

Introduction

“Revised Commemoration” in Public Art: What Future for the Monument?

Analays Alvarez Hernandez and Marie-Blanche Fourcade

Volume 46, Number 2, 2021

“Revised Commemoration” in Public Art: What Future for the Monument?

État des lieux de la « commémoration corrigée » en art public : quel avenir pour le monument ?

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1085417ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1085417ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

UAAC-AAUC (University Art Association of Canada | Association d'art des universités du Canada)

ISSN

0315-9906 (print)

1918-4778 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this document

Alvarez Hernandez, A. & Fourcade, M.-B. (2021). Introduction: “Revised Commemoration” in Public Art: What Future for the Monument? *RACAR : Revue d'art canadienne / Canadian Art Review*, 46(2), 13–20.
<https://doi.org/10.7202/1085417ar>

“Revised Commemoration” in Public Art: What Future for the Monument?

Analays Alvarez Hernandez, Marie-Blanche Fourcade

In fall 2019, when we launched our call for contributions to gather observations on revised commemoration in public art, we had just wrapped up an analysis of the subject in an international forum¹ organized by Culture Montréal’s Commission permanente de l’art public.² Before the forum was held, the Commission’s members discussed a number of cases of contestation over, intervention on, and removal of works of public art in Montreal. These cases had led us to consider, among other things, how important it is that intervention processes—temporary or permanent, on or around the artworks—be properly framed and explained so that the scope of the gestures undertaken wouldn’t be diminished, or distortions or inconsistencies be introduced. It was therefore obvious that we would need to draw on and be inspired by actions taken in other geographic and social contexts, including elsewhere in Canada and in the United States, to bring concrete solutions to light. In addition, we would have to seek input from those involved with public art from a wide range of fields so that we could get a well-rounded picture. This stimulating encounter resulted in recommendations aimed at helping decision makers and institutions plan for mediation and guidance regarding these works of public art.³ What also emerged was a desire to broaden the circle of references to the global scale and to understand what the relationships with works in different social and political contexts said about those who contested them, hoped to transform them, or wanted them to disappear. To reach this goal, we had to go beyond the contours of the forum and invite

the international academic community to submit views to be collected in a publication.

But we were far from imagining, in fall 2019, what the future had in store for humanity as a whole. The coronavirus pandemic (COVID-19) caused a fundamental upheaval in every aspect of our lives. The massive and unprecedented global lockdown of populations, however, far from completely emptying public spaces and quelling actions concerning monuments representing controversial figures and events, actually propelled an acceleration in such contestations.⁴ The state of listening into which the world was plunged gave these gestures new reach and media coverage. As a consequence, the contestation of monuments became even more intense at the very time when the authors were writing their articles for this issue. They had to cope with a constant multiplicity of voices, plot twists, and fluctuations, to the point that pausing their thought processes for the purpose of publication proved to be a real feat.⁵

The contestation of monuments, usually in the form of civic or artistic actions, seized on a constantly growing number of figures, most of them dating from the colonial period. On May 22, 2020, not one but two statues of Victor Schoelcher were knocked over in Martinique.⁶ Asked about these actions, French political scientist and decolonial feminist activist Françoise Vergès explained that they expressed a desire to re-appropriate the city.⁷ Indeed, demonstrators were denouncing multiple permanent tributes to Schoelcher that remain even today: towns, statues, schools, and libraries in Martinique still bear his name.⁸

In Colombia, on September 16, 2020, a group of Misak Indigenous people overturned the equestrian statue of Sebastián de Belalcázar in Popayán, thus staging a symbolic trial of the Spanish conquistador who had been appointed governor for life of the city in 1542.⁹ The statue epitomized colonial domination—domination that did not completely fade away even as country after country in Latin America gained independence. It continues to be embodied and perpetuated in daily life in imaginations, linguistic policies, institutions, or simply in colonial modernity’s denial of different forms of knowledge and ways of living and being. These two examples clearly typify the close relationship that exists between the monument and the future. Indeed, the goal of the monument is “to transmit to posterity the memory of well-known people, decisive actions, or ideologies deemed exemplary, thus forming a (monument-centred) contract with the future.”¹⁰ As a consequence, the “futurist” aims of the monument are its reason for being. Françoise Divorine notes that “the future-historical nature of a monument is inherent to the monument’s very essence: it seals its fate forever.”¹¹ Paradoxically, it is this very desire for perpetuation, expressed in the use of materials that resist bad weather and the passage of time, that weakens the monument.¹²

Stepping back a few years, a turning point occurred in 2015, with the start of the most recent wave of demonstrations that have revealed the fragility of monuments. In the spring of that year, the *Rhodes Must Fall* student movement took off in Cape Town, South Africa, with the removal of the statue of British mining magnate Cecil John Rhodes at the entrance to the University of Cape Town. Two years later, the contestation initiated by *Rhodes Must Fall* intensified, following events in the U.S. city of Charlottesville related to the plan to dismantle the statue of the Confederate Army general Robert E. Lee.¹³ The demonstrations triggered by the death of Georges Floyd, an African American man murdered by police in Minneapolis in May 2020, exacerbated the groundswell of contestations and interventions, which benefited

from media attention that was intensified by the lockdown context.

The period from 2015 to 2020 saw not only various interventions upon monuments but also a broader societal reflection that reached out to academic and governmental circles.¹⁴ This issue of *RACAR* is one instance of the many conferences and publications that have been produced to compose a portrait of the situation and try to understand the horizon that stretches before us. The eight contributions collected here offer a critical and multidisciplinary look at commemorative art practices, past and present, in order to draw concrete lessons for the future of public art in the broad sense. They also invite readers to explore the artistic, identity-related, aesthetic, historical, and even technological and legal implications of actions aiming to “revise” commemoration. These revisions take the form of civic and activist interventions; permanent, temporary, and ephemeral art practices; and curatorial practices that might bypass direct action on monuments to home in on an approach involving reparation, restoration, and inclusive rewriting of history.

With essays covering Eastern Europe, Australia, the United States, and Canada, this issue takes a wide view of the question of monuments through the lens of a variety of historical, political, and symbolic contexts and their possible interrelationships. We bring together scholarly articles, portfolios and accounts of practice, and a commentary piece that lean into the current crisis of commemoration and, more broadly, open perspectives on the evolution of the monument and the shifting ideologies that have governed it over time. We give the floor to art historians, curators, artists, and a lawyer in order to present both artistic and extra-artistic points of view.

The issue is divided into three parts. The first takes readers to Eastern Europe and Australia to observe both resurgences of and challenges to monuments, in the light of different post-socialist conditions and diasporic experiences. The second explores “updated” commemorations in the United States and Canada, especially in relation to Indigenous and Black communities.

One of the main focuses here is on the role of social media in transmitting and contributing to debates and interventions around commemorative practices. In the third part, a lawyer who specializes in copyright positions the artist at the heart of the debate on monuments through a discussion on the legal mechanisms that apply in the field of public art.

As a complement, this issue includes a thematic section of book reviews that covers recent publications devoted to commemorative practices and the need to rethink our relationship with monuments. Cameron Cartiere delves into *Teachable Monuments: Using Public Art to Spark Dialogue and Confront Controversy*, edited by Sierra Roney, Jennifer Wingate, and Harriet F. Senie, which addresses the educational potential of monuments in an era marked by the *Black Lives Matter* movement and the presidential term of Donald Trump. Rodrigo D'Alcântara reviews Ana Lucia Araujo's *Slavery in the Age of Memory: Engaging the Past*, which examines the contemporary reception of the legacy of the Atlantic slave trade. Julie Deschepper looks at Frederico Belletani's book *The Meanings of the Built Environment: A Semiotic and Geographical Approach to Monuments in the Post-Soviet Era*, which explores the fate of Soviet-era monuments and memorials in Estonia. Felicia F. Leu comments on Fred Evans's *Public Art and the Fragility of Democracy: An Essay in Political Aesthetics*. Evans analyzes the connections between public art and democracy, and the potential of this art form to resist current autocratic trends. Varda Nisar provides an overview of *Public Memory in the Context of Transnational Migration and Displacement: Migrants and Monuments*. The contributions to this book edited by Sabine Marschall offer a reflection on the role played by immigrants and refugees in the commemorative landscapes of their respective host countries. Finally, Laurent Vernet reviews *Monuments aux victimes de la liberté*, edited by Les Entrepreneurs du commun, and *Monument Lab: Creative Speculations for Philadelphia*, edited by Paul M. Faber and Ken Lum, presenting two projects that concretely expand thought on possible ways to engage in dialogue with monuments.

Approaching the Monument

The two articles and the portfolio presented in this first part of the issue address the mechanics that drive the processes of challenging and transforming monuments. What are the ideas and arguments that feed into the transformation of society's relationship with its commemorative works? What civic, artistic, scientific, and political interventions are implemented to lead to change? What are their tangible results, restorative or not, and how are they finally received? These articles take a critical look at both behind-the-scenes and performance spaces for commemorative works, through which we can grasp many of the actors' dynamics and discourses. Finally, in light of present social phenomena and past experiences, these articles help us decipher the almost synchronic situation that occupies public spaces today.

In her article titled "Palimpsestes mémoriels: démantèlements et résurgences de deux monuments en Bulgarie postsocialiste," Ph.D. student in Art History Ina Belcheva looks at the symbolic dance that played out over decades between two monuments in Sofia: those to the 1st and 6th Infantry Regiment and to the 1300 Bulgaria. The first, erected in the 1930s to pay tribute to soldiers who died during the First World War, gave way in the 1970s to the second, which, with its modern architecture and references, testified to the socialist era. Naturally, after 1989, this monument was challenged. Finally, after twenty-eight years of tension and conflict, it was taken down. Over the long term, this movement, materialized by debates and civic mobilizations, but also by the operations of dismantling, shows how the two monuments succeeded and confronted each other following regime changes.

In the saga of the two monuments described by Belcheva, several aspects stand out. Although memorial monuments tangibly manifest, in the public space, a history that we are supposed to remember, they also challenge citizens to examine their plans for a future in constant redefinition. Belcheva also shows the complexity of the back-and-forth arguments and, through them,

the complexity of monumental works that necessitate an inclusive approach, respectful of their qualities and fair with regard to their histories.

The article by researcher and independent curator Raino Isto, “‘Weak Monumentality’: Contemporary Art, Reparative Action, and Postsocialist Conditions,” extends and complements Belcheva’s thought by shifting the focus from the biography of monuments to performative works that create a dialogue with them. The works he discusses were produced by three artists from Southeastern Europe (ex-Yugoslavia and Albania). Each of them allows us to explore the implications of the notion of “weak monumentality,” which, in Isto’s view, “does not aim to undo the monument; it seeks to use it as a focal point to both recover and discover new affective patterns, and new ways of being together, while still acknowledging its problematic perceived authority.”

The first work, Luiza Margan’s *Eye to Eye with Freedom* (2014–15), invited viewers to come into contact with a monument produced during the socialist era. This physical encounter was based on a restorative approach seeking to re-establish equality between the public and the monument. The second work, *Humanistic Communism* (2016), was produced by Nada Prlja. The performance, which took place in Tirana, Albania, brings a group of people to show their love for and attention to old socialist monuments that have been removed and relegated to an area near a parking lot. The last work, Albanian artist Armando Lulaj’s *NEVER* (2012), is a composite consisting of an intervention in the landscape near Mount Shpirag in southern Albania, a video work, and a series of archival and documentary photographs that transform a monument made in 1968.

Through their work, these artists approach the commemorative work no longer as a strong and authoritative symbol of the past but as a weak monument in the present. It thus becomes, despite the painful or traumatic memories that it embodies, “a new grounds of commemorative practices” that opens the way to restorative gestures and to other interpretations, memories,

and hopes. The performative works invite us to grasp different possible degrees of encounters and interactions with the monument: from close observation to physical and affective contact to intervention that changes its meaning. These three modalities forge new and positive paths for intervention that affect both the approach to and the relationship with monuments, as well as gestures that may respectfully transform and reconcile the past and the present.

Following the first two articles, the portfolio by the artist Nina Sanadze continues the shift from reflection on the history of monuments to the dialogue instigated by performative works that engage with monuments in the public space and transform perceptions of them. Sanadze takes us a bit further in this encounter because she casts her gaze within the artistic process. This privileged point of view is combined with another type of intimacy, that with objects and documents, vestiges of socialism, that were to form the material for a series of installations. During her childhood, Sanadze spent time with a well-known sculptor of monuments, Valentin Topuridze, a neighbour and friend of the family. Many years later, Sanadze acquired Topuridze’s archives. Her goal is therefore to reactivate and challenge this heritage that is part of (her) history. Between violence, beauty, and vulnerability, the objects, which she closely observes and then stages, lead her to reflect on their fate and on the involvement of artists in this outcome. The questions that she asks and the works that she creates from Topuridze’s archives lead her to form links between postsocialist concerns and a postcolonial context. She chose to work with colonial monuments in Melbourne by reactivating the grand narratives to which they testify in the urban space, in order, once again, to question them, to reveal their mechanisms, and to propose calming avenues in the image of the naturalized plants of *Grass Monument* (2020). By closing this section that brings us progressively closer to the monument, Sanadze clearly indicates the essential role that artists play in the process of revision of commemoration and of the types of intervention

associated with them (installations, performances, and exhibitions).

Commemoration 2.0: Updates

One of the objectives of this section is to reflect on the future of commemorative practices and on the nature and expansion of the practices themselves, as a means of ending, for example, the contemporary discursive impasse regarding whether or not controversial monuments should be withdrawn. In “Dread Scott’s *Slave Rebellion Reenactment*: Site, Time, Embodiment,” art historian Adrian Anagnost centres his discussion on a performance by the American artist Dread Scott, *Slave Rebellion Reenactment*. Produced in 2019, this work is intended as a reconstruction of the revolt of enslaved people in New Orleans in 1811. The uprising did not attain its goal of emancipation and was violently crushed. Scott decided to return to its unachieved objectives and give it a triumphal ending, almost two centuries later, in his reconstruction. Anagnost looks at the need to implement commemorative practices that go beyond the monument itself and open up to the imagination, to events, to original sites, and to the community. Here, it is a matter of apprehending commemoration as a process, beyond a single object or event, that stretches it out in time and allows the performance to continue for months, even years. Aside from Scott’s idea of considering the preparations that led to the two-day reconstruction as an integral part of the work, Anagnost also points to how social networks tend to perpetuate temporary art practices and broaden their scope. Scott’s work is deployed across public and virtual space in a continual back-and-forth, leading toward new possibilities for socially engaged practices and placing individuals at the heart of the act of remembering to transform them into “performers of memory.” The constitutive role of participants in this work made Scott into more than simply a facilitator; he was the instigator, the orchestra conductor, and he therefore had been actively supervising the preparations for the performance since 2014.¹⁵ *Slave Rebellion Reenactment* also allows a

community to recover the memory of an event, as a “counter-monument,” a term coined by James E. Young¹⁶ to describe commemorative practices adopting anti-monumental strategies to put the burden of memory back in users’ hands. To return to the idea of the future, Anagnost concludes that the performance organized by Scott is not just a tool of historical revisionism but, above all, a form of futurism.

The commentary by one of this issue’s guest editors, art historian Analays Alvarez Hernandez, creates a bridge between the United States and Canada, and between the first and third articles in this section, which discuss works produced in close collaboration with communities. Alvarez Hernandez’s article, “The Life and Death of the Monument in the Era of Social Networks: New Communities of Memory,” paints a portrait of the crisis of commemorative landscapes in light of the impact of social networks on contemporary ways of remembering and their role as new spaces (virtual platforms) where people can make themselves heard. Alvarez Hernandez also analyzes the impact of the globally “shared” heritage of the colonial undertaking, as well as the role played by the Canadian Truth and Reconciliation Commission in the contestation of monuments in this country. If she starts with the situation surrounding the monuments in South Africa and the United States, it is because she hopes mainly to understand the scope and the presence in Canada of new virtual communities grouped around an intrinsically trans-national and trans-cultural memory. Examining the “revision” gestures undergone by the statues of Edward Cornwallis, in Halifax, and of Queen Victoria and John A. Macdonald, in Montreal, she establishes links with the contemporary effects of colonization and with the formation of solidarity and empathy networks around the planet and in social networks, attempting to reflect on removals of and interventions on these statues without obliterating the specificity of the contexts within which they stand.

Most of the monuments in the news in Canada are portrayals of figures who actively participated in the assimilation and eradication of

Indigenous populations. Artist and professor Brandon Vickard examines this reality, as well as ways of remedying it, by analyzing the process of creating his sculpture *Wolfe and the Sparrows*, inaugurated in 2019 on the 12th Street Bridge in Calgary. In his essay “Monumental Remix: Subverting the Monument in Canada’s Public Spaces,” Vickard describes the process of designing and fabricating the sculpture, for which he adopted an approach aimed at “remixing” the monument. He modified and appropriated Scottish artist John Massey Rhind’s *Monument to Wolfe*, which had been standing since 1898 in Calgary’s South Mount Royal Park, by transforming the head of the British general into a flock of sparrows. The project was developed in close collaboration with residents of the Inglewood neighbourhood and the Moh’kinsstis Public Art Guiding Circle,¹⁷ and the people he consulted expressed the wish to see a more-traditional work—that is, a figurative grouping made with materials associated with monuments.¹⁸ Furthermore, they wanted a project that was both humorous and critical. But the guiding principle for the process seems to have been the desire of residents consulted, both Indigenous and non-Indigenous, to reflect on reconciliation between First Nations and settlers. Ultimately, Vickard’s sculpture decapitated General Wolfe, which can be perceived as a symbolic trial of the past, held jointly by Indigenous and non-Indigenous people, as a step on the long road toward reconciliation.

The portfolio by Montreal artist Noémi McComber concludes this part by bringing the discussion to Montreal, where she, like the guest editors of this issue, lives and works. McComber takes the opportunity to share a number of her projects, in particular those that are deployed in public space. Adopting an approach similar to Vickard’s, she “remixes” monuments and flags—and, sometimes, monuments with flags. The new, temporary meanings that she breathes into these objects may last only for the duration of her interventions, which often take the form of an intimate encounter with the monuments. Starting from her observations in the city, McComber articulates questions about the

possibility of appropriating the built urban patrimony so that it reflects contemporary conditions in a city such as Montreal: is it possible to “remix” statues, individually or collectively, so that we recognize ourselves in them? Although she understands her interventions as “counter-monuments,” more than countering the monumental, they are rather framed by a performative drive. Because she would like the public to see these statues in a new light and encourages thoughtful interaction with them, but also thanks to the role of photographic documentation in her projects, Noémi’s works can be considered “performative monuments,”¹⁹ a notion to which several authors in this issue turn, and sometimes problematize.²⁰ The series in which many of these strategies definitively converge is *Nouveaux drapeaux pour vieux monuments*, a project that McComber produced in collaboration with Dare-Dare, an artist-run centre, in 2011. She began this series of interventions in order to challenge the presence of several monuments in the Montreal borough of Ville-Marie—including those with likenesses of Jean Vauquelin, Jean-Olivier Chénier, John Young, and Queen Victoria—in the light of contemporary geopolitical and social realities. Alone or with collaborators, she decorated these statues with Quebec flags whose symbolism had been modified. On the “fleur-de-lys,” references to the French monarchy and the Catholic religion were replaced by snowy owls, pink-coloured high heels, ice-cream cones, poutines, and rainbow hearts—symbols embodying realities and representations more closely aligned with the local communities in which these statues stand today. Flags and monuments are among the elements that contribute to the formation of an imagined community, which Benedict Anderson²¹ defines as a (national) community whose members, although they do not necessarily know each other, imagine themselves in “communion.” Within these communities, people think of and connect with others in different ways, in the absence of face-to-face contact, through symbolic forms of the nation that consolidate a sense of belonging.

Although based in a desire to promote dialogue with monuments, most of which glorify figures from the colonial period, the works by Vickerd and McComber nevertheless enjoin us to explore whether such a dialogue can take place and whether the (national) community can be reimagined as long as these statues remain in place. The prospect that dialogue would be impossible was put forward by Métis artist David Garneau in 2014 in his performance *Dear John, Louis David Riel*, presented on the 129th anniversary of the death of Louis Riel, leader of the Métis people and recognized as the founder of Manitoba.²² In Regina's Victoria Park, host to a statue of John A. Macdonald—who, as prime minister of Canada, ordered Riel's execution by hanging—, Garneau assumed Riel's identity. A hood over his head and a noose around his neck, the artist wore a costume inspired by Riel's garb during his trial. During the performance, Garneau became more and more frustrated by the impossibility of having a dialogue with a statue—in this case the statue of Macdonald—bringing out a more symbolic register and the expressing complexity of reconciliation. As Dylan Miner explains, "Reconciliation also presupposes a prior relationship between two parties that was amicable, well-balanced, and equitable. Settler colonialism, as we know too well, was none of these."²³ In this issue, rather than offering pat responses to the debate underway or adopting entrenched positions, we wish to unpack and expose a variety of points of view that confront each other in the public sphere in order to encourage reflection by many voices.

Moral Rights and Public Art: An Assessment

We wanted to include in this issue a contribution outlining a legal framework that shows the concrete effects of contestations of and interventions on commemorative works. Although it is important, the legal aspect is rarely invoked in current debates. Lawyer François Le Moine took on this exercise by focusing on what he feels is swept under the rug in these discourses: artists and their rights. Nevertheless, his article is also addressed to public art managers and therefore

provides essential legal guideposts for concretely approaching contestation movements and interventions and, more generally, public art policies. Le Moine looks at both the present and the future, and that is why his article concludes this thematic issue. In "La loi, la statue et l'artiste. L'apport du droit moral aux débats sur la commémoration," he reviews the provisions of the Copyright Act that govern public art in Canada. A clear comprehension of it can further enlighten many contemporary decisions regarding controversial monuments." After giving an overview of the main elements of moral rights, including how they are different from copyright, Le Moine examines a series of examples drawn from the United States, Canada, and Quebec to clarify which situations and transformations would be an infringement of a work's integrity, even in the absence of temporary or permanent physical modification. Although mutilation or modification of a work of public art is a violation that can be contested, destruction leaves the artist little recourse because it is not always an infringement of moral rights. Finally, Le Moine posits that authorities responsible for the management of the works of public art on their territory should adopt policies or guidelines that frame, for example, the possibility of removals while respecting artists' moral rights. This issue is even more urgent in a time when governments are called upon to respond rapidly to multiple demands for intervention on the commemorative works in their collections. ¶

Analays Alvarez Hernandez is Assistant Professor of Art History at the Université de Montréal.
—analays.alvarez@umontreal.ca

Marie-Blanche Fourcade is head of conservation and exhibitions at the Montreal Holocaust Museum and Adjunct Professor in the Art History department at the Université du Québec à Montréal.
—marie-blanche.fourcade@museeholocauste.ca

1. This study day at the Bibliothèque et Archives nationales du Québec brought together researchers, artists, cultural professionals, and residents to discuss major political, symbolic, and aesthetic issues related to individuals' relationships with monuments and, therefore, to collective memory in the public space. Concretely, the objective of the forum was to share case studies of monuments and of mobilizing projects that might contribute to a search for management solutions for these works, whose place and relevance are being challenged today. For more on the forum, see: https://culturemontreal.ca/app/uploads/2019/08/FORUM_Art-public-et-commemoration_Programme_F.pdf.

2. About this commission, see: <https://culturemontreal.ca/grands-dossiers/art-public/>.

3. See Analays Alvarez Hernandez, Marie-Blanche Fourcade, and Maria Silina, *Rapport synthèse du forum Entre raison et tensions: L'art public à l'épreuve de la commémoration corrigée* (Montreal: Culture Montréal, August 2020), https://culturemontreal.ca/app/uploads/2021/06/Synthese-forum-art-public-2019_VF_EN.pdf.

4. For examples of temporary or permanent interventions on monuments in 2020, notably in Europe and the United States, see: "Vague de vandalisme contre des monuments jugés racistes aux États-Unis et en Europe," Radio-Canada, June 11, 2020, <https://ici.radio-canada.ca/nouvelle/1711129/racisme-statues-christophe-colomb-europe-etats-unis>.

5. In this regard, we would like to extend our warmest thanks to all contributors to this issue for their tenacity in meeting their commitment despite an unanticipated and complex context.

6. Schoelcher, a French politician, wrote a decree the adoption of which, on April 27, 1848, banned slavery throughout France.

7. Bruno Sat, "Statues de Schoelcher brisées en Martinique: réflexion avec deux spécialistes de l'esclavage," *Outre-mer laïque*, May 31, 2020, <https://la1ere.francetvinfo.fr/statues-schoelcher-brisees-martinique-reflexion-deux-specialistes-esclavage-838076.html>.

8. *Ibid.*

9. "Colombia: Indigenous protesters topple conquistador's statue," BBC News, September 17, 2020, <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-latin-america-54186047>.

10. Analays Alvarez Hernandez, "La représentation du génocide

arménien dans l'espace public français: le monument comme dispositif ethnoculturel d'appropriation et de légitimation," PhD dissertation, Université du Québec à Montréal, 2015, 97 (our translation).

11. Françoise Divorine, "Entre événement et mémoire: la monumentalité contemporaine," in *Ville, forme, symbolique, pouvoir, projets* (Liège: Pierre Mardaga, 1986), 17 (our translation).

12. Alvarez Hernandez, "La représentation du génocide."

13. For more on the events in Cape Town and Charlottesville, see the commentary by Analays Alvarez Hernandez in this issue.

14. We are thinking, for example, of municipalities setting up commissions of experts and citizens to examine controversial monuments in their area and make recommendations. See, for example, the report produced by one of these commissions in New York: "Mayoral Advisory Commission on City Art, Monuments, and Markers," January 2018, <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/monuments/downloads/pdf/mac-monuments-report.pdf>.

15. Scott's role is reminiscent of that of British artist Jeremy Deller in the reconstruction of one of the most highly media-covered battles between miners and police officers on June 18, 1984, in Orgreave, England. Claire Bishop explains that, in *The Battle of Orgreave* (2001), Deller "is a directorial instigator, working in collaboration with a production agency (Artangel), a film director (Figgis), a battle re-enactment specialist (Howard Giles), and hundreds of participants." Claire Bishop, "The Social Turn: Collaborations and Its Discontents," in *Artificial Hells, Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorships* (London and New York: Verso, 2012), 37.

16. James E. Young, "The Counter-Monument: Memory against Itself in Germany Today," *Critical Inquiry* 18, no. 2 (1992): 267–96.

17. This is an advisory committee for the public art program of the City of Calgary, composed of Indigenous artists from different communities and practising various disciplines.

18. This desire seemed to be related to recent public-art controversies in Calgary around, among others, the sculpture by the Inges Idee collective, *Travelling Light* (2013). On this controversy, see "Blue Ring Artists Surprised by Reaction to Installation," CBC

News, October 11, 2013, <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/calgary/blue-ring-artists-surprised-by-reaction-to-installation-1.1991453>.

19. Mechtilid Widrich, *Performative Monuments: The Rematerialisation of Public Art* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2014).

20. See the articles by Adrian Anagnost and Raino Isto in this issue.

21. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983); rev. and exp. ed. 2006 (London: Verso).

22. Garneau returned to this work in 2019, in the following essay: David Garneau, "Extra-Rational Indigenous Performance: Dear John"; Louis David Riel, "Canadian Theatre Review 178 (2019): 72–76.

23. Dylan Miner, David Garneau: *Dear John; Louis David Riel* (Regina: Dunlop Art Gallery, 2014).