



© 2021 by the author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), allowing third parties to copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format and to remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially, provided the original work is properly cited and states its license.

Citation: Smith, M. 2021. 'Who controls the past... controls the future': A Case for Dialogical Memorialisation. *Public History Review*, 28, 1–12. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/phrj.v28i0.7787>

ISSN 1833-4989 | Published by UTS ePRESS | <https://epress.lib.uts.edu.au/journals/index.php/phrj>

'Who controls the past... controls the future': A Case for Dialogical Memorialisation

Mariko Smith

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5130/phrj.v28i0.7787>

During the first History Council of NSW and Australian Centre for Public History at the University of Technology co-hosted seminar 'Vandalism, Vindication and what to do with the Empty Plinth?', my Australian Museum colleague, Wiradjuri man Nathan mudyi Sentance, saw the prospect of the empty plinth as 'a great opportunity to create space for more truth telling about this country'.¹ The newly vacated space would present an opportunity to take the statue or monument's physical domination of place completely out of the equation and instead refocus our collective attention towards the stolen Aboriginal land upon which it was situated. In doing so this would open up space to 'restoring places [and] learning from Country'. During the second seminar 'Public Protest and Public History', I expressed my own critical engagements with the Australian memorial landscape in answering that same question of what happens once a statue or monument is removed.² In my view, an empty plinth or field does not automatically create a more just society. And the complete removal of a contested statue or monument could in fact give rise to more injustice in the sense that it tends to turn what should be a constructive shared dialogue about history into a potentially dangerous one-sided, zero-sum game which further pits groups of people against each other in divisive identity politics.

To begin with, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples were effectively removed from this country's history with the advent of British colonisation. Speaking as a Yuin woman, we First Nations peoples experienced our rich, diverse cultures and knowledges being supplanted by colonial narratives which disregarded hundreds of generations of First Nations custodianship of Country and reset the clock to deem that the only Australian history that should count began with the likes of Cook and the First Fleet from the late 1700s.³

This is the state of affairs inherited by us today, and at the heart of the issue is belonging: we (in the broader collective sense of Indigenous and non-Indigenous Australians) find ourselves in a situation where the removal of representations marking one group's history and connection to this place results in division and a sense of being erased. I am not only referring to the experiences of First Nations peoples being subjected to dispossession and genocidal practices. But also to the experiences of non-Indigenous Australians who descended from 'currency lads and lasses' and that they themselves know no other sense of belonging than to this land, albeit in a *very* different way to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.⁴

DECLARATION OF CONFLICTING INTEREST The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. **FUNDING** The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Dialogical Memorialisation as a Pragmatic Approach

To this end, I advocate for a pragmatic approach which provides an avenue for intergenerational and cross-cultural dialogue that includes multiple perspectives and accounts in ways to represent a more complete, layered and nuanced history. Personally, I first came across the concept of ‘dialogical memorialisation’ from reading Brad West’s 2010 article ‘Dialogical Memorialization, International Travel and the Public Sphere: A Cultural Sociology of Commemoration and Tourism at the First World War Gallipoli Battlefields’, which presents this approach to commemorating events that involved multiple actors, in this case the Turkish, Australian and New Zealander people in respect of the Gallipoli campaign in World War One.⁵ West unpacks the importance of dialogue in dialogical memorialisation as a participatory discourse involving more than one person’s point of view, through adopting Russian scholar Mikhail Bakhtin’s conceptualisation that ‘language is half someone else’s’.⁶ He also considers this method of recalling and engaging with the past through the lens of Erving Goffman’s dramaturgical analysis on the importance of social interaction, in how a dialogical approach ‘fundamentally alters the stage on which history is narrated and performed’.⁷

Fellow contributors to this special issue of the *Public History Review*, Bruce Scates and Tony Ballantyne, both contribute pieces about counter-memorialisation with examples from Australia and New Zealand respectively. These describe processes which are methodologically consultative and capable of accommodating not only multiple voices of the past, but also facilitating the inclusion of First Nations perspectives.⁸ In the Australian context, I was especially inspired by what can be described as a great instance of dialogical memorialisation, in the form of the Explorers’ Monument in Fremantle, Western Australia. This had finally included local Aboriginal peoples’ perspectives previously omitted from the colonial memorial commemorating three colonisers killed by Aboriginal people on the far north-western frontier in Western Australia in 1864. Scates himself was involved in the ‘Public Action Project’ with the Bidyadanga and Baldja communities, City of Fremantle councillors and historians which worked on adding a plaque to the 1913 monument in 1994 that aimed to acknowledge Aboriginal people’s right to defend against those who invaded, as well as to pay respect to all First Nations peoples who died in resistance to colonisation.⁹

The debates about the history of as well as the future for Confederate statues in the United States of America have played out against the backdrop of *The New York Times’ 1619 Project*¹⁰ and the Black Lives Matter movement. This has provided a masterclass in dialogical memorialisation strategies and techniques. In 2019, the American *60 Minutes* program sought political and academic responses to the issues raised about Richmond Virginia’s Monument Avenue of Confederate statues. In his interview Professor Julian Hayter (a historian at the University of Richmond) suggested as another option to removing statues that ‘we use the scale and grandeur of those monuments against themselves’.¹¹ He elaborated on this idea by saying:

I think we lack imagination when we talk about memorials. It’s all or nothin’. It’s leave ‘em this way, or tear ‘em down. As if there’s nothin’ in between that we could do to tell a more enriching story about American history.¹²

With the dangers of a zero-sum game being very real in the United States, where tensions have at times become violent because groups of people have resorted to physically defending legacies of the past that they identify and connect with, I find Professor Hayter’s argument compelling. He sees a way forward in finding ‘a useable way to tell two stories, or tell multiple stories’. In this case it involves including both the descendants of Confederate soldiers from the American Civil War (1861-1865) as well as the descendants of enslaved people so the statues can be recontextualised and re-signified to enable an intergenerational dialogue that contributes to a multi-faceted and more participatory American history. Ultimately, it is a way to promote critical thinking and engagement with these old statues, moving away from viewing them as

nineteenth-century memory culture relics and transforming them into more dynamic parts of society which more accurately reflect the many different people now residing in it.

A Local Case Study in Hornsby

I wish to describe another guiding example of dialogical memorialisation inspiring my recent research and praxis, which is from Australia and involved the inclusion of essential local First Nations history and voices. It occurred close to where I now reside on the lands of the Darug and GuriNgai¹³ peoples in the Hornsby Shire local government area in Sydney, New South Wales. This example centres on a collaboratively drafted statement by Aboriginal and non-Indigenous local community members plus local government representatives which responded to the fiction of Cook's 'discovery' of Australia in 1770. This statement has been produced in the form of two plaques, dated 2006 and 2020 respectively.

Both versions have the same wording as follows:

Hornsby Shire Council acknowledges that when Captain James Cook claimed possession of the east coast, the land which is now Hornsby Shire had already been occupied by the Darug and Guringai Peoples for many thousands of years. The descendants of the Indigenous people continue to live in our community. They remain Traditional Custodians – still caring for Country.

Dyaralang Gnia Norar (Darug)
Maniau Oomillayn Goorri (Guringai)

In 2006, the first of these additional plaques was created and installed on the ornamental fountain in Hornsby Park which was named the Bicentenary Fountain (it was also known as the Captain Cook Fountain) to commemorate the 200th anniversary of Captain Cook in 1770. It was an inspiring collaborative act between the local Aboriginal community, members of the Hornsby Area Residents for Reconciliation group and Hornsby Shire Council councillors and staff. This additional plaque was an emphatic response to the original plaque's assumption of *terra nullius* before Cook's arrival – the legal doctrine meaning 'land belonging to no one' in Latin which was overturned by the 1992 *Mabo* High Court of Australia decision. The wording on the original plaque was:

This Fountain was erected in 1770 to commemorate the 200th anniversary of the discovery and exploration of the east coast of Australia by Captain James Cook.¹⁴



Bicentenary Fountain 2009 (Hornsby Shire Council) <https://www.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/library/catalogues-and-resources/local-history/hornsby-park-history>



Original plaque (undated) (Hornsby Shire Council) <https://www.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/library/catalogues-and-resources/local-history/hornsby-park-history>



Additional plaque 2006 (Hornsby Shire Council) <https://www.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/library/catalogues-and-resources/local-history/hornsby-park-history>

For a number of years, the two plaques sat together in dialogue until the fountain was eventually removed by 2017 as part of redevelopment plans within Hornsby Park for the Aquatic Centre.¹⁵ Both plaques were thankfully salvaged by Hornsby Shire Council and placed in storage until the council could reach a decision, as guided by its Hornsby Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Consultative Committee (the HATSIC Committee),¹⁶ on whether to reinstate either both plaques or just the 2006 one (since without the fountain being in existence, the original one has somewhat lost its context) somewhere in the local vicinity in order to continue honouring that important local shared history. As an Aboriginal person and local Hornsby Shire



Local newspaper article about the 2006 plaque (Photograph Helen White – member of Hornsby Area Residents for Reconciliation)

resident I am a member of both the HATSIC Committee (also serving as co-chair) and Hornsby Area Residents for Reconciliation group.

From 2019 to 2020, Hornsby Shire Council and the HATSIC Committee collaboratively worked on plans for a newly constructed plaque which would retain the 2006 plaque's wording and be placed on a new plinth of sandstone featuring carvings that depict two local animal totems of stingray (for GuriNgai) and possum (for Darug). It was decided that a new and prominent location in the garden bed in front of the council chambers – an important site of local decision-making – be chosen to emphasise the visibility of the local Aboriginal community and the priority of achieving reconciliation in the Hornsby Shire.

The two plaques from 1970 and 2006 were certainly not to be forgotten. In the lead-up to the eventual unveiling of the new sandstone monument in 2021 (delayed from the first-half of 2020, the year of the 250th anniversary of Cook, due to COVID-19 social restrictions) they were moved up to a display case inside the council chambers general meeting room.¹⁷ Together, they share value in presenting an intergenerational dialogue which demonstrates the significant shift in community attitudes when residents in Hornsby Shire understood the history of Australia within their own local setting and showed their acceptance and appreciation of other perspectives besides that of Europeans.¹⁸



New plaque and sandstone plinth 2020 (Hornsby Shire Council) <https://www.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/library/catalogues-and-resources/local-history/hornsby-park-history>



New plaque (2020), photograph Councillor Robert Browne of Hornsby Shire Council

Clashes of Class

It is important to point out that the use of dialogical memorialisation is not a recent or ‘woke’ strategy that has been limited to use for the benefit of non-White people in relation to race. White people have also engaged with memorials in this way. They too have a history of protesting statues and monuments for their own reasons. Of course, this is not intended to be an over generalisation or particularly novel observation. But in the current political climate this point could easily be overlooked and result in simply casting these

Statue Wars as racial Culture Wars fodder. I was able to consider dialogical memorialisation through the lens of power dynamics and class through an example of an 1879 (the same year as “old mate” Cook was erected in Hyde Park, Sydney) monument dedicated to a figure in American Revolutionary War history whose memorialisation prompted debates around ‘old’ and ‘new’ American ideals and values that are intrinsically linked to class.

Major John André was a British army officer involved in the American Revolutionary War who is well-known in history not only for plotting with the notorious Benedict Arnold (who was an officer of the American Continental Army before he defected to the British side, with Arnold’s name becoming synonymous with the word ‘traitor’) to betray the strategic fort of West Point but also for being caught behind American lines and hanged as a British spy in October 1780 in Tappan, a town in New York State.¹⁹ In 1879, the site of his execution and initial burial (before his body was repatriated to England in 1821 to instead lay in glory within Westminster Abbey) was marked by a large granite monument, paid for by American businessman Cyrus W. Field.²⁰ The main inscription on the monument was written by the then-Dean of Westminster Abbey, Arthur Stanley. It stated:

Here died October 2, 1780
Major John André of the British Army
who, entering the American lines
on a secret mission to Benedict Arnold
for the surrender of West Point
was taken prisoner, tried and condemned as a spy.
His death,
though according to the stern code of war
moved even his enemies to pity;
and both armies mourned the fate
of one so young and brave
In 1821 his remains were removed to
Westminster Abbey
A Hundred years after the execution
this stone was placed above the spot where he lay
by a citizen of the United States against which he fought
not to perpetuate the record of strife,
but in token of those better feelings
which have since united two nations,
one in race, in language and in religion,
in the hope that the friendly understanding
will never be broken.²¹

Even after nearly one hundred years following the Revolution, the memorial to a British spy was not received well by American community members who felt it was an insult to the memory of General George Washington.²²

There were comments made at the time that Field was ‘falsifying history’ and that no local would support the monument ‘unless the inscription is amended according to historic truth.’²³ The Americans who attended his execution could not have helped but admired André’s demeanour in the face of death – while he was condemned to be hanged as a common spy rather than shot according to his status as an officer, he was dignified and refined till the end. He was also recognised as a worthy adversary with his bravery, loyalty and patriotism (even if it was for the other side). Nevertheless this sentiment would not necessarily extend to the need to venerate an enemy agent with a monument on American soil.²⁴ Significantly, the three

soldiers of humble backgrounds in the American countryside – John Paulding, Isaac Van Wart and David Williams – who caught André as he attempted to escape, and were for a time considered true patriots for their deeds, were not honoured in quite the same way as André.²⁵



The Andre monument, 2012 (photograph Joe Schumacher) <https://jschumacher.typepad.com/joe/2012/03/the-andre-monument.html>

Such was the impression made by André during his short life – dying just shy of thirty years of age – that post-death in England his name ‘had become a byword for fidelity, his death a symbol of the stoicism Britain expected from its officer class’.²⁶ Even when the British consul travelled to Tappan in 1821 to witness the exhumation of André’s remains and see to their safe departure to England, he was met with a relatively peaceful reception from a number of prominent and respectable American residents including the local gentry and clergy of the town.²⁷ John Knight notes in his article about the resurrection of André’s character ‘from dishonourable criminal to venerated martyr’ that the ones who were against the event were typically ‘of a lower caste’ who had believed that this favourable treatment of a convicted criminal was ‘a disgrace to the memory of George Washington’, as well as to Paulding, Van Wart and Williams.²⁸ As Knight observed in his analysis, even in the United States of the early decades post-Revolution, apparently ‘class played as large a part in honouring virtue and commemorating patriotism as it ever did in aristocratic Britain’.²⁹ The aspirations and ideals of America’s founding fathers and other influential men – denoting the strong gender bias of the time – led to debates about who, in the absence of a British monarch because of obvious reasons, should be in charge of the republic’s destiny and future.

The Federalists, including the likes of Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, would see to it that only men of a certain class, education and breeding should have the right to govern and rule.³⁰ Knight identified that André would have fitted in with this crowd – again, despite obvious reasons.³¹ On the other hand, men like Paulding, Van Wart and Williams from more humbler backgrounds as ‘yeomen farmers’ were often the supporters of an ‘agrarian democracy’ which came to define elements of Republicanism championed by the likes of Thomas Jefferson, who noted that ‘cultivators of the earth are the most valuable citizens’ in terms of patriotism and morality.³² However, in time these three men would be characterised in a negative light influenced by an assessment of their class as opportunistic thieves rather than patriots – labelled as ‘Loyalist military freebooters’ (also known as ‘Cowboys’) – who decided to turn over André to their advantage, despite it being a clear-cut case that André indeed violated the rules of war by engaging in espionage.³³



The Andre monument, 2012 (photograph Joe Schumacher) <https://jschumacher.typepad.com/joe/2012/03/the-andre-monument.html>



Plaque to Washington 2012 (photograph Joe Schumacher) <https://jschumacher.typepad.com/joe/2012/03/the-andre-monument.html>

Due to the controversy the monument was vandalised and several bombs were thrown at it monument, causing damages that needed to be repaired along with the erection of an iron fence around it for protection.³⁴ An additional plaque was added to it in 1905 by the American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society to specifically pay tribute to ‘the fortitude of Washington and his generals in one of the crises of the American Revolution’, referring to Arnold’s treachery and defection.³⁵ Critically, this plaque not only added another perspective to the context of André’s story – that of Washington and his men. But it mentioned preserving ‘the identity of a place of historic interest’ – that is, it supported *adding* to the existing narrative in place rather than participating in its obliteration.³⁶ Indeed, one motivation behind including

this additional plaque was to help deter any ‘destructive ideas’ and further attacks by shifting the narrative favourably towards Washington and the justice that he meted out back in 1780.³⁷

This demonstrates the potential of dialogical memorialisation across various power dynamics. This monument and the history of people’s engagements with it shows a robust dialogue between Revolutionary-era and post-war American values. Contextually, we can learn about the tug-of-war between Hamiltonian Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans’ visions of what they envisioned the republic of America to become, as well as the ideal type of man they wanted to run it: whether this is an affluent gentleman like André or rather a man of the people who represented those like Paulding, Van Wart and Williams. We can see this through André’s valorisation in comparison to the three ‘Peasant Patriots’ who caught him.³⁸

Dialogical Approaches to Memory, History and Shared Dialogue

I have used other modes of dialogical memorialisation in my practice as a First Nations museum curator at the Australian Museum in Sydney. I worked as the assistant curator alongside the curator, Wailwan and Kooma woman Laura McBride on the *Unsettled* exhibition. This is a temporary exhibition showing from 22 May to 10 October 2021 in the Museum’s new basement touring exhibition space. It is a First Nations-led and -informed truth-telling exhibition about Australia’s foundational history. While it was developed primarily from a First Nations perspective, it also includes colonial accounts and documents relating to people like James Cook and Sir Joseph Banks.

These were not used to dominate the story as the only authoritative voice. They were used to accompany a range of perspectives including voices such as the Kaurareg First Nations people who dispute Cook’s records of a landing and annexation ceremony on their island of Tuined (now called Possession Island because of Cook’s account). Rather, we present the various and at times conflicting accounts regarding Cook and Possession Island, not to suggest that they corroborate the narrative, but instead to highlight the diversity of viewpoints of that event between a number of different participants. Visitors can read and consider these various perspectives together to gain further knowledge and understanding about the complex and multifaceted nature of Australian history.

Acknowledgement

The article’s main title is taken from George Orwell’s 1949 novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: ‘Who controls the past,’ ran the Party slogan, ‘controls the future: who controls the present controls the past.’

Endnotes

1. See <https://historycouncilnsw.org.au/history-now-statue-wars-vandalism-or-vindication-and-what-to-do-with-the-empty-plinth-20-july-2020/> (accessed 16 June 2021). See also Nathan Sentance’s commentary in this volume.
2. See <https://www.uts.edu.au/research-and-teaching/our-research/australian-centre-public-history/events-and-seminars/history-week-2020/public-protest-and-public-history-statue-wars-ii-public-history-hour-archive> (accessed 16 June 2021).
3. This history is critically examined in the *Unsettled* exhibition I co-curated with Wailwan and Kooma woman Laura McBride at the Australian Museum, Sydney. *Unsettled* is a temporary exhibition showing from 22 May to 10 October 2021 in the Museum’s new basement touring exhibition space. It is First Nations-led and -informed truth-telling exhibition about Australia’s foundational history: <https://australian.museum/exhibition/unsettled/> (accessed 16 June 2021).
4. See definition in Helen Doyle, ‘Currency lads and lasses’, in *The Oxford Companion to Australian History*, Oxford University Press, Melbourne, 2001 retrieved 13 June 2021 from <https://www.oxfordreference-com.ezproxy.library.sydney.edu.au/view/10.1093/acref/9780195515039.001.0001/acref-9780195515039-e-396>; and B.T. Jones, ‘Currency Culture: Australian Identity and Nationalism in New South Wales before the Gold Rushes’, *Australian Historical Studies*, vol 48, no 1, 2017, pp68–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1031461X.2016.1250789>
5. B. West, ‘Dialogical Memorialization, International Travel and the Public Sphere: A Cultural Sociology of Commemoration and Tourism at the First World War Gallipoli Battlefields: Contemporary Tourist Studies in Australia’, *Tourist Studies*, vol 10, no 3, 2010, pp209–225. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468797611407756>

6. M.M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, Austin, 1981, p293 cited in *ibid*, pp209–225; 210.
7. E. Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Penguin, London, 1959 and J.C. Alexander, J. C. (2004) 'Cultural Pragmatics: Social Performance Between Ritual and Strategy', *Sociological Theory*, vol 22, no 4, 2004, pp527–73: cited in West, *op cit*, pp213; 211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0735-2751.2004.00233.x>
8. See Kiera Lindsey and Mariko Smith, 'A Most Ungrateful Citizenry?: The Power of Protest and Public Histories', in this volume's article section.
9. See Bruce Scates' article in this volume and Bruce Scates, 'Monumental errors: how Australia can fix its racist colonial statues', *The Conversation*, 28 August 2017, <https://theconversation.com/monumental-errors-how-australia-can-fix-its-racist-colonial-statues-82980> [accessed 14 June 2021].
10. 'The 1619 Project', *The New York Times*, 2019, <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/08/14/magazine/1619-america-slavery.html> [accessed 14 June 2021].
11. CBS News, 2019, 'The History and Future of Confederate Monuments', *60 Minutes* television program, 12 July 2019, transcript, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/60-minutes-the-history-and-future-of-confederate-monuments-2020-07-12/> [accessed 14 June 2021].
12. *ibid*.
13. GuriNgai (also written as Guringai) refers the local Aboriginal people who are connected to Country by ancestry in parts of northern Sydney and parts of the Central Coast of New South Wales. The name of these people derives from how they describe themselves in their language, using the words guri (man) and ngai (woman).
14. Hornsby Shire Council, 'History of Hornsby Park and the fountain plaques', *Local History*, 2020, <https://www.hornsby.nsw.gov.au/library/catalogues-and-resources/local-history/hornsby-park-history> [accessed 14 June 2021].
15. *ibid*.
16. As an Aboriginal person who resides in Hornsby Shire, I joined the committee as a member and have been in a role of co-chair for several years now. It was wonderful to be part of the recent iteration of the plaque which responded to the fiction of Cook's 'discovery'.
17. Hornsby Shire Council, 2020, *op cit*.
18. Hornsby Shire Council, 'Captain Cook fountain', *Hornsby Shire Recollects*, nd, <https://hornsbyshire.recollect.net.au/nodes/view/5162>, accessed 14 June 2021; and Hornsby Shire Council, 2020, *op cit*.
19. J. Schumacher, "'The Andre Monument", what about the plastic animals?', blog, 22 March 2012, <https://jschumacher.typepad.com/joe/2012/03/the-andre-monument.html> [accessed 14 June 2021].
20. Field was influenced by the Dean of Westminster Abbey, Arthur Stanley, who in fact wrote the plaque's inscription. R.E. Cray, (1996). 'The John André Memorial: The Politics of Memory in Gilded Age New York', *New York History*, vol 77, no 1, 1996, pp6, 12-15. See also Schumacher, *op cit*; Rockland County, '42 Andre Hill, Tappan', *Andre Monument*, 2016, <http://rocklandgov.com/departments/environmental-resources/county-parks-and-dog-runs/andre-monument/> [accessed 14 June 2021]; J. Knight, 'The Death and Resurrection of Major John Andre', *Journal of the American Revolution*, 14 August 2018, <https://allthingsliberty.com/2018/08/the-death-and-resurrection-of-major-john-andre/> [accessed 14 June 2021].
21. Cray, 'The John Andre Memorial', pp17-18.
22. *ibid*, p5.
23. *ibid*, p91.
24. See descriptions detailed in J. Knight, 'The Death and Resurrection of Major John Andre', *Journal of the American Revolution*, 14 August 2018, <https://allthingsliberty.com/2018/08/the-death-and-resurrection-of-major-john-andre/> [accessed 14 June 2021]; R.E. Cray, R. E. (1997). 'Major John André and the Three Captors: Class Dynamics and Revolutionary Memory Wars in the Early Republic, 1780-1831', *Journal of the Early Republic*, Fall, 1997, pp379-380 <https://doi.org/10.2307/3123941>; Cray, 'The John André Memorial', *op cit*, pp7-8.
25. Knight, *op cit*. See also Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors' *op cit*, p381. The Captors Monument in Tarrytown was overshadowed by the André monument. See Cray, 'The John André Memorial', pp19-20.
26. Knight, *op cit*.
27. *ibid*; Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors', pp389-391; Cray, 'The John André Memorial', p9.
28. J. Knight, 'The Death and Resurrection of Major John Andre', *Journal of the American Revolution*, 14 August 2018, <https://allthingsliberty.com/2018/08/the-death-and-resurrection-of-major-john-andre/>, accessed 14 June 2021; Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors', pp388-391.
29. Knight, *op cit*.
30. *ibid*; Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors' pp379-380.
31. See also Cray, 'The John André Memorial', p8.

-
32. *ibid*, pp393-394; Knight, *op cit*.
 33. Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors', p372.
 34. Cray, 'The John André Memorial', p26.
 35. Rockland County, *op cit*; Schumacher, *op cit*.
 36. An existing inscription on the monument provided a quotesaid by Washington about André. This still centred the narrative around André rather than about Washington himself. See Cray, 'The John André Memorial', p17.
 37. Cray, 'The John André Memorial', p31.
 38. Knight, *op cit*; Cray, 'Major John André and the Three Captors'.