Seremetakis’ (1994:6) comment that ‘the sensory is not only encapsulated within the body ... but is also dispersed out there on the surface of things as the latter’s autonomous characteristics, which can then invade the body as perceptual experience’. Edensor (2006:30) states that ‘particular physical phenomena impact upon people and influence their spatial practices, their sensory perception and sensory evaluations’. The cavernous physicality of the Afrikaans column invoked a soundscape which included calls, yells, yodels and singing by visitors. Through their enactions, then, the space was constantly being reproduced as an auditorium. This might suggest that because this activity occurs within the dimly lit interior of the Monument, such auditory performances of what might be, in a different context, inappropriate enactions are not subject to the disciplinary gaze of onlookers (Edensor, 2007).

6.9 Conclusion
Throughout the period of fieldwork, I became increasingly conscious of the importance of my own senses and how the different sensory experiences beyond the visual each contributed to building up a more complete phenomenological understanding as I
engaged with the ATM. As any other visitor to the Monument, I looked, touched, listened, smelt and expressed a range of emotional responses to what I had encountered. To gain the deepest insights into the visitor experience, I concluded that my own analytical framework needed to incorporate a set of variables which would identify and categorise not only who were the visitors, but what they did at the Monument, where they did it and how they responded or reacted. As a result, I formulated research objectives and questions and a research design which has been informed by Edensor’s (1998) work on visitor performance and meaning making at the Taj Mahal.

In an effort to demonstrate the primacy of the embodied experience, this chapter has challenged critical readings of the tourist ‘gaze’ by focusing attention on visitors’ enacted performances and multisensory experiences and corporeal engagement. It has been demonstrated that the visitor experience is at once a lived experience comprising different situated practices and corporeal encounters mediated by a combination of representations, discourses, actions and sensory engagement. The action-oriented perspectives which have been presented here—walking, gazing, photographing—along with remembering and sensory encounters, as equally as interpretations and meaning made of an attraction, are socially and culturally determined. Edensor (2006) argues that the emphasis given to the tourist gaze in the academic literature has been to the detriment of other senses such as smell, tactility and hearing which have received less scholarly attention. Rather than trying to downplay the importance of the visual, however, Edensor and others (such as Munro, Franklin & Crang, 2001) have sought to reconsider the visual, along with the other senses, in terms of performance and practice. This chapter has also sought to establish the visitor, not as a recipient or consumer of an attraction but, rather, firmly at the centre of the production of an attraction as well as the primary producer of memories and reflexive performance. Visitors’ practices and actions, their perceptions, beliefs, contexts, attitudes, opinions, ideas, thoughts and interpretations all contribute in their own way to the development of the holistic visitor experience which, in turn, is a major contributor to the meaning made of an attraction.

In the chapter which follows, I will turn attention away from the observation of visitor practices and experience to make room for the many nuanced layers and dimensions of meaning and interpretation of the Monument which have been provided by the
interviews conducted with a number of visitors and other key informants. Given the time to reflect on their experiences and interactions with the site, visitors were better able to consider and to better deliberate on their impressions of the attraction and to offer their ideas on what the attraction has meant to them. Such deliberations will provide a richer and more nuanced understanding of the ATM and form the basis for the analysis of visitors’ interpretations of and meanings given to the Monument.
Chapter 7

Meaning making at the Afrikaanse Taalmonument

The imposition of meaning on life is the major end and primary condition of human existence. (Geertz, 1973: 434)

7.1 Introduction

The previous chapter examined the behaviours and activities of visitors to the ATM, in order to explore the ways visitors engaged with and experienced the Monument. This chapter examines the ways in which visitors interpret and give meaning to the ATM. ‘Interpretation is an essential component of the visit experience’ write Poria et al. (2009:94), so to best grapple with the complexities associated with the issues of interpretation as a process carried out by an individual visitor and meaning making, the chapter looks at the many influences and impediments which contribute to interpretive and meaning making processes for visitors. To that end, the chapter centres on the diversity of motivations and desired experiences which lead people to visit the site, details the multitude of meanings which this single location holds and demonstrates that a visit to the ATM is an interactive encounter influenced by both the site attributes and the individual’s socio-cultural, ethnic and linguistic backgrounds.

The Afrikaanse Taalmonument serves as the particular case study for the exploration of the various meanings which can be attributed to an ‘attraction’ and the effects on visitors brought about by their interaction with the site. Alert to the political, economic and cultural contexts of both ‘production’ and ‘consumption’ of this particular attraction, an approach is taken which involves the attraction being viewed as a ‘text’, which has been metaphorically ‘written’ and ‘produced’ by an ‘author’ and ‘read’/’consumed’ and interpreted by an audience of ‘readers’/visitors. As was alluded
to in Chapter 3, the types of ‘readings’ of an attraction are potentially infinite and meaning is, then, ‘a messy, complex and multidirectional process [where] all texts will contain a plurality of possible meanings’ (Mason, 2011:27). Yet, despite its inherent ‘messiness’, it will be demonstrated that, because of shared social, cultural and, increasingly, global understandings of sites and objects designated as ‘visitor attractions’, some ‘readings’ appear to be more dominant than others, some more topological or figurative, others more literal. A useful aspect of the idea of textuality is that it raises the question of unintentional meanings, omissions, contradictions or ‘silences’ which may be evidenced by visitors’ comments. How visitors are ‘positioned’—spatially, temporally, socially, culturally, economically, politically, ethnically, ideologically and linguistically—i.e., their personal ‘context’, will be shown to have a marked influence upon the ways in which they respond to and interact with a visitor attraction (Lidchi, 1997; Mason, 2011).

7.2 Themes

It was detailed in Chapter 4 how the various comments made by visitors interviewed for this study were coded and categorised. In the analysis of those comments, a number of major issues and concerns emerged. Those issues and concerns appear in this section as five major themes. While the major themes will be discussed separately, it is important to understand that those which emerged as a result of the analysis of the interview data, all appear to interlock to some degree and that, together, each of the themes discussed contributes to an over-arching understanding of what the Monument means to visitors. It is worth noting that, in terms of the different factors which might potentially influence their interpretation and meaning-making of the Monument, visitors to the ATM fell into three broad categories: (i) Many visitors arrived at the Monument with certain preconceptions which would influence and direct the manner in which they ‘read’ the Monument. (ii) Many international visitors came to visit out of sheer curiosity, intrigued at the idea of visiting something as seemingly ‘odd’ as a monument to a language. Most of those visitors had little or no preconceptions about the Monument. (iii) Finally, for others, it was the site itself which was seen as a place of leisure, relaxation, contemplation and enjoyment rather than for its role as a language-
based attraction. For them, the presence of the Monument seemed to be largely incidental.

7.2.1 Setting, View & Function

As evidenced in the observations of the experiences of visitors discussed in the previous chapter, the function of the ATM as a lookout from which to admire the view is borne out in the interview data. For a majority of visitors, it was the physical location of the Monument and the views of the surrounding region which dominated their discussions and it was this outward gaze which provided the lens or filter through which to give meaning to the structure and site. Words such as ‘beautiful’, ‘breathtaking’, ‘impressive’, and ‘amazing’ were used repeatedly to describe the landscape which can be seen from many vantage points at the ATM:

It’s very beautiful, actually, it’s partly the setting…it’s just stunning. (Sara, female, 30, German, German/English speaking)

I love it…it’s amazing. (Mark, male, 40, English-speaking Zimbabwean living in South Africa)

I think the setting is brilliant. (Pieter, male, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

Sensational … it’s one of the most amazing views I’ve ever seen, to be quite honest. Sensational, yeah, lovely … really nice. I’m just really impressed. I think the area is fantastic … I mean to have something like that [pointing across the valley to the mountains], you couldn’t pick a better place could you really?’ (Neil, male, 40, Australian living in Scotland, English speaking)

The monument itself doesn’t speak to me, let’s put it that way. It’s more the setting and the environment here is beautiful…But if there is no Monument, I would come here as well.’ (Noelle, female, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

As expressed in the final comment here, for some people I interviewed, the presence of the Monument appeared quite incidental to the setting and its surroundings in which it is embedded. Such comments, however, were indicative of many for whom the ATM served more as the backdrop for the social or recreational pursuits than for those curious to visit and explore the Monument as a visitor attraction. The superlative descriptions used to describe the vistas can be interpreted as expressions of awe and delight at what was experienced by visitors, for many of whom the overwhelming impression of the Monument derived from its position which allowed for unfettered and unimpeded
views. The vocabulary used by interviewees here support the theory that positive emotions develop positive attitudes towards an attraction which, in turn enhance a visitor’s cognitive and affective attitudes (e.g., Allen et al., 2005).

Arguably, the consideration given to the positioning of the Monument and the way in which van Wijk had exploited the view to maximise both the exposure of his construction, so as to be seen from afar and the terrain which it overlooks, has served to endorse the idea that the ATM stands as a metaphorical surveyor of its domain and purveyor of strength and dominance: ‘It’s imposing and there is a certain solemnity and grandeur about it …’, said Matt (male, 40, Australian, English speaking).

As for its conspicuousness, the original architectural competition brief for the Monument included a clause emphasising the importance of the visual aspect, stating that ‘the Monument or at least part of it, must have a strong outline, so as to be visible from far away’ (‘Die Monument, of ’n deel daarvan, sal sterk belyn moet wees om van veraf sigbaar te wees./Die visuele aspek is van belang…’) (ATMK, n.d.:7, my translation) and the resulting structure is very successful in its prominent positioning and its visibility, in its ‘exposed position above the N1 [freeway north from Cape Town]’ (André, male, 20, South African, Afrikaans speaking). While the greater majority of those I interviewed seemed to have been surprised by the size of the Monument, two people objected to its conspicuousness. Both felt that its structure was incongruous with the surroundings, one interviewee objecting that ‘the Monument stands out and is quite obtrusive.’ (Rona, female, 40, South African, English speaking) whilst the other suggested that, because of its ‘sheer size…it doesn’t fit in the setting’ (Schalk, male, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking). Overwhelmingly, however, visitors voiced little objection to its conspicuousness but rather interpreted its prominence as a strength:

Everyone does know it because if you’re driving you can’t miss it—makes it “special”. Susann (female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking)

and
It’s definitely got a force that you can feel when you’re here. I mean, the location with this backdrop of the mountains, I means it’s an incredible position … (Michael, male, 20, South African, English speaking)

An important feature of any monument is its visual aspect. As an attraction, the relative ‘success’ of a monument relies very heavily upon its prominence and its accessibility to visitation and, as such, it is impossible to underestimate the significance of its physical and symbolic space and place. As was evident by the behaviour of visitors detailed in Chapter 6, the position and outlook of the Monument is an important feature for determining visitor behaviour and activities, such as stopping, gazing and photographing. Relative size and position are two of the essential features critical to our understanding of the way in which we make sense of monuments and imbue them with particular meaning, so the generally imposing nature and exaggerated size of a monument means that its positioning will ensure its visibility from a certain distance will be unimpaired and that its magnitude or magnificence will encourage some emotional response in a visitor.

For local people, however, for whom the Monument was a frequently visible and often visited site, any meaning attributed to it necessarily differed greatly from that of other South African and international visitors. Many local visitors reiterated the comments of non-local visitors with regard to the exceptional views, but many said that they made use of the Monument for a combination of recreational, rather than for more general touristic reasons—to either spend time picnicking or visiting the coffee shop and socialising with friends or family. For some locals, a visit to the site served as a place of respite, providing an opportunity to escape the ‘daily grind’ of life and from which to enjoy the exceptional views of the Berg River Valley in safety, comfort and relative calm. For such visitors, their visit was defined more in terms of the atmospherics which the site offered them.

A large proportion of all respondents was complimentary of the gardens and noted how clean and well cared for were the grounds which, coupled with the otherwise natural surroundings, contributed to the sense of ‘calmness’ (Pierre, male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking), peace and tranquillity which the site offered. The idea of being ‘in
nature’ was important for a number of interviewees who saw its natural setting as a safe and secure place of fun and enjoyment, for younger and older visitors alike:

It’s really nice to come here, being in nature... It’s a nice outing for a day if you’re taking your family, too. (Susann, female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking)

It’s a place of fun. You’ve been seeing the kids...It’s a playground ... the structure ... that fountain and the echo and the pool and they’ve just been roaming about and so I’ve used it quite often as an interesting outing because structurally it’s a very interesting place...it has all these angles and the kids climb on and so on. (Marianne, female, 30, Dutch, living in South Africa, Dutch/Afrikaans/English speaking)

Whilst it was predominantly ‘local’ people who used and gave meaning to the Monument as a recreational or leisure site, many ‘non-local’ visitors, however, expressed their understanding of the Monument in terms of its ‘situation’ with regards to the surrounding district over which it lauds. For one respondent, a Dutch migrant now resident in Paarl, the setting provided an opportunity to contemplate the development of the Afrikaans language:

It’s interesting to see a Monument that is saying something about your language…and this is a good place to think about it because it is in a beautiful setting. The view is one of the main things I’m attracted to … (Pieter, male, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

7.2.2 ‘Trots’/Pride

Overwhelmingly, Afrikaans speakers expressed how the Monument instilled in them a real pride—not only in their language but in their Afrikaner heritage and culture as well. Many young people, in particular, extolled the view that the Monument symbolised the birthplace of Afrikaans in South Africa and that it formed part of the rich cultural heritage of the nation, despite, as many saw it, its unwarranted and continued associations with the apartheid era. Of those I spoke to aged in their late teens or early twenties, they were able to reconcile the events of the past because they had not grown up or directly experienced the harsh laws and policies and looked optimistically to a more equitable South Africa. Despite its past associations, then, for these young South Africans, the Monument endures in a climate ‘increasingly marked by the growth of African nationalism’ (Marschall, 2009:165). The Monument stands as a public statement acknowledging the ongoing contribution, and constituting a lasting justification, of the Afrikaner presence through the elaboration of traditions and
symbols that represent it and make it visible to the wider society. According to Marschall (2009), since 1994, South Africa has seen an escalation in the number of monuments and symbols designed to assert group and ethnic identity through heritage (2009). In fact, she writes, ‘one almost needs a monument to remain visible in the expanding symbolic landscape’ (2009:165), so it is little wonder that in such a competitive climate, supporters of the ATM would be promoting and extolling its virtues.

Despite the numbers of international visitors each year to the ATM, it is still very much a ‘domestic’ attraction. It is little known outside South Africa and is not featured at all on the South African National Tourist Board website, for example. Despite the numbers of international visitors each year to the ATM, it is still very much a ‘domestic’ attraction. It is little known outside South Africa and is not featured at all on the South African National Tourist Board website, for example. Unlike the majority of South African visitors for whom the ATM represented many different things and for whom its significance was much more immediate, most international visitors had little prior knowledge of the Monument and rarely held any pre-determined position towards it. Whilst opinions and comments offered by international visitors were rich and revealing, the information leaflet provided to visitors on entry to the site formed the basis for their understanding of the meaning and significance of the Monument. ‘Domestic’ points of view and perspectives, therefore, often proved to be richer and much more nuanced in their interpretation of the Monument and the meanings it holds for them.

As such, ‘domestic’ points of view and perspectives proved to be much richer and much more nuanced in their interpretation of the Monument and the meanings it holds for them. Unlike the majority of South African visitors for whom the ATM represented many different things and for whom its significance was much more immediate, most international visitors had little prior knowledge of the Monument and rarely held any pre-determined position towards it.

For many Afrikaans speakers, the Monument plays an important socio-cultural role, serving as a marker or focal point to provide Afrikaans speakers in general and those
who identify as Afrikaners in particular with an opportunity to (re)-engage with their real, perceived or symbolic identity. For many, the Monument acts as a symbol of Afrikaner tenacity, solidarity and social cohesion:

It’s amazing … it’s nice … it’s a part of you … a part of us and … it’s nice to share it with people that don’t know it as well … (Schalk, male, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking)

It’s nice if you speak Afrikaans … and it’s nice to have a monument for your own language, I think. (Susann, female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking)

It [the ATM] makes people proud who speak Afrikaans. (Pieter, male, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

By far the most commonly used word to describe the feeling which the ATM instilled in the hearts and minds of Afrikaans-speaking visitors to the Monument was ‘trots’—‘pride’ or ‘proud’. Many Afrikaans speakers interviewed expressed their sense of pride in being an Afrikaans speaker, in the sense of pride inspired by visiting a place, a Monument which had been erected to celebrate their language. By virtue of the very existence of the Monument, then, and in its recognition of the continuing prominence and importance for the Afrikaans language and cultural heritage, many commented to me that it stirred a genuine sense of pride and gratitude in them.

Comments were never jingoistic, nor even overtly nationalistic, but rather there seemed to be a general sense of appreciation and a certain humbleness expressed in the comments in relation to their pride about the Afrikaans language and Afrikaner culture. Renata’s (female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking) comment, ‘I really appreciate it here,’ succinctly summarises and reflects the general tenor of the comments made in this regard. While many lauded the Monument as a symbol of Afrikaner solidarity, for some such as Paul, an Afrikaans-speaking South African male in his forties who, having lived in Paarl for the previous ten years, was only now visiting the Monument for the first time. For him, the ATM served more as an inspiration for self-reflection and contemplation. As far as he was concerned, the ATM was a ‘reminder’ of what it was to be an Afrikaner and an Afrikaans speaker. ‘It stands,’ he said, ‘as a “beacon”, something that stands in recognition of the history of the language and its development and as an “indicator” of the language and the culture.’
Even English-speaking South Africans and other non-Afrikaner visitors were quick to acknowledge the sense of pride which the Afrikaners hold for their language and their culture:

The Afrikaner people are, rightly so, very proud of their country and they are very proud of where they came from and what they have achieved and want to express that through the Monument ... Yeah ... proud, very proud ... very proud of their language. (Pieter, male, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

I think Afrikaans-speaking people are very proud of their language and how it has grown and how it is still going to grow ... (Jane, female, 40, South African, English speaking)

I'm an English-speaking South African but very strong with the Afrikaans ... but I love the language and I think most South Africans do ... there's so many things that can be said in Afrikaans ... that can never be the same in English ... never, ever, ever. (Michael, male, 20, South African, English speaking)

I'm amazed by the strength of Afrikaans...they’re a proud people. (Noelle, female, 50, Dutch, Dutch/English speaking)

Many of the Afrikaans speakers interviewed saw the Monument as a strong, tangible expression of their identities which they often articulated through feelings of nostalgia and a sense of gratitude towards their pioneering forebears who had settled the surrounding area, and for their efforts towards the establishment of Afrikaans as a fully-fledged, legitimate language. Paarl was, after all, the place where efforts to raise the status of the language were first instigated in 1875 with the creation of the GRA and the publication of the first Afrikaans newspaper, Die Patriot (The Patriot), so it is little surprise that André was to say that:

Basically this monument symbolises Afrikaans ... I mean, Afrikaans started here. (André, male, 20, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

While others, such as his friend, Riaan (male, 20, South African, Afrikaans speaking), stressed the importance of maintaining the Monument as a tangible demonstration to the world of the continuing existence of the language:

It [the ATM] makes you feel proud that there’s actually a monument that symbolises that Afrikaans is still prominent in the country ... It’s still a language that’s alive.

Furthermore, for André, the Monument served as a “museum ... to keep history intact”, to serve as a focal point to remind visitors that it was in Paarl where Afrikaans was born.
7.2.3 Design & Structure

Marianne (female, 30, Dutch, living in South Africa, Dutch/Afrikaans/English speaking) explained that the driving factor in her choosing to visit the Monument was not to contemplate its symbolism but, rather, because of the combination of the natural surroundings and the design. Of the design and structure, Bob (male, 40, English, English speaking) spoke for many others when he said that, despite the hard, stark material from which it is constructed, he did not think the ATM looked sterile, cold or austere but thought that, in terms of the surrounding environmental context, the material was quite sympathetic and complimentary. Whilst only about half of interviewed respondents made any comment about their impressions of the building materials, those who did were overwhelmingly impressed with the concrete and granite material which they found to be ‘(very) interesting’, ‘amazing’, ‘unique’, ‘beautiful’ and ‘inspiring’.

For those visitors who saw the Monument from this perspective, meaning for them derived from its spatio-temporal surroundings and its ability to complement the Paarl Rock, which it had been van Wijk’s intention to replicate in his choice of building materials:

> It is definitely a sensual experience, I think and even like it’s cold [the material from which it’s constructed] it definitely didn’t happen by accident…he chose it well and I think that’s probably what he wanted you to experience. (Liezel, female, 20, South African, Afrikaans/English speaking)

Mark (male, 40, English-speaking Zimbabwean living in South Africa) was quick to equate the singular, continuous neutral colour and texture of the granite and concrete composite as being representative of what he believes to be Afrikaner stoicism. The ‘plainness of the material’ from which it is constructed appeared to Mark to be ‘quite Calvinistic, reflecting the housing, furnishing and general lifestyle of the traditional Afrikaners who were not “frilly” people’.

Of the structure of the ATM itself, there were many mixed reactions to van Wijk’s design and, because of its abstract form, how visitors interpreted it. What it ultimately meant for them was, in many cases, markedly different. For Marie, an Afrikaans-speaking woman in her 50s visiting from Johannesburg with an English friend, it was ‘an impressive structure…with many surprises’. ‘Architecturally it’s just really interesting and very beautiful as well,’ Sara (female, 30, German, German/English
speaking) commented, while Pierre, (male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking) from the nearby town of Worcester, ‘admired its structure’, as did Susann (female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaking) who said that she ‘likes the Monument as it is, I think it is a beautiful structure. It’s very modern.’ Neil (male, 40, Australian living in Scotland, English speaking) was particularly impressed by its idiosyncracies and distinctiveness:

I like the architecture of it … I think it’s unique … I like the little fountain in the middle … the fact that it’s hollow and you can look up and, yeah, I just like the design of it.

Marie recalled how when she was at school, ‘we were really interested in the competition that went on and who got it and I think there was a lot of controversy about why pick [pointing to the Monument] … many people didn’t like the idea of it [the winning design] being selected’. That controversy prevails even today, as more than one visitor described the Monument as an ‘odd’ structure, whilst a young American woman and her English female friend described it as at once ‘strange though interesting’ (Trisha, 20, American, English speaking; Jacqui, 20, English, English speaking). Another visitor, Jane, a woman in her 60s who described herself as ‘an English South African’ was exceptionally blunt in her description, describing the Monument as ‘definitely ugly’, while a detractor, Gordon, (male, 60s, South African, English speaking) portrayed it in an exceptionally critical and negative light, saying: ‘It’s a very strange monument … really more phallic and bizarre than interesting and evocative.’

Others spoke more directly about the impact which the design and structure had on them and on their appreciation of the Monument. As will be recalled, for example, one visitor, Michael (male, South African, 20, English speaker), expressed the ‘fear’ he felt and the sense of being somewhat intimidated by the sheer size of the Monument. Similarly, Jan (male, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking) emphasised its aesthetic qualities. It was a sense of surprise which most affected some visitors when they discovered that the Monument was not as it appeared from a distance: ‘I thought it was solid, as I walked up,’ said Robert, a visiting English tourist in his forties’. Sarie, (female, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking) was similarly surprised to find ‘[the top of the Afrikaans column] is open inside and that feature wasn’t evident when first looking at the structure’, as was Marie, (female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking)
who similarly expressed her surprise when she said that:

It’s [the ATM] really fascinating, isn’t it? I didn’t realize it was open from underneath … that was a real surprise going in [to the Afrikaans column] and looking up and seeing it open …

7.2.4 Symbolism & Making Sense of the Monument

For many visitors to the Monument, meanings made of the Monument were multi-layered. Many were readily able to extrapolate (unconsciously in many cases) from the physical to conjecture about its aesthetic or symbolise dimensions

I do like it [the ATM], I mean I do like it ... It’s unique, but it’s pleasing to the eye ... it’s not something you look at and go, what’s that? It’s nice to look at. I only take photos of things that I like and I took quite few photos here, so, you know ... (Neil, male, 40, Australian living in Scotland, English speaking)

Jane, for example, an English-speaking South African woman in her 40s, stated that she had brought her visiting male English friend ‘up here for the architecture…and basically the wonderful view…that’s why we’re here…not for the symbolic reasons’ but then proceeded to discuss the symbolic nature of the construction material and of what it represented. The aesthetic and symbolic nature of the material from which the Monument was constructed and the way in which the granite and concrete composite conveyed, visually as well as through other senses, a symbolic notion of power, strength, solidity, durability and permanence was strongly supported by comments such as:

[Speaking of the material] I think it’s strong … I think it makes it look so strong and powerful. It’s not bland [the material] … because it’s overwhelming a bit, isn’t it?’ he continues. ‘It’s a strength, the strength of their language to me, it says … the hardness [of the material] is their [Afrikaans speakers’] strength. (Michael, male, 20, South African, English speaking)

while going on further to say:

I suppose if it’s all the same [material used], … unites the language … as one, otherwise you’d have different colours … different colours of the masonry or whatever … rather than in the one colour … quite unifying …

For Karl, a visiting German tourist in his 50s, his impression was that the Monument looked quite harsh, out of place and fairly phallic from ‘down below’, basing his interpretation on his perception of Afrikaner culture:
because of my understanding of Afrikaans culture it does feel like a very macho, very masculine kind of culture … so down below, it [the ATM] looks as though it reflects that but when you come up here, it’s a much more complex space and just feels more gentle [where] the granite and concrete feel as if they fit very well. (Karl, male, 50, German, German/English speaking)

as did an Afrikaans speaker in his early twenties but who saw the Monument in a much more benign and more simplistic light:

[The ATM is] not a ‘threatening’ structure—not trying to be invasive or dominant—just a monument to ‘our language. (Riaan, male, 20, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

The majority of those interviewed saw the Monument in its entirety, rather than as a set of component parts when it came to discussing its symbolic relevance and importance. Some confidently discussed the various features of the Monument, suggesting that they had formulated ideas about it and had attributed certain meaning to it and its symbolism. Others, however, who did not ‘understand’, or had not had time to assimilate their ideas and impressions of the Monument, were less confident in their ‘reading’ of the Monument and, thus, in how they responded to my questioning. Such uncertainty of understanding could, arguably, contribute to multiple and contested meanings attributed to the Monument.

While most visitors were eager to explore the various sections of the Monument, only very few interviewees discussed their impressions of its design features on anything other than a very superficial level. Generally, their acknowledgement of the symbolism attached to the various parts seemed to very much follow that outlined in the leaflet given to visitors on arrival. However, one respondent, Liezel, a female architect in her twenties from Cape Town who shared both Afrikaner and English heritage, was very keen to discuss the architectural design and what it meant to her. Her comments proved to be very insightful and served to exemplify the argument raised about the importance of a visitor’s relational ‘proximity’ to an attraction and the influence that would have on one’s interpretation of it and the meaning assigned. This particular respondent spoke of the Monument in terms of its visual, affective and psychological impacts on the visitor and the way in which a visitor’s perspective and understanding of the Monument derives very much from the architect’s intentions, and in the execution of his design. She spoke of how cleverly she believed the architect, van Wijk, had been in presenting...
his own interpretation of the impact of the different languages on the development of
the Afrikaans language while, at the same time, allowing visitors the opportunity to
develop their own interpretation and meaning of the Monument:

… but without taking it too literally, it’s what you’re going to gain out
of it, like your, I think your ascent up the stairs have been split there in
two by that middle piece [the Malay block] and then you’re guided in …
and you’re basically in that little piece there [the Bridge] … he’s taken
total control and exposed you to everything he wanted to expose you
and when you get out here, it’s kind of a release now you look at it and
think about it … there is light coming through and then, what you were
experiencing with that like verticality was exactly what he wanted you
to experience it was like this … he hasn’t tried to layer it with all the other
history that he would feel like he needs to … it’s just too much, you know,
you can take from it what you want to take from it. (Liezel, female, 20,
South African, Afrikaans/English speaking)

Furthermore, speaking of the way in which van Wijk had represented the influence of
the European and African languages on the creation and development, for instance,
Liezel said that:

To his [van Wijk’s] mind, he’s represented the African languages or African
cultures totally different to the European influence, where this round and sort
of sitting on the earth [pointing to the domes in the forecourt] where as those
[the Afrikaans and the Republic columns] are more like reaching up to the sky
… he’s defined the European and the African influence differently quite well, I
think. The way the psyche interprets architecture … that’s why I found it
walking through there, sort of and the sound of the water in the background, the
light filtering in on the side and then you’ve got this vertical light shining down,
so he has obviously thought about how you’re going to experience this space but
also once you’re here, you’re kind of released and you … I don’t think it’s
prescriptive … I think that also that’s why the use of material is very sort of
‘non’ in a way … it’s not ‘finicky’ or he’s not trying to force anything down …
it’s here and you can basically experience it in the way that you want to
experience it and I think for every single person the experience will be different
…

For this visitor, the experience of the Monument is deeply personal, ‘a spiritual
experience … it’s one big spiritual experience that you walk in here and you can take
from it what you want to. He’s not forcing anything down on you’. For her, ‘the longer
one sits here, the more you’ll start seeing’ and because the Monument is an abstract
design, Liezel argued that the ATM, in its simplicity, not only opens it to continual
interpretation and re-interpretation, but that it has been ‘stripped from all the …
voortrekker [‘pioneers’] and all those…you know it’s nothing like that’. With just one
word, Liezel was making reference here to the widely held perceptions of the pioneering
Afrikaners who made the *Groot Trek* [Great Trek], away from British control in the Cape Colony during the 1830s and 1840s to establish a number of independent republics. The point she was making was that, in her opinion, the ATM is devoid of any of the socio-political and historical ‘baggage’ that might be associated with Afrikaner nationalistic sentiments and very blatantly expressed in such monuments as the Voortrekker Monument:

He’s not brought in, I don’t think there’s much politics brought in here or…obviously he’s thinking of the Afrikaans language. (Liezel, *female*, 20, *South African, Afrikaans/English speaking*)

The continued success of a monument as a viable attraction, as outlined by Riegl (1982), rests in its dynamism and in its capacity to remain relevant through time and what Liezel has suggested in her commentary is that the ATM transcends its socio-political and temporal origins to remain relevant and open to interpretation now and into the future.

What became apparent from the many comments visitors made about the Monument and how they interpreted its symbolism was that very few seemed to be able to offer any interpretation beyond that which was presented to them either through what they were told by a guide or from the information leaflet which each person had received on arrival. Visiting Australian tourist, Neil, (*40, currently living in Scotland, English speaking*), for example, who acknowledged that he had not read anything about the Monument so had ‘no preconceptions whatsoever’ about it, did admit that he was puzzled as to the reasons for the existence of such a monument.

Pieter (*male*, 50, *Dutch, Dutch/English speaking*) said that he had been unable to interpret the symbolism. Further to this, he stated that:

If you ask somebody, what do you see in it, it will never come up as about language, you know. They would perhaps say that it’s something to do with the environment or … the link to language is not … clear.

Similarly, Pierre (*male*, 30, *South African, Afrikaans speaking*) said that he was ‘unclear as to the symbolism’. The correlation between the design and construction and its reference to the Afrikaans language was certainly at best vague for Sara (*female*, 30, *German, German/English speaking*) who suggested that for her:
It just isn’t clear to me is why *this* … you know, this collection of shapes relates to language … If you just looked at that from a distance and said, what’s that mean, you could say, then, okay, it’s a human made monument … but you think, well why … it’s not at all obvious … do you think, well that’s a monument to language, obviously, I mean, you just wouldn’t think that, would you?

It could well be argued that visitors’ interpretive uncertainty when discussing the Monument’s symbolism is attributable to the Monument’s abstract design and the very mixed messages that such fluidity of form and interpretation allows. The literary quotes which served as the inspiration for van Wijk’s design are presented on a plaque for visitors to read as they approach the Monument. The leaflet each visitor is given acknowledges each of the sections of the Monument by making reference to the relevant parts of those quotations. In that respect, one might argue that the visitor’s interpretation is very much dictated to and directed by what van Wijk had said each of the contributing parts ‘meant’. However, repeatedly, comments such as ‘Not everyone understands it, so there is a need for better explanation’ (Pieter, *male*, 50, *Dutch*, *Dutch/English speaking*) were made during interviews:

I was surprised there weren’t more references on the Monument itself. The only bit is as you go in isn’t it [the literary quotations]?
(Marie, *female*, 50, *South African, Afrikaans speaking*)

Comments were regularly prefixed with ‘I think …’, ‘I’m not sure why …’, ‘Maybe …’, ‘I don’t know what …’, ‘I don’t know why …’, and ‘Do you know what the meaning is …?’ Neil, (*male*, 40, *Australian living in Scotland, English speaking*), for example, who was quite impressed with the Monument’s design, was unable to explain what he thought it symbolised: ‘I can’t explain why … I just like the whole design; I think it’s just unique and I just like it’ and concluded his interview saying that he didn’t ‘know if it suggests it’s about a language’. Any connection between the literary quotations, the explanations offered on the information leaflet and visitors’ interpretations did not, it seems, necessarily correlate. Marie, speaking on behalf of many of the visitors, said that: ‘Not everyone understands it, so there is a need for better explanation.’

The lack of on-site interpretive material means that the Monument is essentially devoid of any real ‘auto-explanation’. It is hardly self-explanatory and, in terms of directing
visitor interpretation, management is left in a quandary not unlike many other cultural
and heritage sites: how much should the visitor be ‘told’ and how much should the
visitor be ‘allowed’ to interpret and make meaning of it him/herself. ‘Unorthodox
readings’ of the symbolism were uncommon, although some visitors did proffer their
own interpretations of some of the component parts. A German visitor, for example,
was overheard describing the Monument as a ‘Sputnikdenkmal’ (‘sputnik monument’) because of the soaring design of the Afrikaans column which, to the visitor, resembled
contemporary Soviet monuments which celebrated their ventures into space, while
references to the ‘phallic’ shape of the various columns were not uncommon.

One visitor compared her learning experience at the ATM with that at the Voortrekker
Monument:

There’s more to learn, maybe more to see, more to learn [at the Voortrekker
Monument outside Pretoria] … this is just a … look, it has a symbolism but
that’s it. In Pretoria it’s really, you can read and you can see more … some
history. (Marianne, female, 30, Dutch, living in South Africa,
Dutch/Afrikaans/English speaking)

On the basis of these findings, it might be assumed that in order to improve visitors’
understanding and appreciation of the ATM, the site might well benefit from enhanced
interpretive signage. As has been mentioned earlier, with the construction of the new
interpretive centre, visitors will in future be provided with a detailed (‘official’)
interpretation in the form of text and visual images. Some critics may argue that the
presentation of interpretive material may reduce, or even take away, visitors’ own
capacities to interpret and make meaning of the attraction. That being said, few visitors
interviewed felt sufficiently equipped to share any alternative perspective in terms of
their understanding of the broader symbolism of the Monument than what had been
presented to them in the leaflet or guidebook, in their reading of the quotations from
Langenhoven and van Wyk Louw or, if they were South Africans, what they may have
learned in school about the ATM.

That there was little in the way of alternative ‘readings’ offered leads to speculation as
to the reasons why this might be the case. The lack of accessibility to the symbolism
and the ambiguities which could potentially arise from that may offer a clue as to why
people’s interpretations tended to conform to the ‘official’ version. The following
comments made by Charlene (female, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking) and Judy (female, 50, South African, English speaking), quoted here at length, may shed some further light on the issue:

Charlene: I think architecture and any type of art which, architecture I would classify the same as art is an object that is culturally, usually, perceived, not necessarily talked about that way but perceived as some type of sacred thing … Not sacred in the terms that it was necessarily defined by being associated with the divine but being defined by the fact that you can’t understand it because most people just are not educated or taught to be able to be visual which I think is outrageous … Judy: … although one doesn’t have to be able to deconstruct everything … Some things that should be accessible and obvious to the relatively uninformed, I mean …

Charlene: But even the most accessible and obvious can be used in a way, though, that becomes more complex to most … it becomes so complex that it’s not accessible anymore and then it should be deconstructed … and that’s what happens in things like building monuments … most people deconstruct or understand … they just follow it. That’s consumption in its largest form in our world today. The controlling people [the members of the ATMK] who made Jan van Wijk make that monument … they might’ve thought the people were stupid … but historically, if you are removed from it, it can be built up to a point where you can’t understand the object anymore.

This conversation alludes to people’s inabilitys to make sense of the Monument because they lack the necessary visual literacy skills required to ‘deconstruct’ it. Charlene is suggesting that, because of people’s lack of visual literacy skills, architecture, as an art form, is largely impenetrable. Judy, however, is arguing that some examples of art should not need to be analysed and deconstructed. Charlene, however, believes that an object which might, on the surface, appear straightforward in terms of its interpretation and meaning, can be further layered with other, less immediately obvious meanings. Most people, Charlene feels, will accept the dominant narrative. The less ‘proximity’ a person has to the object, Charlene concludes, the less accessible it becomes, to the point that it will eventually bear little or no meaning to some visitors. Interviewee, Kiswick, (male, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking) was mindful of the fact that younger people are perhaps better equipped to make sense of the Monument because they have learned about it as part of their education: ‘They understand the symbolism as they have learned about it in school,’ he suggested.
What might be described as the symbolic capital embedded within the ATM, in its complexity—and, one might add, its ambiguity in its abstraction—is neither obvious nor accessible for many. Bourdieu (1984) argues that symbolic capital gains value at the cross-section of class and status, where one must not only possess but be able to appropriate objects with a perceived or concrete sense of value. In order to fully explain its influence, the ATM, it may be argued, possesses symbolic capital because of the prestige of its social, cultural, linguistic, economic and environmental contexts, which in turn distinguishes the ‘actor’ (in this case, the Afrikaans language) who inhabits it. Furthermore, symbolic capital must be identified within the cultural and historical frame through which it originated (Bourdieu, 1984) and, as Charlene has rightly suggested, the further removed (socially, culturally and historically) one might be from an object, the less likely you are to be able to ‘understand the object any more’. Although he did not write directly about the relationship between tourism and symbolic capital, Bourdieu’s (1984) argument that it is at the cross-section of class and status that symbolic capital gains value was alluded to when interviewee, Karel, (male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking) insisted that a person’s education and ‘proximity’ to or ‘distance’ from an object, and to the ATM in particular, are fundamental to their appreciation of its symbolic capital:

In any society, obviously class structure and people from different spheres in society will look at things differently purely from a sense of education, sense of connection, sense of language, sense of who you communicate with, so I guess, the Monument can be like any art piece where you, and a very high level where you present a huge amount of knowledge concerning what you create—because it’s probably a symbol—and then you have people who’ve just got a vague memory of stories that have been told to them ... they haven’t read about it or they don’t have a specific personal connotation or a sense of knowing where it fits into time or place or space ... it’s just a story and it resembles a time in maybe their grandfather’s life or their father’s life ... so it’s just another story for people ... so a relation to something because it’s a story. (Karel, male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

According to Helene (female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking), ‘a lot of people don’t understand the symbolism of the Monument’ and that because of its sculptural design and its size, some visitors found it too imposing while others considered it somewhat ‘crass’. A majority of visitors interviewed understood that the Monument was a symbolic structure and that the symbolism was important to its understanding:
Yeah the symbolism … I know this part of the Monument represents the
growth of Afrikaans and this part, the state … of … ja … the symbolism
is especially important. (Susann, female, late teens, South African, university
student, Afrikaans speaker)

[speaking of the symbolism] We came, we saw, we liked. (Jane, female 40,
South African, English speaking)

The symbolism, it’s interesting … (Liezel, female, 20, South African,
Afrikaans/English speaking)

The size [is impressive]…and the symbolism (Simone, female, late teens, South
African, university student, Afrikaans speaker)

and, despite her apparent disdain for the Monument:

I’m from Worcester, so when I drive home … then I look at it [the ATM]
and then we laugh …we say, look at that phallic symbol over there, you
know … (Sonja, female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

From one perspective, it may be legitimately argued that it was the intention of the
overseeing committee to develop an architectural brief which would ultimately allow
them to ‘dictate’ and ‘control’ the interpretation of the Monument. It may well have
been a primary motive of the ATMK members to stipulate that the winning design for
the ATM be both symbolic and abstract in nature in order that they be allowed the
opportunity to prescribe its meaning, in much the way which Charlene above suggested:
to create a work of art or architecture which is so seemingly intellectually inaccessible
to the average visitor that they will accept the preferred (dominant or officially-
designated) interpretation. Hall (1994) has argued that studies on the relationship
between power and heritage presentation show that heritage settings generally provide a
single, monolithic interpretation supporting a particular ideological framework.
However, it is important to remember that, whilst there is clearly a dominant
interpretive perspective, how the ATM might otherwise be interpreted can be
understood in relation to one of van Wijk’s major intentions of his design and
construction. According to Erna van Wijk, it was her husband’s express intention to
inspire people to think about the Monument and not necessarily to dictate to them how
they should interpret it: ‘He had wanted people to leave asking questions’ (pers.
comm., Erna van Wijk, 13 April 2010).
Yet, as Karel, (*male, 30, South African, Afrikaans* speaking) is quick to point out, the stories, along with the (re)-interpretation of history, cannot be underestimated and that visitors’ impressions of the Monument and their preconceptions of what it represented made a vital contribution to the way in which visitors interpreted the Monument and the meaning they attributed to it. Interestingly, however, are the numbers of people who mentioned to me that their understanding of the Monument had ‘only improved a little’ as an outcome of their visit. Suffice to say, however, that most South African visitors arrived with their own preconceptions of the Monument and what it represented and that their motives for visiting and their experiences at the Monument served little to alter but generally to reinforce their already existing thoughts or opinions. To summarise, then, different assumptions on how people from different backgrounds engage with the Monument are dependent upon a number of different and varying factors. My own findings suggest that visitors’ dispositions towards and understandings of the Monument, for example, relate very closely to visitors’ nationality, ethnicity, linguistic background, and the depth of understanding or appreciation of relevant historical circumstances (relative proximity-distance). Visitors’ antipathy towards or their ability to empathise or sympathise with Afrikaners or with the precarious situation in which Afrikaans is to be found nowadays also played an important role in affecting (some might say ‘clouding’) visitors’ capacities to interpret the Monument in a particular way and to afford it certain meanings.

For ‘outsider’ international visitors, they generally found little difficulty in coming to conclusions supporting the idea of erecting a monument in recognition of one’s language. For one interviewee, a female American visitor in her mid-forties of mixed Anglo-Hispanic-Cherokee origins, who was witnessing the slow demise of her grandfather’s Cherokee language, she was able to relate to the idea of the importance of a heritage language, saying that ‘language was the most essential feature of what it is to be human’ (*Sandra/Morning Cloud, 40, American, English speaking*).

Not all visitors, however, shared the positive impressions which many visitors might have associated with the Monument. Despite his acknowledgement of the ATM’s role as a tangible representation of the history of Afrikaans and of its development and
associated culture, one respondent, Karel (*male, 30, South African*), himself an Afrikaans speaker, was quite adamant in saying that, as far as he was concerned, the ATM was not viewed by those ‘outside Afrikanerdom’ as being of any importance, the ‘outsiders’ he was speaking of in this context being non-Afrikaner South Africans. His statement was confirmed on more than one occasion when English-speaking South Africans anecdotally told me they could see no reason why they would visit a monument that ‘meant nothing’ to them and which ‘was an Afrikaner thing’. Darelle, a female academic in her fifties living in Cape Town who had spent most of her formative years growing up an Afrikaans speaker in Namibia, when asked to comment on her impressions of the significance of the ATM, acknowledged the creativity and craftsmanship involved in its creation and construction, but of its emotional impact on her she said:

> The Monument … I have respect for the man whoever designed it because every monument, I think, you must have a lot of creativity to be able to do that. For that, I have a lot of respect but I can’t say I feel proud there. The Monument itself doesn’t make me proud. (Darelle, *female, 50, Namibian/South African, Afrikaans speaking*)

As to its future, however, she spoke of its contribution to the history of South Africa. Because of its perceived importance, she urged that:

> people won’t break it down or destroy it because it’s a part of our [South African] history … if we want to become a country who really respects the diversity that we say we are and that we stand for, then we must have respect for that as well … and people must be able to move beyond their own spheres and their own feelings of comfort and discomfort and know that all of us played a role here—and Afrikaans played a role here. (Darelle, *female, 50, Namibian/South African, Afrikaans speaking*)

Even though there were many comments from visitors who spoke about the growing importance of the notion of ‘inclusivity’ and the changing nature of South African society since 1994, not all were convinced that the ATM could be seen as an appropriate agent for change when it was still very much tied to its apartheid ‘shackles’, which some argued it could never really shake off. Two interviewees, Koos (*male, 50, South African*) and Gert (*male, 30, South African*), both of whom were Afrikaans speakers, however, insisted that the Monument was representative of all South Africans, not only of themselves as Afrikaaners. ‘All South Africans,’ said Koos, ‘should be proud of it. The language does not owe its origins to only one group but originates from all the
languages and ethnic groups of South Africa—it is a *South African* language and should be acknowledged by all in South Africa as such’, and together they urged that all people should accept this as fact.

For Sonja, a female Afrikaans-speaking academic in her fifties, she stated that she had never had any inclination to visit the ATM ‘because it was really billed as a way to confirm Afrikaner nationalism’. It was her wish that the Monument could be renegotiated to ‘become a symbol that would unify people but…is that possible?’ she asked. ‘Is it possible,’ she queried, uncertain of its capacity to act as a viable agent for change, ‘can one change, you know, turn around this symbol without touching it?’ In that respect, she had heard that:

they have many happenings there and so on and you know what is happening is that people are getting the gist of the history of the Afrikaans language so there’s a reclaiming of the language … it was not only the White Afrikaners that made this language but it actually started with the slaves and the indigenous people and I don’t know if that monument can be changed as I said to incorporate that because the way it stands there, it doesn’t tell the truth … (Sonja, female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

Despite the fact that she had never visited the Monument, for Sonja the ‘story’ which had been built up around the ATM was one that suppressed any suggestion of the importance of the input provided by the slaves and indigenous people into the origins and development of Afrikaans. This is a clear demonstration of the power and influence of myth-making and of the importance of ethnic and national narratives and how they are told and retold. Annelie (*female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking*), further to this, herself no apologist for ‘the most zealous of Afrikaners’ whom she described as being less than gracious in their ‘pride’ for their language and culture, insisted that ‘the continuing perception of Afrikaans was as being seen as the language of the oppressor by the have-nots, that the Taalmonument symbolised the pro-Afrikaner government, and that it represented oppression to the Coloured and Black populations’. In terms of its symbolism, furthermore, she said that ‘a lot can be seen as being very positive [the recognition of the contribution of the many different linguistic and ethnic influences on the development of the language] …’ but was adamant that ‘it is still going to be seen as Afrikaans over all spheres.’ Karel (*male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking*), highlighting for him what is the ‘allegorical and conceptual’ nature of the Monument,
suggested that it was the relative lack of knowledge and understanding of the Monument and its symbolism which were largely responsible for the creation of the many different and competing narratives about the ATM:

You have people that have got just a vague memory of stories that have been told why it’s [the ATM] been put there … so people make up stories … I think a lot of people just talk about the Monument because stories have been told to them … they haven’t read about it or they don’t have any personal connotation or a sense of knowing where it fits into time or place or space … it’s just a story … so that’s just another story for people.

(Karel, male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking)

7.2.5 Site of Contested Meanings

As has already been testified, meanings attributed to the ATM are many, varied and quite contentious. Despite such seemingly intractable odds against any attempts to change the long-held and heavily entrenched views about the Monument, the ATM management are adamant that ongoing efforts were being made to incorporate the wider South African community into the workings of the Monument. They write that the ATM is ‘a monument which tells the story of Afrikaans’ with its vision to operate the Monument ‘in such a manner that all South Africans are able to respect and appreciate Afrikaans’ while ‘build[ing] relationships with all South Africans through the medium of Afrikaans and in the context of multilingualism’ (Afrikaanse Taalmusuem en – monument, 2011:6) and through establishing ‘mutual respect for Afrikaans and other indigenous languages’ (Afrikaanse Taalmusuem en – monument, 2011:7) as well as its importance as a ‘unique’ tourist attraction which is representative of a broader and more inclusive South Africa.

Despite its efforts to broaden its representative ‘base’ with its philosophy of inclusiveness and respect, the ATM, however, struggles to unchain itself from the past which is still for many, very real and very raw. For these people, the Monument serves as a very clear reminder of the sense of exclusivity which many have experienced (and some say, continue to) and of the identity ‘crisis’ which they have suffered throughout their lives. A former curator of the ATM and Museum for approximately five years in the 1990s, and currently senior tourism officer of the local Drakenstein Municipal Council, supported the view that the Monument persisted in its being perceived as the exclusive domain of the White Afrikaner, stating that the very broad perception of ATM
is that ‘it’s not for all the communities in South African society’ (Helene, [female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking], emphasis in original). To this, she added, ‘Coloureds, Blacks, Malays, Indians were not involved in any aspect before 1994, so a large number of people still believe it [the ATM] to be an “Afrikaner” monument. A lot of the previously disenfranchised populations had not been to the Monument and would not consider going there’. At the same time, however, Helene admitted she was able to identify with the pride felt by many of the other Afrikaans-speaking visitors to the Monument, saying that despite the mixed feelings she maintained about it from a political point of view, from a language perspective, she had ‘always been staunchly proud of Afrikaans’ and of its continued expansion and innovation which she described as being very aptly represented in the Monument fountain with its sense of life and growth symbolised by the bubbling water and the Afrikaans column.

A Coloured Afrikaans-speaking visitor in his fifties, Kiswick, reiterating similar comments made by other Coloured Afrikaans speakers, said he was proud of his language—that it was as much his language as anyone else’s and that Afrikaans was very much the language of all South Africans irrespective of what other languages they spoke. He stressed the fact that he believed that ‘the Monument is representative of a feeling of “embracing”’. The Monument, he said, ‘was very effective in showing that the language owes its origins to a whole lot of influences that came together here [Western Cape] to create the language that is uniquely South African’. Comments made by Pierre (30, South African, Afrikaans speaking) similarly supported those of Kiswick, the ATM providing him with something which, as a Coloured Afrikaans speaker, he could identify with as a symbol of both his past and his language. For Pierre, the Monument ‘grounded’ him in time and place and, along with the Afrikaans language, contributed in the development of his identity. For him and others like him, he said, ‘the Monument reminds me of the past that has brought about the present’. In describing the structure as ‘very solid’ he, in line with others, interpreted the sense of solidity with that of the fortitude and tenacity of the Afrikaans language which, despite efforts to curtail its linguistic and cultural influences within the nation, he felt would continue to endure.
For another Coloured Afrikaans speaker, Mariette (*40, South African*), though, she insisted that people of colour did not see the ATM as representative or inclusive and that if attitudes were to change there was a very strong need to educate people about what she termed ‘real inclusivity’. Growing up Afrikaans-speaking, Mariette stated that she had been unaware of the contributions to the development of the Afrikaans language by non-European languages but she had been taught that Afrikaans was not *her* language but ‘was the language of the Afrikaners’. Under the apartheid system, she argued that she had little voice to express her ideas or thoughts and so accepted things as they were. She had been, she emphasised, excluded from the Afrikaner ‘world’ and it was only in recent years when she had learned more about the symbolism of the Monument that she better appreciated what it stood for. Still, when questioned about the Monument’s continuing relevance, she dismissed the ATM as an anachronism, a ‘white elephant’ (her words) and quite scathingly described it as the ‘Holy Grail of the Afrikaners’, still the domain of the Afrikaner. This obvious sense of divisiveness is supported by another long time (White) resident of Paarl who seemed to suggest that for whom the Monument had most relevance or importance was somehow based on and accounted for by the type or variation of Afrikaans spoken by different ethnic groups:

> It [the ATM] has very different connotations for the Coloured and White communities in Paarl … but they speak different Afrikaans, they have a different accent, so that’s the kind of racial connotations and the whole dominance thing and the whole kind of phallic image of it …

(Sara, *female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking*)

Very mixed reactions were provided by other informants who chose, on strong political and moral grounds, not to visit the Monument:

> Well, there was a time when we disparagingly referred to it [the ATM] as the largest phallic symbol in the world and it seemed very much as if it was an Afrikaner thing … not something that included the majority of the speakers of the language, Afrikaans, but then there’s so much contestation about ownership—my language, your language, your language isn’t the right variety of Afrikaans … I have to say that I probably come from the community that viewed the construction in a very negative light … saw it just as one of the symbols of Grand Apartheid and really would not be very interested in it.  

(Adele, *female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking*)

This same respondent, a Coloured senior academic at one of Cape Town’s universities, further commented, saying that ‘Afrikaans will always be weighted in terms of its history in the same way that being White in South Africa, you will always have the
baggage, you just can’t get rid of it.’ Such disparaging remarks, however, were
counterbalanced when she continued by saying that ‘I have noticed that things are being
done to make more open space where people of all backgrounds, language backgrounds,
are welcome’. Even though Adele acknowledged that she was aware that various
efforts were definitely being made in order to create a more inclusive and welcoming
place and space for visitors to the Monument, she believed, however, that the historico-
political discourse which had arisen around the Monument was something which she
believed had helped to define her as being somehow ineligible to claim the ATM as
much her own as any other Afrikaans speaker, despite the fact that Afrikaans was her
mother language.

As one way to encourage greater inclusivity and to placate any ingrained bitterness
towards the Monument and what it represents, the marketing and communication staff
at the Monument has established a program of entertainment which has very
consciously incorporated not only Afrikaans-related items but also concerts with a
broader and more inclusive audience in mind. Thus, ‘by looking to popular culture’
(Adele, female, 50, South African, Afrikaans speaking university professor) and ‘by
encouraging greater local involvement and participation’ (Helene, female, 40, South
African, Afrikaans speaking local council member and former Monument employee),
efforts are being made at the Monument to reclaim the Afrikaans language as one which
all its speakers, and ultimately all South Africans, can confidently claim as their own.
Staging different cultural, pop and special interest events combining storytelling, poetry,
music and dance at the Monument has been a conscious effort by the ATM staff to
‘liberate’ Afrikaans from its past image as the ‘language of the oppressor’ and (in
Adele’s words) ‘reclaim a space’ in today’s South Africa. Still, any efforts to achieve
this through cultural means is, however, contentious and

… with apartheid history, it will be difficult for everyone to accept
Afrikaans not as a symbol of apartheid but as a symbol of the country
as a whole … or as a culture … (Schalk, male, late teens, South African,
Afrikaans speaking)

Not until perceived ethnic or cultural barriers are brought down and the voice of
youthful positivity prevails will there be any chance for Afrikaans to shake off its past
dark shackles:
Susann (female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaker): There is always in South Africa a cultural issue with everything …

Schalk (male, late teens, South African, Afrikaans speaking): … because of the many cultures … there’s always a little bit of a …

Simone (female, late teens, South African, university student, Afrikaans speaker): ... but now, knowing that apartheid is gone, then you can just say it’s not that, it [the ATM] is just about the language … (emphasis in original)

Taking ‘ownership’ of the Afrikaans language as one’s own is a very complex and nuanced process, particularly in Western Cape Province where 75% of Afrikaans speakers are not defined ethnically as being Afrikaner but rather as Coloured. Helene (female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking) argued that the ‘ons’ (‘we’, ‘us’, ‘our’) in the only text intentionally connected to the Monument: ‘Dit is ons ernaar’ (‘This is our earnestness’/’This is what concerns us’) was the White Afrikaner. This perspective was supported by other Coloured visitors, one of whom said that the Monument ‘symbolises the White Afrikaner and even though Afrikaans is my first language, the Afrikaans that the Monument symbolised isn’t my Afrikaans’. The ATM, he asserted, was ‘very much the Monument to the [White] Afrikaner’ (Yaseem, male, 30, South African, Afrikaans speaking). An English-speaking woman, a retired history teacher and school inspector in her seventies, insisted that, under the apartheid regime, she had been considered a ‘second-class citizen because of being English-speaking’ and that visiting—or even simply seeing—the ATM made her feel ‘alienated’ and that as an English-speaking South African, she was never made to feel welcome at the ATM:

Given the time when it was built, it [the ATM] is an example of Afrikaner ‘triumphalism’ … the fact that, at that time, the Afrikaner was at the “top”—politically and in terms of the overall control of South Africa … and the fact that the Monument is atop Paarl Mountain is symbolic of this being at the ‘top’. (Margaret, female, 70, South African, English speaking)

Margaret’s comment here accords well with the earlier analysis of the ATM being commanding and exhibiting a sense of power because of its location. The Monument for her, she continued, is a figure of linguistic and cultural hubris, of alienation, separation and denial:

It [the ATM] declares and claims that the past, present and future is ‘theirs’[Afrikaners] and it alienates all the other cultural and language groups in South Africa, focusing attention on and praising the Afrikaner, putting his or her culture, power, dominance and
language above all others … It denies, too, what belongs to the ‘people of colour’ in South Africa as only ‘theirs’.

Furthermore:

The Monument presents a feeling of separation, of being separate and the Afrikaners perspective of being ‘apart’ and different from others in South Africa.

When questioned about the efforts to make the Monument a more ‘inclusive’ attraction, Margaret was very blunt in her analysis, arguing in favour of the Monument serving to unite and reconcile rather than divide, as she felt that the Monument continues to do. She felt, however, that ‘any change in perspective—at least the public perspective (being “politically correct”)—of the Monument being “inclusive” of all those who contributed to the birth and development of Afrikaans’ she described as ‘simply flying a “flag of convenience”…that it serves current ideological and political thought, much like the attitude now where having mixed-race heritage, for example, needs to be “celebrated”—and when the ruling National Party edited out the non-Afrikaner perspective when the Monument was built.’ She continued by saying that any efforts being done at the Monument was ‘yet another version of “selective history”’ and that South Africa remained polarized along linguistic lines, racial origins and creed’ and concluded her interview, saying that in terms of visiting the ATM, she felt there was ‘no good reason’ to visit it or to take visitors to what she, along with other English speakers, ‘affectionately’ termed ‘that monstrosity on the hill’!

Annelie, an Afrikaans-speaking, lifetime resident of Paarl in her forties, believed that the pride which many of the more outspoken, jingoistic and ‘zealous’ Afrikaners expressed in regard to their language, culture and traditions could be construed more as hubris dominated by a certain arrogance and a sense of exaggerated self-importance than as any humble sense of pride in themselves. She continued by saying that they also felt very single-minded, as well, ‘that there is this group, that is, Afrikaners and nobody else.’ She further raised the point that ‘if cornered, the Afrikaner will defend him or herself by creating a camp ‘laer trek’—an enclosure—the implication being that the Afrikaner will close ranks for self-protection and become very inward thinking, to the exclusion of others.’ This shunning of the ‘Other’—the non-Afrikaner—and self-imposed exclusivity coupled with a ‘siege mentality’ was a perception of the Afrikaner
psyche which had been voiced by other interviewees, particularly in relation to the ever-diminishing status of the Afrikaans language in South Africa. Luke, an English male tourist in his early twenties, suggested that to even consider creating a monument to a language seemed to point to at least a degree of insecurity about the relative position of the language and culture in the broader society and that the construction of the Monument was a way of justifying and strengthening the language and culture’s existence—and with that, their Afrikaner identity.

In terms of the history, origins and development of the language, few visitors appeared to have had anything but a very superficial understanding of the events leading up to the inauguration of the Monument in 1975. One female Afrikaans-speaking respondent, born in Johannesburg but now resident in England, said she could recall the inauguration ceremony and learning about the ATM in school but was unclear as to ‘why they picked this spot…I suppose it’s here because…sort of birth of Afrikaans was here, wasn’t it?...but unless you knew that, you wouldn’t really know that, would you?’ (Marie, 50, South African living in England, Afrikaans/English speaking). Sweeping statements & generalisations were common amongst those interviewed and many left it to the information sheet to provide them with their ‘understanding’ of the Monument and how they should interpret it:

OK … it [the information sheet] tells that … [the relationship between ‘helder Wes’ (‘heroic West’) and ‘magiese Afrika’ (‘magical Africa’)] in fact that’s the first time … because I’m probably not as knowledgeable about Afrikaner self-consciousness as I ought to be but that was the first time I’d seen those two connections.

(Ute, female, 30, German South African, German/Afrikaans/English speaker)

Despite her feeling of inadequacy in terms of her knowledge of what she described as ‘Afrikaner self-consciousness’ and the sense of guilt at not knowing more about something she considered so central to the Afrikaner identity, Ute convincingly extrapolated from what she had read regarding the relationship between the symbols to ‘heroic Europe’ and those of ‘magical Africa’ to theorise about how the interpretation of that relationship has changed over the years (with the emphasis of the importance of the various European languages on the development of Afrikaans) to one which much better and more accurately reflects today’s reality:
But what I also find interesting is that just, I mean, in that … in a position of the Afrikaans ‘heroic’ and the ‘magical’ African … I mean it’s part of the whole, I suppose, the development of consciousness and if you look at the stages of that … that you do have a ‘magical’ stage which is often associated with the feminine much more strongly and you kind of have the rounded domes here and then you have the rational scientific consciousness which is associated with the masculine and that’s kind of brought progress and whatever and so there is something that taps quite deeply into the subconscious ways in which we make sense of the world as well … maybe people were just less self-conscious about them in 1975 and now, with postmodernism, we’re kind of much more aware that that’s how we’ve been making sense of it. (Ute, female, 30, German South African, German/Afrikaans/English speaker)

What Ute had done was to show the dynamic face of the Monument and how it remains relevant because of the flexibility in its interpretation. The members of the ATMK, in their architectural brief, required that the prize winning design for the Monument would be ‘symbolic’ in nature (‘n Simboliese monument word beoog) and which did not rule out an ‘abstract creation’ (Dit sluit ‘n abstrakte skepping nie uit nie) (ATMK, n.d.:7). Van Wijk used a visual language of form, colour and line to create a design which demonstrated a degree of independence from visual references in the world but which, at the same time, represented for him his interpretation of the quotes from van Wyk Louw and C.J. Langenhoven which provided him the inspiration for his creation. Because of that independence from visual references, the ATM is, arguably, to some greater or lesser extent (potentially) liberated from any ‘fixed’ interpretation which might befit other less stylised monuments where visual imagery and textual displays more directly cue the visitor to respond and to interpret the imagery or text in a more targeted way.

The Monument represents an intangible notion—a language—in a tangible but varyingly accessible form, contingent, amongst other things, on the visitor’s ‘biography’. Arguably, it was not van Wijk’s intention to depict an objective reality but rather the subjective emotions and responses which people, events and circumstances arouse within a person. Nor was it the intention of the ATMK, who insisted on the symbolic and possibly abstract design in their competition brief, a design which would best exemplify and which would ‘symbolise the marvel of our [Afrikaner] cultural and political flourishing’ (Dit moet die wonder van ons kulturele en staatkundige opbloei
versinnebeeld) (ATKV, n.d.:6). In its brief, the ATMK invoked a strong sense of patriotism in the twelve competitors for the winning design, by referring to the struggle which those forebears had endured:

The stated goal of the Society for Real Afrikaners was: ‘To stand for our Language, our Nation and our Land’. This slogan is on their coat of arms, abbreviated as ‘For Mother language and Fatherland’. The so-called First Afrikaans Language Movement which began here [in Paarl] was thus much more than simply a language movement; it was a movement for the cultural, political and religious emancipation of the Afrikaans-speaking section of the population. Herewith was the language, the Afrikaans word, naturally a powerful means towards self-development and self-liberation’.

However, while the resulting concrete and granite expression represents a subjective perspective derived from van Wijk’s imagination, the ATM is a representation which seeks to express an emotional experience and, in its emotional effect, invokes in visitors different moods and ideas. Such invocations strongly influence the way in which visitors create meaning of an attraction. In their study of the importance of expectations, experience and mood on the visitors’ level of satisfaction in the context of cultural tourism, de Rojas and Camarero’s (2008:525) argue that the ‘mood state moderates the cognitive path’. ‘Emotions and experiences,’ they insist, ‘are fundamental to cultural activities’ (2008:526). They (and others) have found a strong correlation between cognitive and the affective in the interpretation and meaning-making of an attraction. To concentrate on a purely cognitive approach is, according to de Rojas and Camarero (2008), to deny the integral part played by an affective perspective when conceptualising visitors’ interpretations and meaning-making. As a consequence of this, it is important to incorporate emotional and affective components into any analysis of visitor commentary about an attraction, so as to create a deeper and more nuanced understanding of what has been said.
Bagozzi et al. (1999) have suggested that visitors’ moods can affect their cognitive and affective processes, thereby directly influencing the encoding of information about an attraction and colouring memories held of the experience once visitors return home. Whilst a visitor’s mood will have repercussions on their reactions towards an attraction and to the emotions provoked, it is also worth noting that the emotions may be elicited from the atmospherics of the attraction. Previous studies have demonstrated that emotions generated from social and physical interactions within a place play a key role in shaping visitors’ experiences, attitudes, and behaviors (Allen et al., 1992; Bitner, 1990, 1992; Oliver, 1993). When a certain level of emotions is reached, visitors’ cognitive activity is enhanced and contributes to developing positive attitudes (e.g., Allen et al., 2005). In sum, it is possible that emotional states can contribute to developing an emotional tie with a place when place attachment is conceived as an attitude toward a place.

7.3 Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that there are a variety of influences which impact upon visitors and help to shape their interpretations of the ATM and of the meanings they attribute to it. Visitors’ motivations and reasons for visiting the site, their own ‘biographies’ and the biographies of those with whom they may be visiting cannot but influence their understanding and appreciation of the Monument. In some cases, visitors’ perspectives changed; for many, their understanding of the Monument, what it represented and its symbolism was broadened. A visitor’s relative physical, ethnic, linguistic, mental (in terms of knowledge and understanding) or socio-cultural ‘proximity’ to or ‘distance’ from the Monument also played a substantial role in developing visitors’ perspectives and considered opinions of the ATM. This sense of proximity or distance cannot be underestimated when evaluating the different ways in which people interpreted the Monument and gave meaning to it. Reisinger & Steiner (2006) state that for some visitors, a particular attraction may have only minimal meaning, perhaps because they are not familiar with the site, its history or its socio-cultural context and that they only visit the site because it is part of an itinerary or because it might be recommended to them as a ‘must-see’. Some visited the Monument ‘not because of any interest in the Monument, not to think, wonder or read about [it]’
Helene, female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking), but simply because it formed part of their general Cape Winelands tour. For others, the Monument embodied much beyond its physical structure and presence and, as evidence provided by the comments of many of the people interviewed suggested, visitors do engage deeply and broadly with the Monument in a dialogic relationship and as an embodied experience. What the Monument—and any attraction for that matter—‘means’ requires an analysis much beyond mere description of its materiality and physical appearance, for it is in the relationship formed by visitors with the attraction and embodied in their total sensory encounter that any meaning making can take place. In other words, it is the dynamic interplay between the material and non-material aspects of the Monument and the physical and cognitive experiences of the visiting public which create the powerful connection between the material manifestation of any attraction and its interpretation and meanings.

An attraction is only invested with meaning and agency when it ‘has been culturally constructed by toponyms, myth, and oral history’ (Moore, 2004:173), at which time it takes on a specific social role and performs some particular social function or functions. Ever since it was first intimated in 1942 that some structure should be raised to fittingly commemorate the birth and development of the Afrikaans language, it has always been known as the Afrikaanse Taalmonument (my emphasis), with all the social and cultural connotations associated with this type of construction. The Monument, too, has been mythologised and the oral history which has grown up around it since its inauguration in 1975 is evidenced by the many different and often disparate perceptions and pre-conceptions which people have internalised. As is the case for many artefacts, an attraction can exist as a vehicle for the expression of cultural identity through its acknowledgement and generation of cultural meanings, where it becomes the depository of collective and personal memories, values, ideologies and identities which are at once interwoven within the interpretive agency of physical and symbolic space.

For many domestic interviewees, the Monument elicited a range of collective and personal memories, invoking a sense of nostalgia (Caton & Santos, 2007)—of what they were doing when the Monument was inaugurated, of the political condition
experienced at the time, the values it holds for them and for the future of their progeny and nation, the events leading up to the demise of an ideology which spread ignorance, fear and hatred, and of their changing identities. Whilst it becomes an exemplar of meanings produced by a source community to which it is strongly connected, the Monument, as with all attractions is, however, at the same time imbued with a multitude of meanings by those who visit and engage with it. Like all analytical categories, then, the idea of the meaning of an attraction such as a monument becomes demonstrably less coherent because its inherent spatio-temporal ‘stasis’ may well stand it at variance with the processes of social change, questioning its continued ‘validity’ or relevance. Often this means that, over time, competing discourses and ideologies and the processes by which certain items of national heritage become legitimised as opposed to others will change. As Hall (1997) argues, it is in attempts to fix meaning that we see power intervening in discourse (1997:10), although he points out as well that ‘even when power is circulating through meaning and knowledge’ (1997:10-11, emphasis in original), meanings still need to be shared to some degree.

That the meanings of attractions change over time is evidence of the dynamic, fluid nature of meaning-making processes and suggests that meaning-making is itself contextual and any meanings made are responses which are influenced by social, cultural, political, economic and ideological forces impinging upon the meaning-maker. Visitors are at liberty to create what Howard (2003) has metaphorically described as their ‘nest of Russian dolls’. ‘Individuals,’ he writes, have different “Russian dolls” to begin with, and they are able to decide how many dolls and which dolls to assemble, according to the meaning they assign to the heritage presented’ (2003:150).

Analysis of the interview data revealed a number of important themes. In its abstract design the Monument possesses many intangible qualities and characteristics. As a physical artefact, it ‘carries’ within it a sense of genealogy and kinship ties, a sense of spiritual connection with the ideals of a people and of a nation. As well, it stands as the physical validation of a certain ethnic, cultural and/or linguistic identity and aspirations. The Monument remains as a modern conduit for the diffuse set of connections between many people brought about through the history and development as well as the current use of the Afrikaans language. Furthermore, as an attraction visited by many Afrikaans
speakers who now live outside South Africa, the Monument facilitates connections between the ‘homeland’ and diasporic Afrikaans speaking communities around the world. Almost all Afrikaans-speaking respondents acknowledged the importance of the Monument, particularly in terms of the history and development of the Afrikaans language, of its contribution to the maintenance of the cultural heritage associated with Afrikaans, and in its value as a cultural artefact which can conjure up a sense of pride. At the same time, comments by various interviewees demonstrated that the ATM is a site of substantial contestation, to the point that some interviewees quite forceably conveyed strong, negative meanings towards the Monument.

As has been evidenced, visitor attractions are imbued with particular and inherent qualities. As the recipients of imposed human categories, meanings and values, attractions generate in visitors certain behaviours and experiences which form the basis for their meaning. Phenomenological engagements with the material world are, therefore, central to the processes of interpretation and meaning-making. Meanings are thus co-generated by transactional processes: the material qualities of attractions flow through and connect phenomenological engagement and local interactions with environments. Such an approach highlights the performative role of an attraction as well as its role of communicator as a medium or mediator between the worlds of its creators and of those who visit it.
Chapter 8

Summary and Conclusion

8.1 Introduction

The impetus for this thesis arose out of a curiosity and growing fascination for a very particular type of visitor attraction, the language-related monument, and particularly as to how the expression and representation of language could be made in concrete form. The overarching aim of this thesis, then, has been to investigate one particular way in which a feature of intangible cultural heritage, in this specific case, language, can be ‘tangibilised’ (Spiggle, 1994) through the process of ‘monumentalisation’. To achieve that aim, four research objectives were addressed: (i) to examine the motives and processes which led to the development and construction of the ATM as a monument to the Afrikaans language; (ii) to describe and analyse the ATM as a tourist attraction; (iii) to explore the ways in which visitors interact with the ATM; and (iv) to critically examine why visitors visit the ATM, how they make meaning of the attraction, and the interpretations and meanings that visitors attach to the Monument.

The thesis has addressed the nature and role of visitor attractions by examining several relevant theoretical perspectives that have been developed to describe and explain the functioning of tourist attractions (Chapter 2). The study made use of MacCannell’s (1976) site sacralisation model, Gunn’s (1979) concentric zones, and studies of visitor attractions undertaken by Leiper (1990, 1995), Pearce (1991, 2005), Canter (1977) and Moscardo (1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2007). The theoretical perspectives developed by these authors provided the framework by which the ATM was examined as a visitor attraction (Chapter 5).

The idea or motivation to design and erect any monument bears the hallmarks of the roles which monuments play in the life of a community or nation state. Monuments form an integral part of the ongoing narrative of a community or nation state. As such, they serve as unifying focal points for their constituents, and as a demonstration to
outsiders of something or someone valued in some way to that community. A monument, after all, is inherently a construction, imbued with cues for evoking emotional responses and designed for visitation and admiration. Monuments are always problematic, as they simultaneously communicate notions of inclusiveness and exclusiveness. For example, monuments can represent one-sided, often ideologically charged, accounts of the past or present specific value systems (often derived from one particular group) as societal norms. As an example of material culture, a monument is, by its nature, built not for its mimetic qualities but as something which is rich in symbolism and which represents and embodies certain ‘noble’ characteristics for the purposes of informing its audience, propagandising, revering people and events and extolling human virtues. The symbolic and representational attributes of a monument create a discursive space, a potentially contested space, a space of tension, confusion and negotiation, where history, mythology, beliefs, attitudes and biases collide, and where each has the potential to be questioned and challenged.

8.2 Summary of Thesis Findings

Objective 1 – To examine the motives and processes which led to the development and construction of the ATM as a monument to the Afrikaans language

This study has described the socio-political process that led to the construction of a permanent concrete and granite structure to ‘monumentalise’ the Afrikaans language. The literature on the nature of monuments and on their roles as visitor attractions was examined, and the valuable contributions of Alois Riegl (1982) and his taxonomy of monuments guided the discussion of the role of the ATM as a monument (Chapter 3). The ATM bears many of the hallmarks associated with monuments: prominence and visibility; size; permanence; stylised subject matter; and symbolism and abstract qualities. To most fully understand this particular aspect of the monumentalisation process, a detailed exploration, drawing upon archival and other historical sources concerning how and why the ATM was conceived, designed and constructed was presented.

The thesis has addressed the issue of the contested, ephemeral nature of monuments in general, and of the ATM in particular, arguing that over time and due to changing socio-cultural contexts, the purpose, function and meaning of monuments become ‘disjointed,
partial and dismembered’ (Bunn, 1995:108). As a consequence of these changes, the ongoing viability and relevance of monuments come to be re-evaluated. Re-evaluation and re-interpretation can have powerful roles in altering, informing and directing the future of a monument. Such changes may result in its destruction, or its continued preservation and conservation, or its reinstatement with an alternative function, depending upon the social, political or ideological imperatives driving the re-evaluation. The ‘conceptual challenge for monuments in a new South Africa is to ensure that their meaning, not only their structural form is durable’ (Hart & Winter, 2001:91). Important challenges today for the ATM’s management are to develop ways to best proceed in its responsibility, in recognising its shift in cultural value since the advent of the ‘New Dispensation’ in 1994, and to protect and promote the cultural heritage of all South Africans through a monument which, from its inception it can be argued, illustrates how Afrikaner nationalism in the mid-twentieth century claimed certain artefacts as symbolic of Afrikaner supremacy.

Critics such as Sabine Marschall (2009:168), argue that ‘[m]onuments still end up pitching one racial or ethnic group against another, because monuments are inevitably exclusive to some extent in order to be meaningful as symbols of group identification based on selected cultural values’. The case of the ATM illustrates that recent attempts to re-semanticise such an iconic monument have important parallels for both tourism and politico-ideological ambitions. To implant the existing monument with a new, ‘improved’ identity, engendering humanist sympathies rather than widespread contempt, suggests that no longer is Afrikaans simply the ‘language of the oppressors’ (Tutu, n.d.) and the Monument no longer conceived of as its tangible representation. The strategy being pursued by ATM management demonstrates that, by subverting its associations with the ‘old’ South Africa, the ATM now serves as a focal point and symbol of transformation and South African nationalist aspirations (Report by ATM Council, 2006), in an attempt to draw people into an association with it, irrespective of their political or linguistic affiliations. Management of the ATM, driven by its mission and vision statement to orientate towards an expression of national identity and changing aspirations, is today disseminating a new image, in contrast to its former incarnation, to exploit the new-founded democracy and philosophy of inclusiveness and
inclusivity, and to promote cohesiveness, linguistic, cultural and social interrelationships. To use Ockman’s terminology (quoted in Smith 2007:84), the Monument is having a radical cultural effect by entering into a ‘wider conversation’. This corresponds with the government’s re-evaluation of the role of monuments within a democratic nation and their ‘re-semanticisation’ (Smith, 2007:88) to fit them with current philosophies. Strong efforts are being made to re-semanticise the ATM in the spirit of nation-building as a symbol of bridge-building and reconciliation, in a multicultural and historically divided country. To reclaim the ATM as a South African symbol—as an ‘institution of the state’ (Woodward, 1992)—is a means by which the government can deploy monumental structures to communicate its political agenda and strategies, and to assist its political objectives in a synthesis of monumental and governmental aspirations. Monuments, then, can be important symbols in the creation of a new national identity. If the roles played by existing individual monuments can be guided by national goals and policies of reconciliation, mutual understanding and respect for and pride in the ‘new’ South Africa, then such monuments can make valuable contributions to the bridging of the ethnic and cultural divides which have dominated South Africa for much of its history.

**Objective 2 – To describe and analyse the ATM as a tourist attraction**

Because the emphasis of this thesis has been on visitor experiences and meaning making of the ATM, the review of the literature (Chapters 2 and 3) called for a broad approach which would locate and position the ATM not only as a monument, but also as a visitor attraction. The various theoretical perspectives have been extended to include the notion of visitors’ perspectives as an important characteristic in determining the nature of a visitor attraction. The extent to which the Monument served more as a backdrop for the surrounding landscape than as an attraction in its own right was discussed, making use of both Gunn’s (1988) and MacCannell’s triadic visitor attraction models to explain the multi-perspective nature of the ATM. Depending upon a visitor’s perspective, rather than the Monument being the ‘nucleus’ (to use Gunn’s [1988] analogy) of the particular attraction system, in some respects it formed the periphery, while the landscape surrounding the Monument formed the nucleus of the visitor experience. In this respect, the attraction is one which looks outwardly from the ATM,
to the landscape over which it ‘lauds’, rather than, or as well as, inwardly to the Monument. The Monument is depicted in sympathy, both with the natural world and with the role that it was called upon to play in the naturalisation of a historical narrative. Van Wijk described the form of the Monument as one which anticipated the future of the Afrikaans language through its sympathy with the natural world. He wrote: ‘You can see that the monument turns towards the east. It turns towards the morning sun—to the rising sun—to the day of tomorrow—to the growing day—to the following day’ (quoted in Beningfield, 2004:520). Paradoxically, at the same time, however, the structure, its component features and its design make for it being very much an inward looking attraction which draws visitors to its ‘heart’—the wellspring of Afrikaans—in the form of the bubbling fountain. From this perspective, the ATM adheres consistently with MacCannell’s conception of sight sacralisation, although its status is complicated by the fact that the whole site turns into an inviolate zone (Gunn, 1988), with the surrounding landscape creating a new nucleus and forming a two-clustered visitor precinct. That it serves these dual functions and can draw the visitor in both directions attests to the importance to the Monument of its surrounding physical context and the symbolism associated with the landscape within which it sits.

This thesis also introduces the idea that the ATM comprises two dimensions: the conceptual; and the narrative. Each tourist to the ATM will construct an individual narrative from a range of different information sources. Following Dean MacCannell (1976:110), narratives are regarded as markers (i.e., information about a specific sight [or nucleus]), and thus as important factors in the creation of a tourist attraction system. Some sites require only minimal markers to enable visitors to understand them, while others need an interpretive framework to guide the visitor’s understanding. In some cases, the ‘nucleus’ of an attraction may contain sufficient contiguous on-site markers to become attraction nuclei in their own right, but in the context of the ATM, there are few on-site markers provided to assist visitors in interpreting the site. Visitors to the ATM are offered an ‘official’ interpretation by way of a leaflet which includes some of the historical context and reference to the symbolism attached to the ATM’s component parts and tour guide oral narratives.
Objective 3 – To explore the ways in which visitors interact with the ATM

By employing a phenomenological, hermeneutic approach, data were collected through observations and interviews. Chapter 6 addressed the third research objective by exploring the ways in which visitors interact with ATM. The outcome of this part of the study has identified the importance of the design of the Monument and its effect on visitor movement through and around the site. The results derived from the observations of visitors’ sensory and corporeal engagement with the ATM demonstrated the dynamic cognitive and affective relationship that develops between an attraction and the visitor. Evidence of this relationship manifested itself through many of the activities in which visitors engaged, and through their verbal and nonverbal comments and responses.

Chapter 6 identified the importance of the design of the Monument and its effect on visitor movement around the site. With the aid of the interpretive leaflet, visitors embark upon a ‘journey’ in and around the history and development of Afrikaans. Visitors follow a generally uni-directional trajectory which allows for the unfolding of a narrative which symbolically encapsulates the history and development of the Afrikaans language, from its origins, through to its (perceived) ongoing importance within South Africa.

The thesis has sought to address some of the salient points surrounding the nature of visitor experiences at attractions by demonstrating the restrictive nature of a purely visual perspective, dominated by Urry’s (1990) notion of the ‘gaze’. Urry’s notion has received overarching prominence in much of the literature. However, this thesis has demonstrated that there is a much richer way of investigating the visitor experience of an attraction. This thesis asserts that by utilizing a holistic, multi-sensory approach not restricted to the dominance of the visual, a broader appreciation of the visitor experience is realised. In their very presence at a site or attraction, visitors are immersed in a multi-sensual experience. At the ATM, visitors touch, smell, hear sounds and, at the Volksmond Café, can even taste the food which has its origins in the Afrikaner community. The influential contributions by Howes (2003, 2004, 2006, 2011) and Classen (1993, 1997) on the multi-sensory nature of experience have guided the
evaluation of visitors’ interactions with, experiences of, and responses to, the ATM in this study.

Recent developments in the discipline of tourism studies have seen a move away from a preoccupation with visual aspects of tourism, as epitomised by Urry’s (1990) notion of the ‘tourist gaze’ towards a greater engagement with tourist experience and practice as being spatialised, multi-sensory and embodied. The literature examining the holistic all-sensory, lived visitor experience, such as the work of Moscardo (1999, 2007) and Pearce (2011), and particularly Edensor’s (1998, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2006) contributions on visitor ‘performance’, proved invaluable. Even Urry, in his most recent thinking on visuality, proposes that the gaze is performative and involves ‘touching and doing’ rather than just seeing (Urry & Larsen, 2011:15).

This study has taken up the challenge towards a greater holistic engagement with visitor experience and practice. Edensor’s work has been instrumental in framing the ways in which visitors make sense of an attraction. In adopting the extended metaphors of performance and performativity, Edensor’s formulation, visitors ‘perform’ their roles in their ‘staged’ visitor experience, and it is in the enaction of these roles, through the processes of walking, gazing, photographing and remembering that visitors interpret and give meaning to an attraction. Edensor, however, fails to take into account the holistic sensory experiences involved in those enaction processes, so a fifth process, entitled ‘Visitor Embodiment & Sensory Encounters’, has been included in this thesis to further extend Edensor’s work in the area of the visitor experience.

Through different situated practices and corporeal encounters, the visitor engages with the Monument through a combination of representations, discourses, actions and sensory engagement. The visitor, it is strongly argued, is located firmly at the centre of the production of an attraction and not as a passive recipient or consumer. A visitor’s practices and actions, perceptions, beliefs, contexts, attitudes, opinions, ideas, thoughts and interpretations all contribute in their own way to the development of the holistic visitor experience, which, in turn, is a major contributor to the meaning made of an
attraction. Interestingly, and quite unexpectedly, my observations revealed that the majority of visitors acted and performed their roles as if ‘scripted’.

Findings suggested that the nature of the visitor experience is one very much ‘scripted’, and that the script was overwhelmingly adhered to by the majority of visitors. The ‘strength’ and ‘depth’ of that experience depends very much upon the ‘emotional engagement’ (Rossman & Ellis, 2012:5) invested by the visitor. Visitor interpretation, it is demonstrated, can be both a facilitator of emotional experience to make people more aware of the places they visit and a means to gain knowledge or voice opinion.

**Objective 4 – To critically examine why visitors visit the ATM, how they make meaning of the attraction, and the interpretation and meanings that visitors attach to the Monument**

Site interpretation is critical in endowing attractions and sites with meaning. The relative value of interpretive signage provided for visitors has been discussed, as have the contributions of guides in influencing visitors’ own interpretations of sites. If we hold the view that attractions are not so much consumed but created and constructed by visitors through their activities or ‘performances’, coupled with their sensory involvement with and affective perceptions of a site, then this may support arguments for the minimisation of interpretive signage at visitor attractions (Bramwell & Lane, 1993). The importance of site interpretation as a facilitator enabling visitors to process and interpret the material towards a bespoke type of experience was highlighted by a number of interviewees who visited the ATM. For these interviewees, the lack of interpretive signage and the abstract nature of the construction provided insufficient cues to prompt any considered interpretation or meaning of the Monument. Although there is a long held view that site interpretation should challenge and provoke the visitor (e.g., Tilden, 1957), it is important to keep in mind the fact that the Monument is representative of something intangible and, unlike more tangible heritage, it does not readily ‘speak for itself’, except to those well-versed in its story and its historical terrain. Despite these interpretive drawbacks, the majority of comments made were wide and varying, ranging from personal, moral and ethical issues, to questions of historical and technical fact. Most visitors, it seemed, were sufficiently engaged with the Monument to draw certain cognitive and affective conclusions about it. A plausible
conclusion which might be drawn from this study is that the best form of interpretation is one which allows for a blend of public or ‘official’ and private interpretation, based on experience and prior knowledge.

Meaning is, itself, created, situated and instantiated by visitors’ interactions with, and responses to, a site. This conceptual perspective has informed this thesis by exploring the ATM as an example of a contested visitor attraction between groups of people with divergent motives for visiting it, and with various claims on it. It has already been shown that the lack of interpretive signage contributes at least in part to the variety of meanings attributed to the Monument. People with differing degrees of attachment to the Monument are identified, using the notion of the ‘proximity-distance continuum’ which I have developed. Rather than presenting a static dichotomy between ‘insiders’ and ‘outsiders’, this framework accounts for the many subtle shadings of human interaction with place, which is seen to fall somewhere along a continuum. The boundaries between proximity and distance are porous rather than concrete, and people's relationships with a place may be transformed over time. This finding has implications for the meanings attributed to attractions in general and the ATM in particular as it takes on a new and more diverse role as a monument in today’s South Africa.

Chapter 7 is informed by comments from visitors about the ATM’s design, symbolism and message to demonstrate how tourism narratives recreate multiple and sometimes conflicting versions of the meanings associated with visitor attractions. The nature of the relationship between visitor and attraction was further revealed in the responses of those visitors interviewed in Chapter 7. Questions asked of interviewees sought to reveal their reasons for visiting the Monument, and their understandings of, attitudes to, and feelings towards the ATM. The depth of visitor engagement with the ATM depended upon a number of social, cultural, aesthetic, ethnic and linguistic variables, each of which influenced and impacted upon visitors in formulating their interpretation of the attraction or what meaning they could ascribe to it. Differing visitors’ comments about the ATM’s design, symbolism and message demonstrated how tourism narratives recreate multiple and sometimes conflicting versions of the meanings associated with
visitor attractions. For international visitors with little or no previous knowledge of the ATM, for example, few if any were aware of alternative or contesting narrative possibilities. As evidenced by their comments, few had any substantial knowledge of the historical circumstances surrounding the origins and development of the Afrikaans language or of its political context. This lack of understanding meant that the symbolic nature of the design did not resonate with them. Most were curious as why a monument would be erected in commemoration of a language. For many of those who felt a very close (linguistic or ethnic) affinity to the Monument, the ‘official’ narratives which shaped the symbolic meanings of the site were widely accepted, although, of course, some visitors willingly expressed their criticism of the Monument or of what it represented.

Visitors’ interpretations of the ATM came about as an outcome of an interactive process which included their corporeal and sensorial encounters with the Monument, coupled with their intellectual or cognitive perceptions or understandings. It is in the relationship formed by visitors with the attraction and in their embodied, sensory encounter that I argue that meaning occurs. It is in the juxtaposition between the material and non-material aspects of the Monument and the physical and cognitive experiences of the visiting public which create the powerful connection between the material manifestation of any attraction and its interpretation and meanings. This thesis argues that the ATM is a symbolic visitor attraction and is a contested space where multiple layers of meanings are embedded and because different interpretations and different interests are in competition. The comments by those participants at the Monument and others who were interviewed elsewhere demonstrated the array of opinions, attitudes and understandings of the ATM, and what it represented in the past and what it represents now. These meanings were at times conflicting, and yet at other times complementary, and the major recurring themes which emerged through the interview process is evidence to the many complementary perspectives and meanings which visitors shared.
8.3 Conclusion and Theoretical Contributions

This thesis extends the knowledge of monuments as attractions and visitor practice, interpretation and meaning-making in a number of ways. In terms of its theoretical contributions, this thesis has demonstrated the ongoing efficacy of the ‘classic’ visitor attraction conceptualisations of MacCannell (1976, 2001), Gunn (1979, 1988), Pearce (1991, 2005) and Lew (1987). It extends the analysis of visitor attractions beyond the ‘ocluarcentric’ nature of Urry’s (1990) tourist gaze to present a holistic, embodied and sensory approach with a view to understanding their role in visitor experiences. To that end, Edensor’s (1998, 2000, 2001, 2006) work has informed much of the theoretical discussion of the visitors’ activities at, and experiences of, an attraction as ‘performance’. To Edensor’s (1998:105) ‘roles’ or ‘embodied enactions’ of walking, gazing, photographing and remembering, I add ‘Visitor Embodiment & Sensory Encounters’, to more closely account for a visitor’s actual corporeal and sensory engagement with an attraction and how that engagement contributes to a visitor’s interpretation and meaning made of an attraction.

This thesis also makes a contribution to the study of a particular aspect of intangible cultural heritage, language, by uncovering a small, but increasing, number of sites around the world which have been designed to promote some language-related theme. These sites appear to be becoming increasingly important foci for visitors, but there is a paucity of research exploring the difficulties or impediments to making meaning out of a monument related to language. In terms of the actual language used by visitors, an interesting finding of the study has been in the words used by visitors to describe the ATM. For the most part, the words were more emotional than cognitive. Words such as ‘beautiful’, ‘amazing’, ‘strange’ and ‘peaceful’ were frequently used by visitors to describe their feelings about the Monument and the site. One could extrapolate from this that the use of such language suggests that the lack of on-site narrative or interpretative signage means that for many visitors, at least superficially, their experience of the attraction was less cerebral than affective.

This thesis has concentrated on an examination of visitors’ movement and the activities in which they partook in and around the Monument. The corollary of movement is
stasis and this thesis makes a contribution to knowledge with regard to the theorising of stasis in the visitor experience, something which has received little scholarly attention. It is through the senses that visitors gain an understanding of an attraction which allows them to interpret and give meaning to what they are experiencing. Yet, it may be when visitors are stopped at particular locations that they engage most fully in their experience of an attraction, particularly in terms of their thoughts; stopping affords the visitor an opportunity for contemplation, consideration or some other cognitive engagement before moving on. Perhaps there is much more importance to these key stopping locations than might have been previously thought. They may, for example, serve as important and necessary reflection points for the assimilation of the accumulated cognitive, sensory and corporeal input derived from the visitor’s movement in and around a site.

Through different situated practices and corporeal encounters, visitors were seen to engage with the Monument through a combination of representations, discourses, actions and sensory engagement. In this respect, this thesis strongly argues that the visitor is located firmly at the centre of the production of an attraction; and therefore the visitor is not a passive recipient or consumer. Visitors’ practices and actions, perceptions, beliefs, contexts, attitudes, opinions, ideas, thoughts and interpretations contribute to the development of the holistic visitor experience, and these, in turn, make major contributions to the meanings made of an attraction.

Finally, in one respect, this thesis could be described as timely. The research trajectory of the thesis has afforded me the opportunity to meet with and to capture first-hand the stories of the remaining few people who had direct involvement with the conception, design, construction and inauguration of the ATM. To be allowed entrée into their memories and recollections has certainly been a privilege. Had this project not been pursued and I had not been given the chance to interview those individuals, those stories and insights would otherwise have been lost. Methodologically, then, the study provides strong evidence of the efficacy of engaged experience and fieldwork, and of the successful use of broad, interrelated data-gathering methods for improving our overall understanding of the relationships between visitors and attractions. Drawing upon,
among other things, an extensive range of historical documents (including ones which needed to be translated), the support and advice of local people and institutions, visitor interviews and detailed observations of visitor behaviour at the Monument, this thesis has presented innovative ways in which these data could be used to expand theoretical and applied knowledge of a monument’s management and of its audience. The thesis has sought to expose to a wider audience the complexities surrounding the discussion of visitor attractions in general and of monuments more particularly in the context of tourism studies by travailing the complex issues of the phenomenology of monuments and by responding to an array of theoretical perspectives. It demonstrates how an example of ‘material culture’ can be viewed as an ‘actor’, as having agency as it impacts upon and influences, ideationally, conceptually, symbolically and emotionally, those with whom it ‘interacts’. The thesis demonstrates, through the use and extension of Edensor’s (1998) theoretical model that attractions are ‘made’ by the performances of those who visit them. It also shows that, far from being pre-existing and static entities acted upon by visitors, attractions, in their interactional capacity, are co-authored, negotiated, multivalent spaces. This is evidenced in the analysis of visitor observations and of visitor comments in Chapters 6 and 7, the latter particularly in terms of the frequency of aesthetic responses. By linking aesthetic judgement (as part of an embodied experience) to symbolism and meaning-making opens up new avenues of thinking about visitor responses to heritage sites. The thesis introduces Hall, Derrida and Bourdieu when discussing heritage interpretation, to transcend the notion of heritage interpretation as being inherently didactic. Similarly, the thesis extends the findings and conceptualisations of such theorists as MacCannell by demonstrating the inability of MacCannell’s semiotic theory of attractions to fully explain the ATM in terms of visitation (pp. 165ff.).

8.4 Implications for Future Research

The findings of this study suggest several possible directions for future research projects. Language is given scant attention in the tourism literature and a search on any relevant academic database will reveal the dearth of scholarship devoted to the study of language-related attractions. Few authors (Beningfield, 2004; Burden, 2004; Herwitz, 2011; Marschall, 2006) write in any detail about South African monuments and fewer
still (Beningfield, 2004; Burden, 2004) have written about the ATM. In an attempt to rectify this imbalance, this study has, through a phenomenological, hermeneutic methodological approach, broadened and deepened our understanding of a particular arena within cultural heritage, language, and provided new perspectives on the nature of the visitor experience at such types of attractions. Further research into the different types of language-related attractions and visitor engagement with them would be valuable.

There is also much yet to be done in terms of the analysis of monuments as visitor attractions. The introduction of Alois Riegl’s (1982) important but little known work into the discussion of monuments will, it is hoped, encourage other scholars to make use of his categorisations to further the understanding and analysis of this particular type of visitor attraction. Research into monuments has been dedicated to their rhetorical messages and functions. Little attention, however, has been devoted to the rhetoric of sites whose subject matter has undergone symbolic transformation. There is still much to be done in terms of the study of visitor attractions and the visitor experience. There is also much yet to be done in terms of the analysis of monuments as visitor attractions.

Future research agendas might more closely address the notion of visitor *stasis*, to examine reasons as to why visitors stop, be it for contemplation or reflection, or for more practical reasons such as rest. Closer examination and analysis as to the reasons why visitors choose to stop at certain locations and what activities and thoughts they engage in there would serve to build a broader and more nuanced theoretical knowledge of the ways in which attractions are experienced by visitors and the processes by which meanings are constructed out of those experiences.

This thesis has opened up lines of enquiry by using a particular methodological approach, which synthesises data drawn from archival research, interviews with key informants, on-site observations and interviews. It has shown the importance of using more than an ‘ocularcentric’ perspective when analysing an attraction and of the importance in the incorporation of the corporeal, sensorial and affective elements of the visitor experience to produce a more holistic analysis. Work which embraces similar lines of inquiry would help add great depth to understandings of tourist attractions,
particularly as to their socio-political contexts and dynamic location within those contexts.

In terms of the ‘research journey’, the Ph.D. ‘project’ has left an indelible mark on me as a researcher, scholar and person. Over the period of the fieldwork, I became increasingly experienced and confident in my capacity to observe the actions and activities of visitors to the ATM and in interviewing techniques and strategies. Fortunately, I had lived and worked overseas for extended periods before and was prepared for and responded to the many inevitable challenges which one would expect to face when working far from the relative comfort of home. Fears, frustrations, apprehensions, disappointments or anxieties of living and working in an unfamiliar environment were few and as I became more ‘acclimatised’ to the society and culture within which I was living and moving, I gradually increased my circle of friends and acquaintances and felt very relaxed in conducting my research. The support received from the staff of the ATM and Museum and other interested community members was certainly instrumental in my feeling reassured me that what I was doing was of merit and allayed any feelings of loneliness and isolation to which I might otherwise have been prone. It would be supercilious of me to suggest that others’ experiences of fieldwork would mirror my own. For me, it can be said though, the fieldwork experience was incredibly fascinating and immensely rewarding. This is not to say that I did not struggle with my fieldwork at times. Had I not had, for example, the additional financial support offered to me by the School of Tourism & Hospitality Management of Southern Cross University which allowed me to hire a car for the majority of time of my fieldwork, the overall experience would have been much less rewarding. Simply visiting the Monument on a daily basis and the practicalities associated with meeting with key informants in Cape Town, at Stellenbosch University, in Paarl, Somerset West, Strand Wellington and Wilderness, for example, would have been fraught with frustrations and limitations as public transport to such places is sporadic at best and, as I was informed, a potentially risky undertaking.

It was the ‘writing up’ stage which proved to be quite a cathartic experience, affording me the opportunity for personal reflection on the philosophical, practical, ethical and political aspects of the research process and during which time I could give greater thought to the strengths, shortcomings and limitations of the research process which I had undertaken.
I am confident that the methodological foundation to my study and the framework of strategies and techniques used in capturing the data related to visitors’ actions and activities were both appropriate and adequate. Careful consideration of such things as ethical concerns, accessing respondents, the importance of building up a network of key informants, trust and rapport building and of the types of questions I would ask meant that the design of the interview and questioning process was more than appropriate. Their success was reflected in the quality of the richly detailed and nuanced data which I was able to collect for analysis. The capacity to ‘overhear’ visitors’ comments would have been beneficial. Had my Afrikaans been anywhere near conversational level, I am certain that the interview data with Afrikaans speakers would have been richer, as it undoubtedly would have been had I spoken German, Hebrew, Spanish, Chinese, Dutch, Hindi or isiXhosa, but this limitation has already been flagged in Section 4.5.

8.5 Summation

Arguably, the ATM stands today as an artefact—a relic even—of the ‘old’ South Africa; an artefact which does not reflect current social and political ideologies. Since well before its inauguration in 1975 and since, the ATM has stirred, and continues to stir, a remarkable polemic, and it remains very much a part of social, cultural, ethnic, political and linguistic debates, not simply in its role and function as a monument, but in the values that it promulgates today and into the future. After the demise of the apartheid regime, there was an (expected) backlash which sought to wipe any monumental vestiges of the previous regime from the South African landscape (Herwitz, 2011), including calls for the dismantling of the ATM which was seen to belie the current nationalist project and, some would argue, stand the monument in an anachronistic past and as an ongoing testimony to the previous autocratic and authoritarian regime. To maintain such historical structures, it was argued, would continue to remind people of the oppression suffered by millions under the previous regime, would continue to grant ongoing legitimacy to the people who helped create, serve and maintain that regime, and would unnecessarily prolong any painful memories they might invoke. This required a sensitive approach on the part of the government, led by Nelson Mandela, who called for calm and rational consideration of these matters.
It is stated in the mission and vision statement of the ATM that ‘Afrikaans may be respected and appreciated to its full extent and as inclusively as possible’ by building relationships with all South Africans through the medium of Afrikaans and in the context of multilingualism’ (ATM website). For the ATM, there has been a shift in emphasis or status away from extolling a sense of Afrikaner ‘ethno-nationalism’ from which the ATM sprang, to one of linguistic association and an inclusive approach, with a variety of uses and functions. The ATM has become an important synecdoche for an inclusive South Africa. Jan van Wijk described the process of designing and constructing the ATM as a process of discovery (Beningfield, 2004: 520):

The English say—‘you build a monument for your language—is the thing dead?’ We say we build a monument because we still want to discover it. Is that not wonderful? If we speak about a monument it is something that still lies ahead.

Through the story of the ATM, from its inception, design, construction and inauguration, to its role as a valuable tourism asset, and to the ways in which it is interpreted and meaning made of it, this thesis has, above all, traced a path of discovery of one particular aspect of the process of ‘monumentalisation’.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 LANGUAGE-RELATED VISITOR ATTRACTIONS

APPENDIX 1.1 AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE MONUMENTS, SOUTH AFRICA

Eastern Cape Province
   East London

Free State
   Kroonstad
   Petrus Steyn
   Reddersberg
   Reitz
   Welkom

Gauteng Province
   Johannesburg

KwaZulu-Natal Province
   Belfort

Limpopo Province
   Louis Trichardt
   Ohrigstad

Mpumulanga Province
   Ermelo

North-West Province
   Delareyville
   Lichtenburg
   Ventersdorp
Western Cape Province

Paarl, Afrikaanse Taalmonument

Paarl Boys’ High School

Touws River

Worcester
APPENDIX 1.2 LANGUAGE & LANGUAGE-RELATED MONUMENTS

Australia

Sydney, Ashfield Park Shaheed Minar, ‘Language Martyrs’ Monument Replica

Bangladesh

Dhaka Shaheed Minar, ‘Language Martyrs’ Monument

Canada

Surrey, British Columbia Lingua Aqua Mother Language Monument

Toronto, Ontario International Mother Language Day Monument

Winnipeg, Manitoba Shaheed Minar, ‘Language Martyrs’ Monument Replica

England

Birmingham International Mother Language Monument

London, Tower Hamlets Shaheed Minar, ‘Language Martyrs’ Monument Replica

Manchester, Westwood, Oldham Shaheed Minar, ‘Language Martyrs’ Monument Replica

Mali

Bamako Obélisque des idéogrammes (Hamdallaye Obelisk)

Russia

Belgograd Monument to the Russian Language

Moscow Statue of Sts Cyril & Methodius
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Monument/Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Burgersdorp, ECP</td>
<td>Dutch Language Monument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>Bust of Dr Lazar Zamenhof, Creator or Esperanto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1.3 LANGUAGE DAYS & LANGUAGE FESTIVALS

Globally

Deutsche Sprachetag (German Language Day)—celebrating the diversity and rich history of the German language; various dates

International Mother Language Day—initially announced by UNESCO in 1999 to promote global awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity; annually, 21 February

Journée internationale de la Francophonie (International Day of Francophonie), commemorating the founding of the ‘Francophonie’, an international organisation of member states where there is a notable affiliation with the French language or culture; annually, 20 March

Lingva Festivalo (Festival of Language)—cultural and educational event held by Esperanto organisations in different countries of the world to provide information about as many different languages of the world as possible and to demonstrate that all languages in the world are equally important and valuable; annually, various times

Australia

Doomadgee, Qld

Waanyi Language Festival—showcasing the Waanyi language and providing activities for all ages; acts as a vital component in the revitalisation of the Waanyi language; annually, in association with the Doomadgee Rodeo, August

Toowoomba, Qld

Toowoomba Languages & Cultures Festival—celebrating the diversity of languages and cultures that exist within the Toowoomba region; annually, August
China

Beijing

Beijing Foreign Language Festival—jointly organised by the Organising Committee of Beijing Speaks Foreign Language Program, the Foreign Affairs Office of the Beijing Municipal Government and the Publicity Department of the Beijing Municipal CPC Committee, serves as a platform for language lovers to communicate and share experiences and encourages people to get involved in foreign-language learning; annually, two days in June

Dominica

Nationwide

Jounen Kweyol (Creole Day)—celebrating Creole language and culture; annually, last Friday of October

England

Sheffield

International Languages Festival—Sheffield University—introducing and teaching 150 different languages and dialects from across the globe, including a wide selection of African languages, Chinese dialects, English dialects and special languages and codes such as Sign Language or Braille; annually, two days in March

Estonia

Nationwide

Emakelepeaev (Native Language Day)—celebrating the Estonian language on the birthday of Kristjan Jaak Peterson (1801–22), commonly considered the founder of modern Estonian poetry and regarded as a herald of Estonian national literature; annually, 14 March

Ireland

Dublin

IMRAM Irish Language Literature Festival—demonstrating the depth and diversity of modern literature in Irish, through poetry, prose and music, film, drama, puppetry, debates, lectures, and writing workshops by placing the Irish
language and its literature at the heart of public life within a modern, energetic and multicultural framework; annually, September

Korea (Republic)

Nationwide

*Hangul Proclamation Day* or *Korean Alphabet Day* -- national commemorative day marking the invention and the proclamation of the native alphabet of the Korean language by King Sejong the Great in the *Hunmin Jeongeum*, the document introducing the newly created alphabet; annually, 9 October

Korea (Democratic People’s Republic)

Nationwide

*Chosun-Gul Day*--marking the day in 1444 believed to be that of the actual creation of *Hunmin Jeongeum*, the document introducing the newly created alphabet; annually, 15 January

Lebanon

Beirut

‘We Are Our Language’—The Arabic Language Festival)—celebrating the Arabic language, culture and history; 26 June

Malaysia

Kuala Lumpur

*Japanese Language Festival*-- jointly organised by the Japanese Language Society of Malaysia (JLSM), the Ministry of Education of Malaysia, the Embassy of Japan in Malaysia, and the Japan Foundation Kuala Lumpur and including Japanese cultural workshops, competitions in speaking, *koinobori*, *kageshibai*, *soranbushi*, wearing *yukata*; annually, May

Singapore

*Tamil Language Festival*-- promoting the speaking of Tamil Language amongst Singapore Indians and encompassing
South Africa

Oudtshoorn, WCP

*Klein Karoo Nasionale Kunstefees* (Little Karoo National Arts Festival)—an Afrikaans language arts festival, the largest South African arts festival, officially recognized by the South African government as a national arts festival; annually, eight days, March/April

Paarl, WCP

*Cultivaria*—Afrikaans language arts festival; annually, four days in October

Potchefstroom, NWP

*Aardklop* (‘Earthbeat’) National Arts Festival—primarily an Afrikaans-language arts festival; annually, one week, September

Pietermaritzburg

*CHS Language Festival*—College of Human Sciences, University of South Africa—celebrating the linguistic and cultural diversity and heritage of South Africa and teaching people about the cultural diversity of others in order to increase tolerance; including traditional African dance, music, storytelling, dress and design, poetry, food, Indian music and dance, with simultaneous interpretation into Zulu, Afrikaans, German and South African sign language; annually, 2 days in September

St. Lucia

Nationwide

*Jounen Kwéyol Enternasyonal* (International Creole Day)—celebrating Creole language and culture; annually, last Sunday of October

Turkey

Istanbul & nationwide

*International Turkish Olympiads*—organised by the International Turkish Education Association (TÜRKÇEDER)—competitors from around the world who have won home country competitions offer a variety of performances in Turkish on stages across the nation, are judged,
awarded medals; includes opening and closing ceremonies; annually, two weeks in June

**United States of America**

**Albuquerque, NM**

*Native Language Festival*—culmination of the New Mexico Association for Bilingual Education Conference; annually, April

**New York City**

*Yidish Tog*—celebrating Yiddish language and culture; first Sunday, November

**Wales**

**Cardiff**

*Tafwyl Festival*—weeklong celebration of the Welsh language, promoting Welsh produce, with workshops, literary sessions, music, cookery, art and drama, live musical performances and children’s activities; annually, late June

**Various places**

*Gwyliau* (Festivals)—celebrating Welsh literature, music, art, film, folk dancing and sports; annually, June-August, November

**Multi-locational**

*Genedlaethol Cymru* (The National Eisteddfod of Wales)—celebrating Welsh language, literature and culture in poetry, literature, dance and musical performances; annually, July-August
APPENDIX 1.4  LANGUAGE MUSEUMS

Australia

Beenleigh, Qld  Yugambeh Museum, Language & Heritage Research Centre

Belgium

Bilzen  Taalmuseum ‘Tesi Samanunga’

Brazil

Sao Paulo  Museu da Lingua Portuguesa (Museum of the Portuguese Language)

Canada

web-based  Canadian Language Museum/Musée canadien des langues

China

Jiangyong, Hunan  Nüshu (女書) Language Museum

Denmark

Aarhus  International Language Museum

Hungary

Szephalom  Hungarian Language Museum

Italy

Dronero  Museo de Son de Lenga (Sound Museum of the Occitan Language)

Lithuania

Vilnius  Lituanistikos židinys (Lithuanian Language Museum)

South Africa

Paarl, WCP  Afrikaanse Taalmuseum (Afrikaans Language Museum)

Ukraine

Kiev  Lingvistisk Museum (Linguistic Museum of National Taras Shevchenko University of Kiev)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Museum Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Park, MD</td>
<td>National Museum of Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kodiak, AK</td>
<td>Alutiiq Museum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1.5 LANGUAGE TRAILS

Australia

Perth

*Indonesian Language Trail, Perth Zoo*—providing an opportunity for students to practise listening, reading and writing in Indonesian by studying some of the Indonesian animals in the Zoo’s collection and making observations about animal structure, behaviour and habitat.

England

Various places

*Foreign Language Trails*—providing foreign students visiting different parts of England an opportunity to see all the sights and learn about the local area in English.

Spain

San Millán de la Cogolla
Santo Domingo de Silos
Valladolid
Alcalá de Henares
Salamanca
Ávila

Camino de la Lengua Castellana (Spanish Language Route), travelling through six towns and cities in northern Spain important in the development of the Spanish language and Spanish literature.

Wales

Kilgetty, Pembrokeshire

*Welsh Language Trail, Folly Farm*—providing fluent Welsh speakers with an overview of the key attractions at Folly Farm Adventure Park & Zoo as well as creating a sense of place for visitors to Pembrokeshire by providing them with the Welsh, English and phonetic spelling of key phrases about their day out.
APPENDIX 1.6 LANGUAGE-RELATED MUSEUMS & INSTITUTES

Austria

Vienna **Esperanto Museum**—a museum and technical library, housing library volumes, magazines museum items, hand-written and printed manuscripts, photographs, placards and flyers; includes interactive media stations

**Papyrus Museum**—contains the largest collection of papyri in the world

Bangladesh

Dhaka **International Mother Language Institute**

China

Anyang City, Henan

**National Museum of Chinese Writing**—dedicated to the Chinese writing system, contains a collection of over four thousand items presented in sections covering the evolution of Chinese writing, history of Chinese calligraphy, and the writing systems of China's ethnic minorities

Germany

Berlin **Museum für Kommunikation** (Museum of Communication)—includes collections of technology related to communication

Hamburg **Museum für Kommunikation** (Museum of Communication)—related to telecommunication and the postal service, the collection places emphasis on the difficulties of communication at sea

Mainz **Museum für Druck-, Buch- und Schriftgeschichte aller Kulturen, Gutenberg-Museum** (Museum for the History of Printing, Book & of all Cultures, Gutenberg Museum)—one of the oldest museums of printing in the world which attracts experts and tourists from all corners of the globe

Italy

Dronero **Institut d'Estudis Occitans /Istituto di studi Occitani , ‘Espaci Occitan’**—houses documentation on the language (the language d’Òc), literature, local culture, arts, architecture, history, narratives, customs and traditions of the Italian Occitan region
Mexico  
Virtual Museum of Languages—provides details about the rich linguistic diversity, including grammar, vocabulary, sounds and writing systems

Netherlands  
Amsterdam  
Schriftmuseum J.A. Dortmond—handwriting museum, part of the University of Amsterdam, housing examples of handwriting from 3000 B.C. till now

Tilburg  
Scription—Museum voor Schriftiche Kommunikatie—houses various examples of different writing technologies and writing in its many guises as a form of communication, including graffiti

Norway  
Hovdebygda  
Ivar Aasen-tunet (Ivar Aasen Centre)—national centre for documenting and experiencing the New Norwegian (Nynorsk) written culture, and devoted to the life and work of Ivar Aasen, most well-renowned for laying the foundations for the New Norwegian language

Spain  
Barcelona  
Linguamón—Casa de les Llengües (Linguamón - House of Languages)—culture centre devoted to languages and communication

Switzerland  
Basel  
Basler Papiermuhle (Basel Paper Mill, Swiss Museum for Paper, Writing and Printing)—houses a large collection of paraphernalia associated with paper production and printing, as well as holding workshops in papermaking, typesetting and the creation of decorative paper

Bern  
Museum für Kommunikation (Museum of Communication)—dedicated to history of human communication, providing an overview of communication and its development - from body language to the exchange of information, using both old and new media

United States  
Annapolis Jn, MD  
National Cryptographic Museum—houses a collection of thousands of artifacts that collectively serve to sustain the history of the cryptologic profession
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Museum Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>The Museum of Broadcast Communications</td>
<td>— collects, preserves, and presents historic and contemporary radio and television content as well as educates, informs, and entertains the public through its archives, public programs, screenings, exhibits, publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waxhaw, NC</td>
<td>Museum of the Alphabet</td>
<td>—contains an array of displays and artefacts depicting the history and development of inscribed languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chamberlain, SD</td>
<td>Akta Lakota Museum &amp; Cultural Center</td>
<td>—features collections of art, artefacts and educational displays in English and Lakota depicting the heritage of the Lakota people and affords visitors an experience with a living lesson on the Native American way of life – both past and present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 2 INTERVIEW QUESTIONING GUIDE

Questions were devised to elicit responses from interviewees which would provide data for later examination and analysis.

Whilst the format was generally adhered to, it was flexible and allowed for the conversation to meander through rather than proceed in a pre-determined pattern. Questioning techniques were employed which would not ‘lead’ interviewees, unless it appeared they needed some sort of guidance as to the intentions of my questioning. Time was given to allow interviewees to unravel their thoughts and say what was on their mind and so best enhance the flow of conversation while seeking the best responses from interviewees.

For consistency, I used a standardised outline form to direct my questioning in each of the interviews. Specific questions asked were then guided by the points in each of the sections. The language used in the questioning in some cases needed modification, depending upon the interviewees English-language abilities. Model questions have been included in Section G.

A. Interviewee Demographic Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>30-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>SA local</td>
<td>SA other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Afrikaner</td>
<td>Afrikaans-speaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured South African</td>
<td>Black South African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of visits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Prior Knowledge of the ATM

Guidebook
Tourist promotional literature
Friends
Schooling

Knowledge of the history of the Monument
C. Motivation for Visiting the ATM

Curiosity
Interest in heritage sites
Guided tour
Signage
Accompanying friends/family
Recommendation

D. Impressions of Location & Surroundings

Physical setting
Surrounding landscape
View

Significance of the location

Emotional response to the view/place of the Monument in the landscape

Facilities

E. Impressions of the ATM

Structure
Design
Size
Features/component parts
Composition
    Colour
    Material
    Texture
Atmosphere/mood invoked
Interpretation of the Monument
Meaning of the Monument

F. Activities at the ATM

Photography
Exploring the site
Stopping and admiring view/landscape
Stopping and admiring parts of the Monument
Discussing interpretation/possible meaning of parts of the Monument
Reading leaflet
Reading the quotations from Langenhoven & van Wyk Louw

339
Sitting and reflecting
Eating & drinking at the café
Buying souvenirs from the curio shop
Sensory experiences

G. Visit Outcomes/Overall Experience (including model questions)

Personal perspective/reflection

‘Understanding’ of the Monument

How would you describe your overall impressions of your visit? Positive? Negative? In what ways?

What did you learn about the Monument today?
How has your understanding of the Monument increased today?

Prior knowledge and its influence on interpretation and meaning made Pre-visit beliefs, understanding, prejudices, attitude vis-à-vis post-visit

How have your attitudes or understanding of the Monument changed today?

Expectations met

Did you enjoy your visit here today? What did you enjoy most about the Monument? What didn’t you like about it?

Overall impression of the experience

How would you describe your visit today having been?

Would you describe your visit as a rewarding/memorable/satisfying/dissatisfying visit?

Why? What has made it rewarding/memorable, etc.?

Lasting impressions

What memories do you think you will take home from today’s visit?

Recommendation to others
APPENDIX 3 THE ORIGINS & DEVELOPMENT OF THE AFRIKAANS LANGUAGE

There are about four essential stages in the multifaceted history of language development in South Africa: The first can be credited to the Dutch, when in 1652 they settled in South Africa with the ‘Dutch East India Company’. The second came from the British, first from 1795 and then from 1806-1948 (the periods they subjugated South Africa)—and referred to as the period of ‘Anglicisation’. The third occurred between 1948 and 1994 during the regime of the Nationalist Party, which resulted in the massive advancement of the Afrikaans language and which, in turn, helped the Afrikaans-English bilingualism. This period may be identified as the ‘Afrikanerisation’ of the South African society. The final stage took place from 1994 when there was a transfer from Afrikaans-English bilingualism to linguistic pluralism and democratisation, acknowledging its status as a multilingual state with eleven nationally recognised official languages.

Stage One—1652-1795: The Need for a Lingua Franca

Under the auspices of The Council of Seventeen in Amsterdam who governed the far-reaching empire of the Dutch East India Company (in Dutch, the Vereenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie, the ‘United East India Company’ (VOC), a refreshment depot for the provision of fresh water, vegetables, and meat for ships travelling between Europe and the islands of the Dutch East Indies was set up in what is now Cape Town (Walker, 1968). The first colonists who, under the command of Jan van Riebeeck as governor, arrived in 1652 comprised the Dutch employed by the VOC and Calvinist settlers from the United Provinces (later Netherlands) who were predominantly Dutch-speaking. As it grew, the settlement saw an influx of temporary and more permanent settlers from many diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds, all of whom were employed by or engaged either directly or indirectly with the VOC which, of course, used Dutch in its everyday and trade dealings. Settlers of German origin who spoke a variety of German dialects, as well as a considerable number of settlers from Portugal, Scotland and others from various countries came to the region (Walker, 1968). After the revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685, French Huguenot refugees fleeing anti-Protestant persecution
in Catholic France to the Netherlands were offered free passage by the VOC to the Cape as well as grants of farmland to work (Viljoen, n.d.).

Much of the physical labour needed to develop and maintain the settlement was provided by the VOC in the form of an imported indentured labour and slave workforce from southern India, the Malay peninsula and from Madagascar between 1652 and 1705 who spoke a variety of languages. Contact and interaction was also maintained between the settlers and the indigenous Khoi-Khoi and San people.

Because it was originally governed by the VOC, official language status was afforded to Dutch and there developed an uneven status between the many languages spoken by settlers, visitors and the indentured and slave labour populations. Even since before the arrival of the first Europeans in 1652, however, linguistic difference and diversity had already been a reality in southern Africa and the many different languages spoken by the indigenous Khoi, San and Bantu peoples evidenced the linguistic diversity of this part of the world and served to differentiate diverse tribal affiliations.

The establishment of hierarchical relations between different languages reflected the historically evolved relations of domination and subjugation between the speakers of what Alexander has described as ‘relevant’ languages (Alexander, 2005:3). The linguistic diversity of the people living in close proximity in the Cape settlement meant that a single and sufficiently simple medium of communication was needed to enable business and social transactions to take place. Out of necessity, then, what resulted was the development of a hybrid dialect with a predominantly Dutch base but which was heavily influenced by the vocabulary, syntax and grammatical structures derived from other constituent languages spoken by the people at the Cape settlement and surrounding region (Bradlow, 2008), viz. Malay, Portuguese, Khoi, San, Bantu, German, French and Arabic languages as well as English and which would become the *lingua franca* for the population there (Ponelis, 1993). Gradually, contact between the Dutch spoken in the settlement at the Cape was demonstrably influenced by other languages spoken by people in the region. Specific vocabulary (which Dutch was unable to supply) was needed for the indigenous flora and fauna, as well as terminology which would best describe topographical particularities, types of foods previously unknown to the inhabitants, dishes created using those newly ‘discovered’ foods and
eaten by different sections of the population and innovations created specifically for the
South African context. The dialect which developed became known as Kaapse Hollands (‘Cape Dutch’) and pejoratively as ‘African Dutch’ or ‘Kitchen Dutch’ (kombuistaal), ‘geradbraakte/gebroke/onbeskaafde Hollands’ (mutilated/broken/uncivilised Dutch), as well as ‘verkeerde Nederlands’ (incorrect Dutch’) and by the nineteenth century the vocabulary and grammatical structures of what came to be known as ‘Afrikaans’ had diverged sufficiently from the Dutch spoken in the Netherlands that speakers began agitating for its recognition as a unique and independent language (Bradlow, 2008:173).

Stage Two—‘Anglicisation’, 1795-1803 & 1806-1948

The settlement at Cape Town was subsequently occupied by the British in 1795 when the Netherlands were occupied by revolutionary France, so that the French revolutionaries could not take possession of the Cape with its important strategic location. An improving situation in the Netherlands (the Peace of Amiens) allowed the British to hand back the colony to the Batavian Republic in 1803, but by 1806 resurgent French control in the Netherlands led to another British occupation to prevent Napoleon using the Cape. During the Napoleonic Wars the colony passed into the control of the United Kingdom. This was formally ratified in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna (Walker, 1968).

The earliest known written Afrikaans used Arabic script and was intended for use amongst Cape Town’s Muslim population. By the mid-1800s, however, more and more Afrikaans was appearing in Romanised print (Bradlow, 2008:173), with the first Afrikaans grammars and dictionaries published in 1875 by the Genootskap van Regte Afrikaners (GRA) (Society of True Afrikaners), a society established in Paarl on 14 August 1875 which, amongst other things, campaigned for the recognition of Afrikaans as an official language in South Africa through publications such as a journal in Afrikaans called Die Afrikaanse Patriot (‘The African Patriot’) (January 1976) as well as a number of books, religious material and histories.

This period of time in the nineteenth century in Europe marked an important historical turning point in the construction of modern nationalism. One of the defining features of
the ‘modern’ nation was the unifying nature of an official language, one which may not have been based on any particular ethnic or linguistic grouping but one which served a unifying symbol of the nation. Judt and Lacorne (2004:4), for example, writing of the politics of language in nineteenth century Europe, note that at that time, ‘one no longer said “the nation exists because it has a language”, but rather “the nation exists, therefore it must be given a language”’. ‘National languages,’ writes Eric Hobsbawm in Nations and Nationalism ‘are...almost always semi-artificial constructs and occasionally ... virtually invented. They are,’ he continues, ‘the opposite of what nationalist mythology supposes them to be, namely the primordial foundations of national culture and the matrices of the national mind’ (1990:54). In his book, Language and Politics (2006), John E. Joseph argues that language has a deeply political dimension which runs to the very core of its functioning. He discusses the political implications inherent in the connection between the use of a given language and identity and, accordingly, suggests that identity is created, performed and above all reproduced through language (2003:49). Joseph further explores the relationship between language, nation and identity by pointing out the ideological and symbolic importance of a national standard language in constructing nationhood. In several countries, where two or more linguistic systems coexist, those languages, whilst inextricably tied to the culture and identity of each of the linguistically-differentiated populations will often be subsumed by a ‘national’ language, a sound knowledge of which may hold certain kudos and, afford speakers greater social, cultural, economic and/or political opportunity (Joseph, 2003).

Ever since its establishment, issues around language and language usage have been intimately entwined with the social, cultural, economic and political life of the fledgling settlement. To this day, any debate about the roles, functions and statuses of different languages used in South Africa which have both structured and symbolised the nation-building project remain a highly charged subject in South Africa. Clearly, the ‘language issue’ (Zhurzhenko, 2002:9) plays a crucial role in the history of relations and in the long-term process of forming the preconditions for any nation-building. ‘Language politics,’ Zhurzhenko writes, ‘can be seen as fight for symbolic power’ (2002:17). In the South African context, Dutch, English and, later, Afrikaans, were considered ‘relevant’ and, thus, the ‘legitimate’ and ‘official’ or ‘national’ languages during different periods of the nation’s history. Neville Alexander (a former revolutionary who spent ten years
on Robben Island with Nelson Mandela and long-time advocate for a multilingual South Africa) has argued that there is a very strong relationship between language usage and language policy and economic, political-military and cultural-symbolic power in South Africa. According to Alexander, linguistic relevance and legitimacy have had little or no relationship at all to the numbers of speakers or breadth of usage of any language but has purely been the result of colonial conquest in the first instance and then by socio-political domination complemented and reinforced by increased structural hegemony (Alexander, 2005:3). Expanding on James Tollefson’s (1991) comment that '[Language] is built into the economic and social structure of society so deeply that its fundamental importance seems only natural’ (1991:2), Alexander stresses that, in his words, such a relationship is ‘intuitively obvious’ (2005:2). He continues by suggesting that language prestige and power come about through the important role which language plays in the processes of economic production and in ‘its function as a transmission mechanism of “culture” or, more popularly, its role in the formation of individual and social identities’ (2005:3). This has certainly been true in the case of South Africa.

Language tensions have not been confined to the ‘colour’ line either. The conflict and rivalry between English - and Afrikaans-speakers goes to the heart of the history of white South Africa. The original European settlers in 1652 spoke Dutch, which eventually evolved into Afrikaans, but in 1822 the British gained control and proclaimed English as the language of the schools, churches and government. This, along with the freeing of slaves and the British efforts to establish racial equity in the courts, led to the Boers' treks northward starting in 1836, and as British imperialism grew, to the Boer War at the turn of the century. When not taught in English, Afrikaners were schooled in Dutch, a language equally foreign to them by the early 19th century. They did not win the right to be taught in Afrikaans until 1925, at which time English and Afrikaans were officially designated as co-official languages of South Africa. The struggles for the official recognition of the Afrikaans language are deeply engraved on the Afrikaner character and ideology. The Afrikaners' language is the primary symbol of their sense of cultural distinctness. On the level of political discourse—and this is an important point—it is the process of constructing not the ‘Other’ but the ‘Self’ which is an important source of where one’s own identity takes place.
Comments made by Meinecke (1970) may be useful here, when discussing the role of language in terms of the social, cultural, economic and political identity of a nation. Meinecke argued that it is important to distinguish between ‘cultural nations’ and ‘political nations’. The existence of the first, he said, is due to the presence of a common language and culture that need not preclude considerable political fragmentation. A ‘political nation’, by contrast, is one which exists ‘by the idea of sovereignty and self-determination of a nation that wants to be political, capable of choosing its own constitution and its own political destiny’ (Meinecke, 1970 [1907]:12). The existence of these two categories of nations does not deny that a cultural nation can be a political nation as well. Such sentiments did not go unheeded in the minds of the Afrikaners. For many years, for example, the Afrikaans-speaking descendants of the original Cape Colony settlers sought to establish their very own cultural and political nation. Discontent with what they saw as the oppressive authority of British rule: its ‘anglicisation’ policies, restrictive laws on slavery and its eventual abolition, arrangements to compensate former slave owners and the perceived indifference of British authorities to border conflicts along the Cape Colony's eastern frontier where by this time many ‘boere’ (Afrikaans-speaking farmers) had settled, motivated an eastward and north-eastward migration away from British control in the Cape Colony. Between the years 1835 to 1846, these ‘Voortrekkers’ (pioneers), with their families and their belongings, made the long, arduous and dangerous ‘Groot Trek’ (Great Trek) northwards and north-eastwards from Cape Town in the hope of establishing ‘civilisation’ (Crampton, 2001:228) in their own independent state in South Africa’s interior, economically, culturally and politically independent of British power. The ‘Natalia Republic’ was established in 1839, the voortrekkers occupying lands to the east of the Drakensberg Mountains. Its life as an independent republic was shortlived, however, when it was annexed by British forces in 1843 (Bilpin, 1977). After the British annexation of the Natalia Republic, most local Voortrekker Boers trekked north into what became ‘Transoranje’, (‘beyond the Orange River’) in 1845, later known as the Orange Free State, and a number of smaller republics across the Vaal river, in the area known as the ‘Transvaal’ (‘beyond the Vaal River’), later to be united as the Zuid Afrikaanse Republiek (South African Republic, ZAR). During the 1850s, the British made an agreement with the Boer republics, recognising the independence of the ZAR.
in what is now the Transvaal. However, in 1877 Britain annexed the ZAR as a convenient way of resolving the border dispute between the Boers and the Zulus. The Boer republic, however, regained its autonomy in 1881 as a result of the so-called First Boer War (1880-1) (Lee, 2005).

The discovery of gold in 1885 in the Witwatersrand (a range of rocky hills which includes the area which is today’s Johannesburg) area of the Transvaal brought about the immigration of many foreigners (uitlanders) and a boom to the local economy. The British feared that the growing wealth of the Transvaal would overtake that of the British-controlled Cape Colony, and it was speculated the Boers might eject the British from power in the region. Using the ZAR refusal to grant uitlander franchise as a pretext, the British therefore planned the annexation of the Transvaal, as a continuation of their seizure years prior of the former Orange Free State and the immense diamond fields of Kimberley there. Increasing fear of British designs on the Transvaal and the amassing of British forces on their borders caused the Boers to make an ultimatum to the British to decrease their forces in the region, and, when it was ignored, to war in 1899. The Second Boer War (known as the ‘Anglo-Boer Oorlog’ in Afrikaans) endured for three years. By the end of 1902 Britain employed 500,000 soldiers against a fighting force of approximately 64,000 Boers. Boer women and children were incarcerated in concentration camps and about 26,000 died of malnutrition, poor hygiene and disease. The British blockade and scorched earth strategy enforced through the entire Transvaal forced the Boer military commanders into submission. A defeated Transvaal was incorporated into the British Empire in 1902 and in 1910, the Boer republics were joined with the Cape Colony to form the Union of South Africa under British colonial rule.

The events leading up to the Groot Trek (Great Trek) were still very fresh in the minds and psyches of those settlers who remained in the Cape Colony. Enforced ‘anglicisation’ through the banning of the use of Afrikaans in the education sphere, for example, resulting in social, cultural and political unrest amongst Afrikaans speakers resentful of British policies. So integral in the minds of the Afrikaners was the relationship between language, country and identity that the explicit goal of the GRA was ‘to stand for our Language, our Nation and our Land’ (ATMK, 1965: 6, my translation). Moreover, the slogan on the organisation’s crest reads: ‘Vir Moedertaal
en Vaderland” (‘For Mother language and Fatherland’), more than suggesting that the Afrikaner people are the progeny of the language and the land in which they were born. Political and social agitation for recognition of the legitimacy of the Afrikaans language became known as the ‘First Afrikaans Language Movement’ was ‘thus much more than simply a language movement; it was a movement for the cultural, political and religious “deliverance”, self-determination and self-development of the Afrikaner people’ (ATMK 1965:6, my translation).

Discussions amongst members of the GRA, beginning on 14 August 1875, reached the conclusion that

[It] was not enough...to write and read ‘Hottentots’ Afrikaans; the time had come to discover how the ‘civilized part of our people’ speaks Afrikaans and to formulate rules for the language. (Giliomee, 2003:5)

Reverend S.J. Du Toit, who is buried in Daljosaphat Cemetery in Paarl and whose headstone reads: ‘Vader van Afrikaans’, is the acknowledged leader of the first Afrikaans language movement. Speaking in the 1890s, he reportedly distinguished between three varieties of Afrikaans supposedly spoken by what he called the notables (Here), the (White) farmers or burghers (Boere) and the ‘Hottentots’ or servant class, and made it explicit that in his pioneering literary work, he deliberately held to the language of the Boere. It is indisputable, therefore, that at least at the outset, the standard of Afrikaans was deliberately racialised and that the ‘Afrikaans’ Du Toit was speaking of was indeed a ‘White man’s language’ as many an Afrikaner nationalist would proudly proclaim in subsequent years. Hein Willemse cites the fact that in his Die Triomf van Afrikaans (The Triumph of Afrikaans) which appeared in 1943, E.C. Pienaar argued that ‘the genuine people’s language...in its most cultured/civilised [form]’ was spoken by the Afrikaner.’ (Willemse in February, 1994:151). Ponelis is eminently reasonable and even prophetic when he maintains in the same volume that ‘Standard Afrikaans is experiencing a golden age, but has now reached a turning point which has important consequences for the language itself and for the institutions which Afrikaans supports’ (February, 1994: 106, my translation).

The representation of Afrikaner identity and the articulation of the Afrikaners’ pioneering quest for—and achievement of—an independent state (Crampton, 2001) ‘in distinctive ethnicist terms’ (Crampton, 2001:221) in the form of the Voortrekker
Monument stands even today as a strong symbol of ‘Afrikanerdom’, of the fortitude and courage of those pioneers and of their anti-authoritarian stance against the British. there allowed the monument to become a key site in the legitimising of a nationalist image which would serve the apartheid nation-building agenda in the late 1930s and 1940s (Crampton, 2001).

Stage Three—‘Afrikanerisation’, 1948-1994

Under the guise of the policy of ‘separate development’ and self-determination, the formation of some ‘independent’ and other ‘semi-autonomous’ Bantustans alongside the Union of South Africa occurred in the years following the beginning of Nationalist rule in 1948, when millions of Blacks were forcibly relocated to ‘tribal homelands’ scattered like tiny islands within the national borders. These ethnic or tribal groupings had traditionally been defined largely by language. The ‘Bantustans’, then, separated the Black majority population linguistically and demonstrate very clearly how policies based around language can be and was successfully used as a major force to ‘divide-and-conquer’ the majority population and to limit contact between groups. Theoretically, each ethnic group had its own separate ‘homeland’, all at various stages of ‘independence’. Despite the political or social motivations for the establishment of these ‘stans’, their existence serves to demonstrate how the notion of a common language and culture can be used to create a ‘nation’, albeit one imposed on people without their consent. Their creation also demonstrates that in the absence of any real power in the choice or control over their destiny, such ‘cultural nations’ serve to accentuate the real power and domination of the ‘political nation’. How the Afrikaanse Taalmonument was viewed in the past and how it is interpreted today is influenced by the changing social, economic, political and ideological landscape of South Africa. The will to develop a cultural and political nation in the ‘new’ South Africa is, it could be argued, to be united, in spite of and because of the variety of languages and cultures within its borders.

The uneven status of the language became even more urgent and fraught with dangerous political conflicts. Attempts to impose a nationalistic linguistic will would boil over into violent protest and resistance in Soweto in 1976 (UNDP, 2004). Under the Apartheid regime, the Afrikaans language, proposed by the Afrikaans-controlled White
political elite as the basis for national identity formation, was completely exclusive of the majority linguistic and ethnic groups within the country. In the area of cultural policy, the federal and provincial governments assumed the promotion of the Afrikaans language at the expense of other languages spoken throughout South Africa. Furthermore, the use of Afrikaans, beyond any linguistic division, served as a symbolic division between people in South Africa. In 1976, however, the Department of Bantu Education, which was responsible for the schooling of the Black majority population throughout the country, introduced a policy requiring that Afrikaans be the sole medium of instruction in Mathematics, Arithmetic and Social Studies in all Black (Bantu) schools from 7th grade onwards. In early February that year, a school board in Soweto was dismissed for resisting attempts to enforce the imposition of Afrikaans as the medium of instruction. This action sparked protests which began at that school and which swelled over a period of months to other schools within the township, gathering the wider support of teachers, parents, and students (Marjorie, 1982). Continued measures to implement the Afrikaans-medium policy were met with strong resistance such that events reached a crisis point and culminated when some 1500 police tried to prevent up to 15000 mainly Black school children from protesting against the forced use of Afrikaans in their schools. Police opened fire on the protestors, resulting in (conservatively reported) 172 deaths (many more, depending upon whose evidence is used) and several hundred injuries. The events of that day eventually helped to cause the implosion of the apartheid state. Consequently, the revolt touched almost every city and village in South Africa that year, reaching far beyond the language issue. Strikes closed businesses and industry, and in Soweto, protest was so strong that the government-instituted Bantu Council was forced to resign (Marjorie, 1982).

Instead of further subjugating the Black majority, the Uprising inspired Blacks countrywide, motivated workers, boosted liberation movement, forever changed the perceptions of white South Africa and sowed panic in Afrikaner ranks that would place them on the defensive. Ethnic divisions and linguistic associations have been and remain important identity markers for people throughout the world and this is no less the case in South Africa. Indeed, the ethnic or racial fault line came to be the most prominent feature of the South African socio-political landscape for most of the
twentieth century. Ethnic divisions were officially sanctioned by law and a person’s (real or perceived) ethnicity or ‘race’ was the cornerstone of the apartheid (separate development) philosophy which dominated every person’s life and which remained the main ideological prism through which people perceived their realities for nearly fifty years (Alexander, 2005).

Linguistic cleavages and the politicisation of language conflict often serves the political elites of a nation to view language conflict as a political opportunity, placing it on the policy agenda as an effective mobilising tool to serve their own non-linguistic political ends (Bucken-Knapp, 2003). Accompanying language policies have meant that the historical distribution of the political goods of communication, recognition and autonomy has been highly skewed and, in the case of South Africa, in the past benefiting Afrikaans and English speakers disproportionately. Neville Alexander goes so far as to say that in apartheid South Africa, the rulers could afford to—and did—approach indigenous African languages as though they had no economic or cultural value (2005:6). The problem of ‘language’ is central to the South African experience (Crapanzano, 1985) and language has been instrumental in the country’s transition from colonialism to apartheid to democracy. Orman (2008) has gone so far as to suggest that many of the social problems which beset contemporary South African are, in fact, sociolinguistic in origin.

Not everyone who speaks Afrikaans, however, chooses to identify with a wider Afrikanervolk (Afrikaner people) or Kleurlinge/Bruintmense (Coloureds/Brown People) ethnicity but, instead, prefer to identify simply as Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. Language, rather than ethnicity or ‘race’, then, becomes a major identifying marker for an individual. The fundamental importance of language to a person’s identity has been evidenced on several occasions throughout the world where the forced imposition of a particular language on people has erupted into out and out conflict. In the case of South Africa, the apparently antagonistic contradictions in the language domain became manifest with respect to the status and use of Afrikaans, especially as a language of teaching in the educational sphere. During the rule of Lord Milner (1901 – 1905) and of Verwoerd and Vorster (1958-1979), social conflict was articulated, among other ways, in terms of the use and recognition of Afrikaans in the schools that catered for Afrikaans-speaking White and Bantu-speaking Black children respectively. The
political polarisation around the language issue became so dramatic that it set off a series of ‘tremors’ which were brought to a tragic head in what is generally known as the Soweto Uprising of 1976 (Zhurzhenko, 2002:11).

The Soweto uprising in South Africa had been sparked by the insistence of the apartheid regime that Afrikaans—the language of the Boer (Afrikaner) White minority—be used as the dominant medium of instruction in Black secondary schools. There is an almost perfect correlation between language and ethnicity in South Africa: those who speak a Bantu language as a mother tongue are almost indefinitely Black African, and there are few blacks who do not speak a Bantu language. No black elite class speaks only a Western language, as in many post-colonial African countries (Marjorie, 1982). ‘Language would seem like an unlikely candidate for such an intense power struggle. Most people never think about their language at all, and never attach any emotional significance to it,’ argues Paul Brass in his book *Elite Competition and Nation Formation* (1991). Yet it is precisely this unconscious attachment that has put it on the frontline of national and international disputes and at the heart of many political identities (Younge, 2010) as evidenced in the Soweto Uprising. ‘What we speak and why is no accident, but rather a product of power struggles for economic, political and cultural supremacy or resistance. Language, then, all too often becomes the most intimate proxy for broader societal conflicts that have little to do with what people actually speak’ (Brass, 1991). Afrikaans clearly came to be identified with and symbolic of the oppressive ideology of apartheid, racial dominance and subjugation. Afrikaans was the language Blacks felt to be that of the ‘oppressor’ and protesting against Afrikaans was really protesting against the whole system of injustice and oppression. Ironically, however, Afrikaans writer, Hein Willemse, voiced what he understood to be the ‘double identity’ of Afrikaans and stated that while ‘Afrikaans is at once the language of the oppressor’, it is, at the same time ‘the language of the oppressed’ and argued for the continued use of Afrikaans as an instrument in the struggle against apartheid (Willemse, 1987: 239).

Instead, South Africa’s Black population has embraced English as the predominant *lingua franca*. There has always been a strong motivation for Blacks to learn English—as ‘a matter of practicality rather than loyalty’ (Marjorie, 1982). As a consequence of the Soweto Uprising of 1976, the government allowed individual school boards to
choose the medium of instruction. Ninety-nine percent chose English (Marjorie, 1982) as Black authorities saw the broader potential of English as a language of wider communication. English, too, in political terms, is much more ‘racially’ benign; it does not harbour those same notions of oppression and dominance which beset Afrikaans and its usage as a social and economic resource is seen very much as means to overcome disadvantage as well as being an instrument of restitution (Alexander, 2009:7). From 1948, the ruling political and administrative elite were dominated by Afrikaners. Afrikaans was for many years the language of the labour bureaux, the police and the prisons, reminders of which help to explain why there might continue to be feelings of ongoing antipathy toward it amongst the Black and Coloured communities.

**Stage Four: Language Tensions Continue in South Africa**

The socio-linguistic history of South Africa has been dominated by the struggle for official recognition of only a minority of languages. In fact, up until 1994, official status had only been granted to three languages—English, Dutch and, more recently, Afrikaans and, for the period from 1925 till 1994, only English and Afrikaans were deemed the official languages of the Republic. It was only after the first free elections of 1994 and under the new democratic Constitution that the government of South Africa opted to dispense with the then two official languages of English and Afrikaans, instead favouring the eleven most widely used languages in the country to serve equally as the ‘official’ languages of the new South Africa (See Section 6 of the South African Constitution [Act 108 of 1996] for details). IsiNdebele, IsiXhosa, IsiZulu, Sepedi, Sesotho, Setswana, SiSwati, Tshivenda and Xitsonga as well as the Khoi, Sama and San languages—these languages have not always enjoyed their present legally-sanctioned status (along with Afrikaans and English) and the history of their recognition and usage reflect and convey what is a complexly differentiated society (Webb, 2002:64).

Du Plessis (2000: 104) further observes that “given the threat to the future of Afrikaans, the Afrikaans community played a very active role in the language debate. A range of publications evolved and several conferences were organised. Probably, the most influential paper was written by Schuring (1991) proposed a language clause that bears considerable resemblance to the one in the 1993 Interim Constitution. G. Viljoen, then Minister of Constitutional Affairs, declared the official status of Afrikaans to be non-
negotiable. All this explains why the language clause was only agreed on during the last hour of the negotiations. The eleven-language policy clearly does not reflect an ANC position. As a matter of fact, it is no more than a compromise between ANC’s covert English agenda and the overt Afrikaans agenda of the Afrikaner negotiators”.

It is not apparent that an English only language clause in the 1993 Interim Constitution could have served the interests of the ANC better considering the movement’s broad constituency that cut then, and continues to be so, across social, cultural, racial, linguistic and economic strata of South Africa society. In contrast, however, what is apparent is that the hard-line stance adopted by the Afrikaner negotiators with regard to the official status of Afrikaans was primarily aimed at safeguarding the position of Afrikaans in the future South Africa. However, these two developments, both from the side of the ANC negotiators and the Afrikaner negotiators point toward the macro ideologies and discourses that informed the formation of the present day South Africa state, particularly as embodied in both the 1993 Interim Constitution and the 1996 Constitution. If the new Republic was to live to the aspirations of being a model constitutional state that adheres to the tenets of liberal democracy, and which unashamedly professes an inclination towards multiculturalism, in the strict sense of these terms, then a constitutionally entrenched multilingual dispensation was to be one of the defining features of the new Republic (Mwaniki, 2004).

Language politics in South Africa can be analysed as a field of political battle for the right to use a new political language: the language of democratic values and human rights, a competition of different interpretations of the key values of democracy (Zhurzhenko, 2002:17). South Africa is an eminently multilingual polity but it is English, as opposed to Afrikaans with its past associations or any of the other of the nine official languages, seems to be the language through which those key values can best be discussed and realised. English is dominant in culture, science, business contemporary English, however, holds greater prestige in finance and education. English is an urban, international language and Afrikaans mainly a rural, national one. English is the language of the more liberal newspapers as well as most Black newspapers and increasingly more and more television and radio programming is being produced in English. Coloureds have traditionally been Afrikaans speakers and they have helped shape the language that is spoken today but many are now switching to
English in sympathy with Blacks (Marjorie, 1982). Despite efforts to diminish the continued importance of Afrikaans, the influential and pioneering work that is being done by Afrikaans language organisations such as Die Buro van die Woordeboek van die Afrikaanse Taal (The Office of the Dictionary of the Afrikaans Language) (‘die WAT’) at the University of Stellenbosch, the Taalfasiliteringsprogram (Language Facilitation Program) at the University of Free State, the Stigting vir Bemagtiging deur Afrikaans), the Afrikaanse Taalraad (Afrikaans Language Council) and many others (Alexander, 2009:8) who are funding and running programs enabling many people to attain skills and qualifications in and through Afrikaans should not be overlooked.

Bourdieu (1993) writes that language cannot be merely a method of communication but also as a mechanism of power. The language one uses, he argues, is designated by one's relational position in a field or social space. Different uses of language tend to reiterate the respective (social, political, economic and cultural) ‘positions’ of speakers. The representation of identity in forms of language can be subdivided into language, dialect, and accent. For example, the use of different dialects in an area can represent a varied social status for individuals. Hence every linguistic interaction, however personal or insignificant it may seem, hears the traces of the social structure that it both expresses and helps to reproduce.

According to Helene (female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking), a former employee at the Monument, during the apartheid era, ‘language was clearly used as a weapon’ and that ‘even now, Coloureds and Blacks who may speak a dialect of Afrikaans will be perceived that their Afrikaans is “inferior” to “standard Afrikaans” spoken by Whites.’ In the Western Cape, an individual’s socio-economic or ethnic affiliation is often defined by the distinct variety of Afrikaans, with its own differentiated accent, vocabulary and pronunciation of the language, which a person might speak. For many non-Afrikaner Afrikaans speakers, their identities are often driven by a person’s own and others’ linguistic—and, with that, ethnic—alliances: ‘For the ‘Bruin Mense’ [the Coloureds] it’s [the language issue] particularly tricky because they have such divided loyalties because they are of the Cape’, said Sue (female, 50, South African, English speaking). Helene (female, 40, South African, Afrikaans speaking) made mention of the fact that because the first recorded example of the Afrikaans language appeared in a transliterated form using Arabic script, a certain
percentage of the Muslim population in the province had even gone so far as to say that they believed that any monument to the language should have been built in the Bokaap [the traditionally Cape Malay/Muslim area of Cape Town, situated above the city’s CBD] in recognition of the Malay population which had been instrumental in the creation and development of Afrikaans. The ATM as it currently exists, she believes, is perceived of as being unrepresentational of many of the speakers of Afrikaans but, rather, stands for “formal” Afrikaans and that speakers of a “lesser” Afrikaans do not consider the language it [the ATM] represents as being their language’.

Leitner told WorldNetDaily that ‘the issue of a language goes very deep and becomes part of the soul, especially with the Afrikaner, being such a “small and gutsy nation”. It is part of their pride and feelings of nationalism, pride in their race. And why not? Every nation has that right, especially, I think, because of the rocky path they have been on since time immemorial. It is appropriate, then, to conclude this section by quoting Neville Alexander, himself a Coloured Afrikaans speaker, who urges all Afrikaans speakers to overcome its past associations and to embrace it from an all-encompassing, inclusive perspective:

Not until ‘Afrikaners’ realise that ‘the only way this sub-national identity could ever become accepted by all South Africans is if it were to be stripped of its anti-black historical baggage and to build on the essential theme of anti-imperialism in which it was constructed as a conscious strategy. One of the implications of what I have said hitherto is that Afrikaans, the language, does not belong to “the Afrikaner”, in spite of all attempts to make out of it a ‘white man’s language’; it belongs to all who speak Afrikaans, especially to its mother tongue speakers. Algemeen Beskaafde, so-called Standard, Afrikaans does belong to ‘the Afrikaner’, especially to the Afrikaner nationalists and, as Dr Johnson might have said, they can have it! They fabricated it as a deliberately racially exclusive way of speaking, writing, feeling, thinking and communicating. If ‘Afrikaner’ is once again to regain its original geographical meaning of “African” (as opposed to ‘European’, ‘Asian’, ‘American’, and ‘Australasian’), it will become an elegant variation of ‘Afrikaan’, that peculiar coinage that was forced upon us by the appropriation through naming of Africanity by white, Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. Identities are social constructs. They can be deconstructed, alternatively reconfigured. In all other Germanic languages, the term ‘Afrikaner’ is
equivalent to the English—but not the South African English—word ‘African’, or the Xhosa term ‘Umafrika’. Only in Afrikaans does it have a racial dimension. When the day dawns that those who take pride in calling themselves ‘Afrikaner’ can think of themselves in terms of Umafrika, will the speakers of Afrikaans no longer have to brace themselves on the backfoot. In the new South Africa, this feat is eminently possible, however loudly the hyenas might howl in the night. (Alexander, 2009:8)
### APPENDIX 4   CHARACTERISTICS OF VISITORS OBSERVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>ORIGIN</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>LANGUAGE</th>
<th>ARRIVAL TIME</th>
<th>DEPARTURE TIME</th>
<th>DURATION (minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CHI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK/ENG</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>1120</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0915</td>
<td>0925</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ITL</td>
<td>0920</td>
<td>0945</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ITL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0955</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1020</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ENG/AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1210</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG/AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1255</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>1040</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1125</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1135</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>1155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1205</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>1235</td>
<td>1300</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>0925</td>
<td>0935</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0935</td>
<td>0955</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>0955</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1140</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>DUT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>0910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>0915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>DEU</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>GER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>CHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>CHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>CODE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>HEB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>DUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>DUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>DUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>DUT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
<td>XHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>GER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>ENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>AFK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>&lt;18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Further to these individuals and groups observed, observations were also made of a number of groups of mixed nationality and ages as well as local and other provincial school groups.
## Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>BELGIUM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHN</td>
<td>CHINA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DEU</td>
<td>GERMANY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GBR</td>
<td>GREAT BRITAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IND</td>
<td>INDIA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISR</td>
<td>ISRAEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>ITALY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NED</td>
<td>NETHERLANDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>SPAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZAF</td>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Age

Ages are only approximate. Year refers to the decade, e.g. ‘30’ means that the estimated age of the visitor was somewhere in their 30s. Children were simply identified as being under the age of 18.

### Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>AFK</th>
<th>AFRIKAANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CHI</td>
<td>CHINESE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DUT</td>
<td>DUTCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GER</td>
<td>GERMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HEB</td>
<td>HEBREW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HIN</td>
<td>HINDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ITL</td>
<td>ITALIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPA</td>
<td>SPANISH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>XHO</td>
<td>XHOSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Arrival & Departure Times

Times were noted down when visitors arrived and departed from the ATM carpark.
Although the grounds lie rather near to the highway (N1), it is not so easily accessible that visitors will just drive there and then go further on again. The hope is that they will stay there and perhaps even relax and spend the day there. The vast majority of visitors will come by car so that families with children of all ages must be expected. For them, provision must be made by way of a play area where they can keep company under supervision.

Then a rest area could be thought about with solid tables and benches...a restroom, and a shelter in case of rain. Attached to that can be a room which can be used on occasion as a kitchen and storage place for crockery for serving tea and refreshments.

This recreation hall must obviously be somewhat distant from the monument, because it is not the wish that its surroundings be seen as a picnic area. (my translation)
APPENDIX 6 VISITOR ATTENDANCE, 2006-2012 (IN ‘000S)

Afrikaanse Taalmonument Visitor Attendance, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Visitor Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afrikaanse Taalmonument Visitor Attendance, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Visitor Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*Due to bushfires, the complex was closed for half of the month of March
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Visitor Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Afrikaanse Taalmonument Visitor Attendance, 2012
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Australian researcher at Taalmonument

An Australian PhD candidate focusing on Language Tourism is currently on a three month study tour in South Africa to do research about the Afrikaans Taalmonument in Paarl.

Stephen Smith is from the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management of Southern Cross University, Lismore, Australia.

He is specifically interested in the public's perception and interpretation of the monument and would like to invite the general public to forward him their views.

On Sunday 18 April, International Monument Day, the Taalmonument will, as part of their Family Day festivities, launch a visitor questionnaire to be used in Mr. Smith's research.

For more information, contact Stephen Smith at stephen.smith@scu.edu.au or 083 965 7594.

End

Media enquiries: Isabeau Botha at bemarking@taalmuseum.co.za or tel. 021 872 3441 / 076 017 6026.
Dear Member

With only 65 days left to the kick-off of the FIFA 2010 Soccer World Cup, what are you doing to attract more feet to your establishment? Creativity plays a vital role – maybe specials on accommodation prices, a reduced entry fee or promotional packages like buy one get one free! Please do inform the office of anything of interest that you are planning to have more visitors to Paarl.

Marketing Co-ordinator
Hybri van Nickerk

What has Paarl Tourism done for you this month?
Meetings attended: 1. Cape Winelands District Municipality’s Local Tourism Association Meeting 2. with Wellington Tourism’s acting chairperson, 3. Executive committee
Visits done: 4 site visits to members and 2 recruitment visits
New Member: 1. Hartbeeskoel Self-catering Cottage, 2. Zerentiy Conference Centre, 3. Laborie Restaurant

Breaking the Barriers Fun walk in Mbekweni

Indaba 2010
To date I have only received pictures of 3 establishments for my Indaba slideshow. Why miss out on a chance of having your pictures visible at an International Tourism Trade Show? Plus it is absolutely free! Come on guys: e-mail me your 5 high resolution photographs and be represented!
Your product can also be advertised at the show. We are planning on giving away goody bags to individuals who pre-booked appointments with us on the Paarl 2010 stand. The products included in the bag have to be own to Paarl. Anyone who donates sherry bottles of wine or wine for tasting, olive, any other unique branded product or even an experience in your town/their brochures will be distributed in each goody bag. We are planning to hand out 500 goody bags over the 4 days. Products can be delivered to our office by no later than Monday 19th of April 2010.

Please Diarise this...
Our next Networking event will be on Thursday 27th of May 2010 at 17h30 for 18h00 at Huis Orange Guest House, 33 Orange Street, Paarl.

Networking Event

Dr. Steve Smith, an Australian PhD candidate focusing on Language Tourism is currently on a 3 month study tour in SA to do research about the Afrikaans Taalmonument. He would like the general public to forward him their views on the monument at stephen.smith@csu.edu.au Cheryl Phillips, Tourism Services Manager of CTTRU and Hybri.

A free Marketing Opportunity not to be missed!
For up aspiring Wine Estate members, there is an opportunity to exhibit and do tastings from Monday the 14th to Sunday the 20th of June 2010 at the Cape Winelands District Municipality’s information desk in the Gateway Centre at the V&A Waterfront. There will be time available and depending on the feedback we receive from you, we will calculate the amount of hours that will be granted to each establishment participating in the event. Goods can be sold but only wines can be taken for wine tours. Remember, it will be the week after the 12th and Cape Town is the Waterfront, there will be “buzzing” with international visitors so “hurry, hurry...” Please do let me know as soon as possible if I need to book a time slot for you.

Brochure Distribution: At our last Networking Event, our members attending offered to take Paarl Brochures with them if they visit places outside of Paarl. If you would like to help us in distributing some of our brochures, please Hybri at info@paarlonline.com – she will drop them off.
What's On

at the Assengaaboish Manor House, Jonkershoek, starting with a 3km Family Fun Walk through the fynbos gardens. Other activities include a snake show, fire truck rides, Tai ki Japanese drumming, magic show, a vintage car display by the Fran- schhoek Motor Museum, VWS and Working on Fire “mock fire simulation” in conjunction with Bird Dog Aviation, tree abseiling, live music, food area and activities for the children.

Entry is free. For information contact Hayley Harrison at 071 219 6083.

Animal Welfare hop session
A hop session in aid of Animal Welfare will be held on Saturday April 18, at 7pm, at Serena’s Dance Studio in Strand for all the rocket- ers of the late 80s and 90s. A food and cash bar will be available, and tickets cost R150 a couple. Book with Carol at 021 651 3900.

Farm market
The Stellenbosch farm market takes place from 9am to 2pm, on the corner of the R44 and Kommetjie Road on Sunday April 25. There are 25 fresh food traders. For information call Eugene at 063 626 2878.

Alzheimer’s support group
The Strand Dementia/Alzheimer’s support group meets on Wednesday April 21 at 11am at Heus Esparza, Donaldson Street, Strand. Ruth Goble, the Medic Alert representative, will be the guest speaker. For details call Erna Nis- sen at 021 612 2311.

Geestesgesondheid
Die maandelike vergadering van die Ondersteuningsgroep Geestesgesondheid Heider- berg is Donderdag 20 April om 9am in die Restaurant van Vergenoegga Mediese Kliniek in Somerset West. Almal is welkom, en vir inskrywing kan Alfa by 021 356 3838 of Ismael by 073 732 2300 of 021 651 5384.

Australische navorsing by Tsalmomment
‘n Australië wat sy dokters- graad lie using ‘n tsaanloerse skryf is vir dié maande in Suid-Afrika om op die Australiëse Tsalmomment in die Pearl te fokus. Stephen Smith is van die Saakie vir Toerisme en hospitaliteitsonderneming die Southern Cross Universiteit in Lisboa. Hy is veal veral belang in die publiek die skryf en interpre- taso van die Tsalmomment.

Op Saterdag 18 April, Interna- tionale Momumentdag, stel die Tsalmomment as deel van dié Grootmondagaktiviteite, ‘n beoek- onsvelbied wat deel van mis Smith so vurkend uitmaak. Vir inligting, kontak Stephen Smith by stephen.smith@csu. edu.au of 083 965 7594.

Spanish speakers gather
Chil Malvina meets in Stellen- bosch on Mondays at 6.30pm for Spanish conversation. It’s free and informal.

Call James at 073 610 8926 or 021 687 3497.

Anna Foundation fun runs
The next Anna Foundation fun runs, and the Stellenbosch Vista Skin Family Trail Run is on Sat- urday April 17 at Coetzenburg Stadium, Stellenbosch. The race begins at 7.30am, and support runners need to be there at 7.15am. The cost is R15.

The Solms Delta Draf is on on Saturday April 14 at the Solms Delta Wine estate, on the R45 towards Franschhoek.

The race begins at 8.15am, and support runners need to be there at 7.50am. The cost is also R15. Visit www.annafoundation.com for more details or call 021 685 1923.

Sudoku solution
No 504010, level: Challenging
(Puzzle on page 16)

6 1 2 7 4 5 3 8 9
5 4 9 6 3 2 1 7
7 8 3 2 1 9 5 6 4
1 2 5 4 3 6 9 7 8
4 7 9 8 5 2 6 3 1
9 3 6 1 7 8 4 5 2
8 9 4 5 6 1 7 2 3
3 5 7 8 2 4 1 9 6
2 6 1 3 9 7 8 4 5
Win tickets to FAB Bridal and Occasions Expo

THE FAB Autumn Bridal and Occasions Expo is coming to Cape Town on 1 and 2 May at the International Convention Centre.

With over 120 exhibitors from the occasions and events industry, daily designer fashion shows, live engagement competition draws and other entertainment such as live music, it is a must to visit. If you are getting engaged or married, planning a special party or going to a special event for which you need a garment, FAB is the answer. Any service needed to ensure your special occasion of success, will be on offer and exhibitors will be making their stands to give guidance to visitors in terms of pricing, ideas, dates, etc.

A great number of exhibitors will offer special package deals on the show and a number of competitions will take place as well. Each winner will receive a voucher to the value of R10 000 each from Steyns in order to choose a ring of their choice. A dinner for two also forms part of the final prize.

All that is needed to enter is to send the word "competition", followed by your name, surname, contact number, time slot and date you wish to be present (on any of the two days) to the organiser on 083-783-8137. You can also register on the website: www.fabbridal.co.za by clicking on the "FAB Engagement Competition" folder. Please note that you need to be present on the day and time selected and also need to pay the R85 entry fee to get into the show, but your entry fee will also give you the opportunity to see the fashion show and larger exhibition. Entries will take place after each
Raak bewus van jul kultuur, sê Aussie

MALANI VENTER
Stellenbosch

’n Australiese navorser se belangstelling in en nuuskierigheid oor Afrikaans het gelei tot ‘n studie oor die Taalmonument en -museum in die Paarl.

Vir mnr. Stephen Smith van Lismore, Australië, was Afrikaans as taal én kultuur nog altyd fassineerend.

“Ek het ’n liefde vir tale, maar ek was nog altyd gefassineer deur die uniekheid van Afrikaans as ’n taal wat in Afrika ontwikkeld het, maar wat die oorsprong van sy inspirasie en woordeskat van Europa, Afrika en Asië gekry het,” het Smith aan Die Burger gesê.

“As ’n buitestander sien ek Afrikaans as iets wat Suid-Afrikaners van die res van die wêreld onderskei. Dit is ’n taal wat Suid-Afrikaners saambind en wat deel is van hul kulturele erfenis. Tog sien ek ook dat taal ’n emosionele en baie politieke kwessie in die land is,” het Smith bygevoeg.

Sy belangstelling in die Taalmonument spruit uit sy navorsing oor die verhouding tussen taal en toerisme. Smith se navorsing het uitgewys dat verskeie gedenktekens vir mense opgerig is wat ’n waardevolle bydrae tot taal gelewer het.

“Die Taalmonument is uniek. Dit is die enigste monument wat slegs aan ’n taal toegewy is. Geen ander plek buite die Paarl het sowel ’n taalmonument as ’n taalmuseum nie. Nêrens elders ter wêreld vind ons dié twee saam nie.”

Uit sy bevindinge tot dusver blyk dit die monument staan as ’n simbool van trots vir elke Afrikaanse spreke. “Die woord ‘trots’ kom gereeld in die antwoordstukke voor.”

Volgens hom is een van die doelwitte van sy navorsing om ’n bewustheid onder Suid-Afrikaners te kweek dat die Taalmonument en -museum ’n belangrike deel van die Suid-Afrikaanse kultuur is.
**Afrikaans and Language Monument fascinate Australian**

*Liedt Dyens*

"LANGUAGE is an emotional and political issue, especially in South Africa - even more so than I expected."

These are the words of Stephen Smith an Australian who has spent the past three months in Paarl doing research for a dissertation in Language Tourism through Southern Cross University.

Smith did lots of research about languages in different countries as background work prior to his coming to Paarl, but has seen nothing like the Language Monument anywhere else in the world.

"This prompted me to come to Paarl and do research about the monument, the Language Museum and the Afrikaans language."

"This is the only place in the world where a Monument was designed and built solely to honour a language," says Smith.

He is at the Monument almost every day, to study visitors’ behaviour and to hear what they think about the Monument.

"I look at their body language, what they look at, whether they touch the Monument and what their comments are about the Monument and the surrounding area. I want to learn more about people’s total experience here at the Monument."

He said some of the words that he heard from visitors to the Taalmonument were “rote Afrikaans”, “pragngi-ting” and “wong en volgi.”

He said that he found that the majority of people visiting the Monument go there out of curiosity and that in general their overall experience is a very positive one.

"For me as an Australian the Monument has one of the most beautiful views in the world - there is nothing like it in Australia."

Smith said that he however still needs more information to complete his study.

"I would like to find people with different views and people who may not like the Monument or what they perceive it stands for, to approach me and tell me why they don’t like the Monument and how they feel about it."

According to him there has been little written academic attention given to the Monument or the Museum, specifically from an international point of view.

"I feel that what we research I can give the Taalmonument some degree of publicity and acknowledgment internationally."

"Afrikaans is unique, reflecting the European, African and Asian roots - a vibrant, modern language with a rich and continuing literary heritage. While many fear that the language is currently under some strain, there exists a real determination that it will overcome any threats and continue to thrive."

Smith will be leaving South Africa on 2 June, but he hopes to come back next year. Contact him on stephen.smith@scu.edu.au.

---

**Music auditions held**

The Fransie Pienaar Music Centre’s annual auditions for placements in 2011 will take place from 31 May to 4 June.

Any person interested in playing a musical instrument, or wanting to sing, can make an appointment beforehand at the centre’s office on 021-872-2125/4 weekdays.

Especially primary school instruments are encouraged to make use of this opportunity. High school learners and adults are also welcome. Tuition is offered in all symphony orchestras instruments, piano, recorder, jazz instruments, classical guitar, orchestral percussion, African percussion, steelpan as well as choral and individual singing tuition.
Indigenous lessons found in Afrikaans

SCU student's research could help minorities

By STEVE SPINKS

A SOUTHERN Cross University student who is studying the impact of an Afrikaans language movement in South Africa believes his findings could have implications for Australia's Staying Indigenous languages.

Stephen Smith, a PhD student, is researching tourism motivation and reaction to the Afrikaans Language Monument at Paarl near Cape Town, built to celebrate the Afrikaans language.

The monument, which was built in 1986, has become the target of controversy in post-apartheid South Africa because it some it celebrates the language of the oppressors.

"Afrikaans is considered the third language in the country, but overall it is the second most spoken after Zulu," Mr Smith said.

"In the Western Cape, where the movement is, 75 per cent of the population speaks Afrikaans, the majority of which is coloured.

"However, many people I interviewed viewed the language as that of an oppressor, despite the fact it was their first language.

"There is a lot of resistance from the Federal Government over there to see English become the second language, because they believe it would be better economically for students going overseas and working with foreign companies.

"Stellenbosch University is the last university teaching with Afrikaans.

"But there are many who believe that Afrikaans is a native language that should be embraced and protected.

"Afrikaans originated as a pidgin form of Dutch with which traders from the Dutch East India Company communicated with native South African and Indonesian slaves in the settlement which became known as Cape Town.

"Afrikaans has French, Malay, Indonesian and English influences and therefore Mr Smith believes the language started out as inclusive.

"He also said similar movements could be built in Australia which would help focus attention on Indigenous languages.

"I really think it could be a way of bringing people together and focusing on languages such as the Kurnji ngalang," he said.

"It could be a place that teaches people about the language and ultimately the culture. My research will have implications for other minority languages, which I hope will provide some ideas of things to do and to avoid doing in similar situations.

"Mr Smith also hopes to send his findings, which will be complete late next year, to the Language Movement committee and the South African government."
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Language research underway in World Cup host country

As thousands of soccer fans flock to South Africa to watch the World Cup, one researcher is investigating the ‘pride and prejudice’ of one of that country’s most controversial tourist attractions.

Southern Cross University PhD student Stephen Smith is researching tourist motivation and reaction to the ‘Afrikaanse Taalmonument’ (translated ‘Afrikaans Language Monument’), a monument just outside Paarl, some fifty kilometres from Cape Town, built specifically to celebrate the Afrikaans language – the language traditionally associated with apartheid.

Mr Smith, who has just returned from three months in South Africa where he conducted observations, interviews and surveys with domestic and international visitors to the Monument, said the Taalmonument inspired a strong sense of pride for many South Africans, as well as generating a degree of debate.

“The Taalmonument is unique because it is the only monument in the world that was constructed as a totally symbolic, non-functional building purely to celebrate a language and nothing else,” said Mr Smith.

“It’s a calm and peaceful place where families often go simply to have picnics or admire the spectacular view, and where the number of international visitors has increased recently thanks at least in part to the World Cup.

“Many of the overseas visitors are really not aware of the significance of this tourist attraction in terms of its uniqueness or importance in the cultural and linguistic heritage of South Africa. In South Africa, language is an emotional and political issue—much more so than I had expected.

“I use the phrase ‘pride and prejudice’ to describe the many different reactions I received from people in regard to their perceptions of the Monument. The word ‘trots,’ meaning ‘pride’ or ‘proud’ was used continually by Afrikaans-speaking South Africans I interviewed, but despite this there is equally as much prejudice because to some it is still seen as a celebration of the ‘language of the oppressor’.

“In fact, if you look at the history of the Monument, the original intention was always more about celebrating the language itself rather than the politics of the Afrikaans-speaking people, although it might be argued that it was later ‘taken
over’ as a symbol of Afrikaner identity and culture.

“Further controversy has been caused by criticism of the Afrikaans language itself - one recent review of the Monument by a British magazine described it as the ‘ugliest language in the world’ - but I think it is a very pretty language and one favoured by many for being the language which, with its use of imagery, subtleties and nuances, can best describe the unique South African environment and landscape and the personality of its people.”

Mr Smith, who speaks French and has studied Italian, has been studying for his PhD entitled Monumentalising Language – Experiencing Language Monuments, through Southern Cross University’s School of Tourism and Hospitality Management since 2008. Having completed the first part of his studies thanks to a scholarship offered through the School, he has just been offered an Australian Postgraduate Award scholarship to continue his research.

Mr Smith said he hopes his work will extend the literature available on the tourism experience as well as helping to increase our understanding of languages under threat.

“At only 300-years-old, Afrikaans is the most modern spoken language in the world and is the second most widely spoken language in South Africa, yet it is a language facing an uncertain future given the prevalence of English and other languages in the country,” said Mr Smith.

“My research will have implications for other minority languages which I hope will provide some ideas of things to do and to avoid doing in similar situations.

“An important aspect of my research is also looking at what the experience of the visitor is from a broad sensory point of view – body language, what they look at, whether they touch the monument and so on - which will contribute to the body of research available on tourist behaviour analysis incorporating all the senses.”

Photo: Stephen Smith at the Taalmonument in South Africa (high resolution image available on request)
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