

A reflection on narrative based historical memory work in peacebuilding processes

Theresa Edlmann

Peacebuilding processes operate within a nexus of historical events, contemporary dynamics and future possibilities. This paper explores the possibilities presented by narrative based historical memory work in enabling an understanding of conflicting stories and perspectives needed to build an understanding of contemporary dynamics of a society or context. The narrative repair created by hearing contrasting stories has the potential to facilitate shifts from previously divisive and exclusionary modes of remembering to more collective ways of moving forward, with lower levels of enmity and violence. The personal insights, as well as the social and relational networks that can emerge out of this work, have the potential to support and undergird the more systemic dimensions of a peace process aimed at addressing legacies of violent conflict.

Keywords: discursive laagers, memory field, narrative, storytelling, trauma and memory

Introduction: historical memory and peacebuilding processes

The aim of this paper is to explore strategies for deepening understanding of psychosocial dynamics in the aftermath of political violence and military conflict. The core argument is that linking transitional justice and peacebuilding processes with work revolving around historical dialogue, memory and trauma potentially facilitates a deepening and strengthening of work undertaken at political, economic and systemic levels. The intention is to unpack the social and political implications of facilitating narrative based

Key implications for practice

- Including narrative based historical memory approaches in peacebuilding work
- Creating space for multiple perspectives and contrasting views on a conflict situation to be heard and factored into a peacebuilding process
- Including the psychosocial dimensions of peacebuilding into a process design, with a focus on narrative repair in historical memory

processes that foreground the important personal, social and political links that can be made between past and present, within a context of historical systems of violence and coercion. It is the author's argument that the possibilities of peaceful scenarios unfolding over time can be strengthened by understanding the historical and contemporary links people make in the way they tell stories about what has happened to them, their families and their communities.

Hearing contrasting stories that enable new or deeper insights into the impact of violence on other people can facilitate important psychosocial shifts. These shifts potentially take the form of narrative repair from previously divisive and exclusionary modes of remembering and constructing different role players within a context to those that respect difference, recognise the impact of personal choices and identify shared ways of moving forward with lower levels of enmity and violence. The praxis that forms the basis for this paper is comprised of the author's personal

involvement in community and academic work in South Africa that has straddled a range of disciplinary approaches over a period of 30 years. This work has included activism against apartheid, involvement in a number of initiatives aimed at supporting the transition of the 1990s, supporting survivors of political and gender based violence in their quests for justice and healing, using the creative arts as a tool for social analysis and change, community development and most recently in academic research and community based work on historical memory and identity.

During this time, it became clear that listening to and reflecting on the historical, current and future stories of individuals, their families, their communities and broader social networks from all sides of a conflict are crucial in influencing how post conflict processes unfold. They have the potential to be the threads that hold the social and relational fabric of a peace process in place. The absence, or inadequate implementation of this kind of psychosocial work, can potentially erode any political, economic or structural elements of a peace process over time. This paper consists of a series of reflections on the underlying ideas and theories that could inform and sharpen how transitional justice practitioners and theorists, social psychologists and community based psychosocial organisations go about their work. It is, therefore, reflexive rather than deductive in approach, with the intention being that ideas contained herein can be discussed, reflected on, explored and refined by the broader community of practice with whom it engages.

Understanding historical memory

At the heart of the historical memory work discussed here lies the belief that the storied historical nature of how people come to be in the situations they find themselves is important to understand. In my experience, analysing and clarifying the beliefs, attitudes and values that people hold dear, through mechanisms primarily aimed at listening to

what people have to say, is central to making sense of current realities and complexities while in the midst of conflict, and within a post conflict context.

The complex nature of historical memory surfaces when safe spaces are created for a dialogical approach to telling stories of people from different sides of a conflict. These processes are dependent on people from different parts of a social or political spectrum each having a chance to tell their story, creating a picture of the story or system that respects individual experience while also providing contextual perspective. When people tell their stories, and these stories are heard by others who might previously have been their enemies, enabling an acknowledgement of the gifts and burdens that people on all sides of a conflict carry – not least because of choices they and their ancestors made in the past. This sharing of, and reflection on, the insights emerging from contrasting personal and communal memories and legacies potentially enables the development of peacebuilding processes and practices that are contextually appropriate and potentially enabling of sustainable change. Shifting silences within the stories being told over time can profoundly affect what happens to people's 'inner' dialogues, as well as the narratives that are woven throughout the way people engage in domestic and public networks and spaces.

Memory fields

Those who work in the field of historical memory and peacebuilding could, therefore, be described as '*memory agents*' who seek to name and shift the ways in which speaking and silence, or memory and forgetting, are shaped by cultural and political codes (Ben-Ze'Ev, Ginio, & Winter, 2010). These codes could be described as creating '*memory fields*' which define whose stories are valued and given prominence, resulting in others being shifted to realms of socio-political marginalisation and silence (Lomsky-Feder, 2004; 2009). In the South African context, I

have described these memory fields as *'discursive laagers'*¹ which have resulted in people's stories from different sides being told in a self-referential manner, often without engaging with the narratives and discourses of those who fought on different sides (Edlmann, 2012). These memory fields, or discursive laagers, therefore, prevent any sense of a context of violence as comprising a *'whole'* within which diverse and conflicting differences exist.

Historical memory work in peacebuilding processes has the ability to enable an understanding of individual and communal stories within a *'bigger picture'*. When this is successful, the need for both individuals and a society or context to heal can be understood within dynamic and unfolding ways, thus feeding into and enabling broader systemic work.

The precise models that are appropriate for historical memory work vary from context to context. What has been appropriate in South Africa might not be culturally, methodologically nor politically viable in other contexts. For this reason, the next section of this paper will provide some analysis of the South African context as a way of leading to some key conceptual and procedural principles that may be applicable elsewhere.

Making sense of historical memory work within the South African context

Since the 1994 elections, South Africa's transition has been turbulent to say the least. The often lauded Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC) was a landmark transitional justice institution which developed an unprecedented model of public confession, using narrative based approaches to build an archive of testimonies of historical events and abuses of human rights. Since then, a number of civil society initiatives have sought to continue the truth telling, reconciliation and social transformation agenda that President Nelson Mandela and

Archbishop Desmond Tutu championed during the 1990s.

The historical memory work that the author was involved in facilitating from 2012 through 2015 was carried out under the auspices of the Legacies of Apartheid (LAWs) Project, which sought to bring together people affected by apartheid political and military violence between 1968 and 1993 (Edlmann, 2015). The aim has been to develop a greater understanding of the experiences of the generation of young South Africans who have made difficult choices about their level of involvement in different sides of the conflict (i.e. supporting or resisting the apartheid government), and to reflect on the legacies of these choices. These dialogues have taken the form of mediation and victim support, workshops, public conversations, research, photographic and video work, as well as writing and research.

An ongoing dimension of this work has been addressing the needs of people caught up in the military and political violence of the apartheid era to engage with those who had, historically, been construed as their enemies. Important as such processes are in any post conflict context, current dynamics in South Africa give this kind of work a particular flavour and growing sense of contestation. Even after all these years, public discourse in South Africa is still shaped by racially and politically determined discursive laagers (Edlmann, 2012). At the same time, there is a growing cynicism around the idea of a *'rainbow nation'* (Allen, 1994), which has been an inadequate reconciliatory tool in the light of the significant structural inequalities of South African society. Recent conflicts on university campuses and elsewhere have included calls for the incomplete work of decolonisation to be carried out, as part of the ongoing need for reconciliation work also to be linked to social and economic justice. Any narrative based historical memory work is, therefore, by its very nature contentious and needs to be constantly adjusted in order to respect and learn from

the information it brings to light, and to bring ongoing and emerging issues into context.

One example of dialogue between enemies bringing new information to light is the mediation held between a perceived perpetrator and a victim of the Highgate Hotel Massacre, which took place in East London, South Africa, on 1 May 1993 (see also: Edwards, 2009; Edlmann, 2007). Neville Beling was shot by gunmen wielding AK47 rifles while sitting in the bar of the hotel, suffering extensive internal damage and spending years in hospital as a result. Many years after testifying to the TRC about what happened and yet not learning the truth of who had carried out this attack, he met with Letlapa Mphahlele in a formal mediation process. Mphahlele was Commander of the Azanian People's Liberation Army (APLA), and was assumed by many to have given the orders for the attack to be carried out. In the mediation, Mphahlele assured Beling that he had not authorised the attack, and that none of the *modus operandi* of the gunmen were consistent with those of APLA. He later met with the rest of the survivors and the family members of those killed, and worked tirelessly with them to find out who was responsible for this massacre. He also spoke at the first public memorial of the attack in 2007, calling on those responsible to step forward. While the identities of the perpetrators have not yet been established, some of the survivors and Mphahlele became close friends and engaged together on political campaigns. As one of the lead facilitators of this work, I can attest to how this series of conversations between people, who had been regarded as enemies, enabled unprecedented levels of healing for Beling and a number of the other survivors, as well as bringing previously unknown facts about the case to light.

Another, more recent, example of historical memory work was a dialogue process between community members of Worcester, a small town in the Western Cape. As well

residing in a small rural community, many residents of Worcester face the complexities of living, working and attending church alongside people who were on opposite sides of historical divides. During the apartheid era, some men and women from this town (and elsewhere in South Africa) chose to go into exile and join non-statutory liberation forces, while others were part of intense anti-apartheid activities in the community itself. White men in the community, including a number of ministers of Christian churches, were conscripted into the South African Defence Force (SADF), where they served as soldiers and chaplains. Women, from all sectors of the community, watched supported and worried as their sons, husbands, lovers and brothers grappled with choices about their levels of involvement in military structures and other forms of violence.²

In 2013, three men from Worcester attended the War Resisters' International conference held in Cape Town to participate in a panel discussion. The aim of the panel was for them to each tell their stories, sharing details of their lives under apartheid and describing the impact and legacies of apartheid era violence for them. One member of the panel had gone into exile when he was young to join the African National Congress's (ANC's) military wing, *uMkhonto weSizwe* (MK), another had been involved in the internal network of anti-apartheid organisations known as the United Democratic Front (UDF) and the third had been conscripted into the apartheid government's SADF as a soldier and chaplain. The success of this panel, facilitated by Wilhelm Verwoerd,³ and the profound effect it had on the three men who took part – both personally and in terms of the relationships built between them as a result of the experience of speaking on the panel – prompted discussions about the possibilities of a broader process of sharing stories by ex-combatants and their family members from across political and ideological divides within the Worcester community.

In September 2016, a group of 18 people from Worcester gathered for a three day workshop in which they spoke about their experiences of the past, what its legacies are in the present, and how the future could be less burdened by these legacies. The aim of these workshops was to move beyond silence about the past by providing a safe space for people to talk about experiences of violence, and to build a deeper understanding of themselves and each other as members of the same community, in midst of the ongoing racial and class divides existing in the current context. Many very painful stories emerged. The process closed with the group committing to both respecting and embracing the different backgrounds, experiences and perspectives that were present in the room, and work together to support members of the Worcester community who were still traumatised by the war and violence of the apartheid era. These initiatives by the group are ongoing at the time of writing this paper. Some of the key elements of these approaches to dialogue based, historical memory work could be translatable and applicable elsewhere.

Working on thresholds

Processes that engage with relationships between the past and the present are working on a number of individually held boundaries or thresholds. They are seldom thresholds of binaries or opposites, but rather spaces of constant movement, complexity and ambiguity. Dynamics that are presented as binaries for the sake of discussion, reflection and learning are seldom discrete and oppositional to each other in people's lived experiences. The author prefers to see the different sides of a threshold as being like different aspects of a folded piece of fabric, depending on the light, the ways the folds have fallen, and depending on the perspective of the viewer or observer, there are any number of ways of understanding and viewing the fabric.

The primary threshold on which historical memory and dialogue work rests is that of memory and forgetting, which is closely related to the thresholds between speaking and silence. In what is ostensibly a post conflict context such as South Africa, the process of shifting silences and invoking the speaking of memories can take place prematurely. That may well have been the case for many people who testified at the TRC hearings. The overwhelming, unspeakable nature of the violence people have experienced potentially strips a person of the language to name what happened, and what are the legacies of those violent events. Especially when the political or military system that person has been affected by is an expression of structural, ongoing and iterated layers of violence. The potential trauma due to the oppressive or volatile nature of this, or any, context should never be underestimated. It is also important to respect the fact that there is seldom only one story to be told, even by people who thought they were on the same side in a conflict. Furthermore, even when one story surfaces and is related, it rests on the foundations of realms of silence about other factors, people, power dynamics and events that may never be spoken.

Any pressure to describe events before a person or group are ready could prove to be counter-productive to dialogue. Both the passage of time and the fact that people relate to the past differently as they get older are also important factors to consider. In fact, any process that seeks to engage with historical memory needs to work with the understanding that a particular process or event is only one step in an ongoing process. The nature of memory is such that no two accounts of the same story will be exactly the same; there are folds and iterations of silence and not knowing that are being negotiated, by both the tellers of a story and those listening. This work, therefore, does not simply cross thresholds of silence into a field of knowing and understanding. The thresholds being negotiated are dynamic and

emerging, requiring astuteness and flexibility in the facilitation, meaning making and analysis of dialogue and storytelling events.

Shifting needs and focus areas over time

Over the decades the author has been involved in narrative based and dialogical historical memory work, it has become clear that both sociopolitical and personal shifts and changes mean the focus and need for memory work shift and evolve over time. The strategies used in undertaking this work, therefore, constantly need to adapt and evolve as well.

In the case of South Africa, the author would argue that the recent sense of urgency that some people who lived through the apartheid era feel about dealing with the past has emerged for a few reasons. The first is subjective and somewhat personal, i.e. that people spend the later years of their lives reflecting on what they did in their youth and need to make sense of their choices and life experiences. Many of the young people caught up in the violence of the 1970s and 1980s are now in their fifties, sixties and seventies and in a very different phase of life. The second is more contextual and relates to the recent escalation of public violence that leaves no one in any doubt that apartheid has not been undone in South African society.

This violence has manifested in physical, symbolic and discursive ways. Firstly, the majority of people who lived in a state of poverty and marginalisation under apartheid are still living in poverty and marginalisation, and have increasingly taken to the streets to protest the government's lack of progress in providing basic services and realising fundamental human rights for citizens. Similarly, students whose parents do not earn enough to pay university fees took to the streets to protest at the news of a fee hike, demanding that tertiary education be free. At about the same time, a series of symbolic

protests took place on campuses around the country, during which statues and other representations of the colonial past were destroyed or removed. This was seen as a symbolic way of dismantling the social, economic and political legacies of colonialism and apartheid. Finally, the discursive violence has also taken the form of public '*spats*' as white South Africans have insulted black South Africans in public spaces and on social media using crude, angry, racist and bigoted language. These have been challenged in a number of forums, and in some cases have led to charges of public violence and hate speech. In return, there have been increasingly incendiary calls from a newly formed political party for the current government to be overthrown by force, and for land stolen by '*whites*' during colonialism to be expropriated. Racialised discursive divides continue to shape the political and public spheres, simultaneously shaping the nature and role of historical memory work.

Complexities of the current situation in the South African context

The complexities facing people seeking to be memory agents in the South African context are significant. The passage of time has led to an escalation of tensions in the public sphere, rather than the kind of easing that facilitates smooth transitions into memory work. Shifting thresholds of silence about the past requires shifting thresholds of silence about the very uncomfortable present too. The present is born out of what happened in the past, i.e. people's lives, homes, social spaces and physical environments are etched with markers of the past. When the discursive laagers that shape how people narrate their experiences are still highly polarised, the task of creating a safe enough space for stories to be told freely by people from all sides is daunting. And yet the risk would seem to be that, without such processes, the polarisation will only continue to become more extreme.

In the midst of these challenges, it has become increasingly evident that no one approach is always or inevitably appropriate. Facilitators and practitioners of narrative based historical memory work need to be constantly examining their work. Key questions include: when is a facilitated intervention or dialogue process enabling? When does it end up reinforcing memory fields and discursive laagers in ways that shut down and pre-empt the potential narrative shifts that a story telling, narrative based process is intended to enable? There are a few more issues that need to be considered before addressing these questions. One is the issue of how narrative based approaches address the issue of trauma.

Memory and trauma

One of the most challenging aspects of identifying and dealing with the emotional and personal disruptions of one or more traumatic experiences of violence is the *'narrative wreckage'* that is created. Previously coherent, and often well rehearsed stories of a person's life history, their identity and their place in the world up to that point are completely disrupted and fragmented by traumatic events and experiences (Crossley, 2000).

As a result, it is impossible to piece together a clear account of who a person used to be, what happened during particular traumatic experiences, or what the effects and legacies of that trauma have been. The courage and psychological resources required to reconfigure coherent personal narratives into a story in the face of emotional, mental and physical fragmentation are intense enough. They become even more so in a context and society that itself remains deeply fractured, and where violence, poverty and crime are ongoing realities. The personal and relational effects for people of managing these challenges should not be diminished nor disregarded when undertaking work that is intended to provide safe spaces and a nurturing environment within which to speak.

The other dimension to trauma that is important to bear in mind in a narrative based approach to historical memory and dialogue work is that time is not a linear phenomenon. The intensity of many traumatic experiences means that they remain forever in the present tense for people and may be impossible to describe events as being in the past (Andrews, 2010). For some, these memories remain locked in realms of the unspeakable and the unsaid because the power of the experience is undiminished, even with the passage of time.

Also, in the midst of making sense of the personal dimensions of trauma, it is important to bear in mind that the people engaging in historical memory and dialogue work come from families, communities and societies that are, themselves, traumatised. An individual narrative is based on both a personal set of stories and a map of the way in which a person's context has been shaped by, and shapes, where and how they live.

The facilitation of a process that is intended to promote release from painful, unspoken memories and the possibilities of new understanding cannot ignore the risks posed by trauma for people and for the process. Being cognisant of these risks, historical memory and dialogue work also needs to have a realistic understanding of what it intends to achieve, and be deeply respectful of both the fragility and the courage with which every participant enters and engages with this process.

Narrative wreckage, reinforcement, loss and repair

The people who participate in processes such as historical memory dialogues and workshops have committed to the possibility of a number of potential changes. One change would be the fact that people may speak about and describe experiences and events for the first time publically. This is an inevitably intense and cathartic moment, one in which suppressed emotions are finally released. Once the story has been told for

the first time, it becomes possible to tell it again, and again. It will shift and evolve with each telling. However, the safety of the context within which this takes place will determine whether the person is left in such an emotionally raw state that they will suffer from a renewed sense of narrative wreckage and struggle to tell the story again, or whether the catharsis will have a quality of relief and future possibility.

Another dimension to the process is the experience of their story being witnessed, and being a witness to others' stories. In narrative therapeutic theory, part of the role of a witness is to sit outside of a story, acting in solidarity with the speaker as an act of hope (Weingarten, 2000). This dimension to an historical memory and dialogue process is poignant and meaningful both when people have shared similar experiences and when they have been in opposite and adversarial positions in the broader narrative of a context. The experience of hearing and being heard changes a story from being an individual event to becoming something shared, collective and part of a bigger social process. The author has personally witnessed how this shift can bring a profound sense of relief and creative perspective for people on many occasions.

However, ideally, there is a further dimension to an historical memory and dialogue process that takes the possible significance of the process even further. This is the realm of shifting from narrative reinforcement to narrative repair. Narrative reinforcement takes place when stories are told in such a way as to bolster historical constructs or discursive laagers.

In the South African context, this may take the form of a white soldier who fought in the apartheid era military (SADF), insisting that he never oppressed black people or fought for apartheid, but was actually defending his country from the communist forces in the Cold War that were threatening the stability of Southern Africa. Narrative reinforcement could also take the form

of a victim of political violence telling a story in such a way that they do not recognise their own potential agency in dealing with their pain and suffering. The story, therefore, demonstrates a reinforcement of the way in which trauma renders narratives of agency, resilience and posttraumatic growth unattainable.

Narrative repair becomes possible when an historical memory dialogue process leads to somebody recognising the place their story holds within the bigger picture of their context. So, for instance, for the victim of political violence, it could lead to a greater understanding of the moral dignity of their story, an affirmation of the stoicism of their silent coping strategies in the midst of ongoing marginalisation and suffering, and a release of the sense of isolation that the silencing of trauma often causes. By contrast, the white soldier's story could shift from being based on justifying his actions and political ideologies in the past to recognising the extent to which propaganda from the apartheid government shaped his identity and life narratives.

Once this shift has taken place, the creative possibilities of new narrative framing of people's lives and relationships can unfold. Again, historical memory and dialogue based work has the potential to catalyse creative shifts and a growing voicing of hidden and *forgotten* dimensions to the story. This will, in turn, affect others who are witnesses to these shifts.

However, as with other dimensions to this work, narrative shifts do not sit on binary thresholds. In exploring the ways that storytelling can bring about change, there is always the danger that the culture and power dynamics of a process end up creating a whole new set of discursive laagers. The racial and gender identities of the facilitators and organisers, as well as the methods they use, potentially polarise and trap a process in the realm of identity politics, or they can create a safe and enabling culture and style of working, before the process has even

begun. At other levels, the narratives of reconciliation, forgiveness and the 'rainbow nation' that have shaped South African society potentially permeate an historical memory and dialogue process, creating the risk the people will feel implicitly coerced into using certain kinds of language and discourses in storytelling. When this happens, a process is stripped of authenticity and precipitates a complex kind of identity negotiation where what appear to be narratives of repair are more likely to be superficial narrative adjustments, with little likelihood of sustainable shifts or new narrative possibilities for storytellers and witnesses. This is not to say that recognising these dynamics within a process, naming them and inviting a level of transparent engagement with these potential narrative traps is not possible. If handled well, such an engagement with unpacking the hidden and silenced narratives within historical memory and dialogue work could lead to a dynamic, creative and remarkable process.

Finally, when real and sometimes difficult processes of narrative repair do take place, there is always the issue of 'narrative loss' to be managed. This is the loss of an often simplistic notion of historical memory and dialogue, based on discursive laagers and a stereotyped version of the enemy or historical 'other'. It is the process of shifting from the realms of nostalgia about the past into memory work into which the relationships between the past and the present become dynamic, constantly shifting and requiring ongoing narrative repair. Filmmaker, artist, writer, teacher Svetlana Boym poetically describes nostalgia about the past in the following way:

'Nostalgia (from nostos – return home, and algia – longing) is a longing for a home that no longer exists or has never existed. Nostalgia is a sentiment of loss and displacement, but it is also a romance with one's own fantasy. Nostalgic love can only survive in a long-distance relationship. A cinematic image of nostalgia is

a double exposure, or a superimposition of two images – of home and abroad, past and present, dream and everyday life. The moment we try to force it into a single image, it breaks the frame or burns the surface' (Boym, 2001, p.xiv).

This 'home' that she describes can take various forms. It is usually perceived to be necessary as a way of avoiding the painful complexities of the present. However difficult and violent the past might actually have been, the passage of time and the stresses of the present sometimes make the past seem somehow preferable and easier. It is the realm of historical memory that is defended when people's stories of the past involve dimensions of narrative reinforcement. Any genuine process of narrative repair requires deconstructing those reinforcements, and letting go of the ossified dimensions of nostalgia that are woven into stories about the past. This is painful, it requires losing something that has probably felt foundational and containing in a person's stories about difficult experiences of violence, change and possible trauma. It has possibly been the means by which people have shifted from narrative wreckage into at least some level of narrative coherence in accounting for the past. The amount of narrative, emotional and psychological work required for this process of narrative loss to take place is profound, as is the process of building new ways of framing life stories through narrative repair.

Conclusion

In the course of this paper, questions were posed about when a process intended to allow for the surfacing of historical memories through dialogue is enabling. Also, when a process possibly ends up reinforcing memory fields and discursive laagers in ways that shut down and pre-empt the potential narrative shifts that a storytelling, narrative based process is intended to enable.

As has been outlined, there are a number of risks in undertaking this work. However, if

the context and the people involved desire to engage with the possibilities of historical memory work in this way, if there is sufficient support and understanding of the psychological, social and political complexities of doing this work, and if there is an openness to moving beyond narrative reinforcement and narrative loss into meaningful and sustainable narrative repair, then the enabling possibilities of this work can be profound. It has the potential to carry people out of narrative realms defined by ossification, fear and denial into new kinds of spaces and dynamics in which positive, less violent ways of being in the world can grow. These could include building local community level alliances between people who might previously have been in conflict with each other. Such as those who have been perpetrators of systemic, political or military violence acknowledging their role, apologising for damage they have caused and actively taking on reparative work in some way. On the other hand, those who have been victims of systemic, political or military violence claiming their voice and a sense of agency in speaking the truth of what happened to them and/or their community and initiating work that addresses the damage done to them. In this way, narrative repair can become a component of individual, social and political healing.

References

- Allen, J. (Ed.) (1994). *The Rainbow People of God: The making of a peaceful revolution*. New York, NY: Doubleday.
- Andrews, M. (2010). Beyond Narrative: The Shape of Traumatic Testimony. In: M. Hyvärinen, L.-C. Hydén, M. Saarenheimo, & M. Tamboukou (Eds.), *Beyond Narrative Coherence*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ben-Ze'Ev, E., Ginio, R., & Winter, J. (2010). *Shadows of War: A Social History of Silence in the Twentieth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Boym, S. (2001). *The Future of Nostalgia*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Crossley, M. (2000). *Introducing Narrative Psychology: Self, Trauma and the Construction of Meaning*. Buckingham and Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.
- Edlmann, T. (2007). The Highgate Massacre Case: Opportunities and Challenges of Further Investigations and Prosecutions. In: C. Ernest (Ed.), *After the Transition: Respect for Justice, the Judiciary and Respect for the Law in South Africa*. Johannesburg: Centre for the Study of Violence and Reconciliation.
- Edlmann, T. (2012). Division in the (Inner) Ranks: The Psychosocial Legacies of the Border Wars. *South African Historical Journal*, 64(2), 256-272.
- Edlmann, T. (2015). Working on the thresholds of memory and silence: reflections on the praxis of the Legacies of Apartheid Wars Project. *Acta Academica*, 47(1), 98-115.
- Edwards, D. (2009). The Lasting Legacy of Trauma: Understanding Obstacles to Resolution Following Traumatic Experiences. In: P. Gobodo-Madikizela & C. Van der Merwe (Eds.), *Memory, Narrative and Forgiveness: Perspectives on the Unfinished Journeys of the Past* (47–73). Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lomsky-Feder, E. (2004). Life Stories, War and Veterans: On the Social Distribution of Memories. *Ethos*, 32(1), 82-109.
- Lomsky-Feder, E. (2009). The Canonical Generation: Trapped between Personal and National Memories. *Sociology*, 3(6), 1047-1065.
- Weingarten, K. (2000). Witnessing, Wonder and Hope. *Family Process*, 39(4), 389-402.

¹ *Laagers* is a South African word that dates back to early wars in that country and it stands for a place where people parked their wagons in a circular

formation to protect themselves from outside threats.

² Women from Worcester feature in Fiona Ross's seminal book on the role of women in the TRC, and in apartheid era violence. See Ross, F. *Bearing Witness: Women and the Truth and Reconciliation Commission in South Africa* (London: Pluto Press, 2003).

³ Verwoerd and Little have developed the 'Journey Through Conflict' model, piloted in Northern Ireland, but since run in a number of countries. See: Little, A. and Verwoerd, W. *Journey through*

Conflict Trail Guide: Introduction, Bloomington: Trafford, 2013.

Theresa Edlmann, PhD, is a historian, researcher and facilitator working in the field of historical memory and identity and a Post Doctoral Fellow at the University of South Africa, Pretoria.

email: t.edlmann@gmail.com

DOI: 10.1097/WTF.0000000000000168