Tourism, Remembrance and the Landscape of War

Geoffrey R. Bird

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the University of Brighton for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
ABSTRACT

The aim of this thesis is to examine the relationship between tourism and remembrance in a landscape of war, specifically the Normandy beaches of World War II where the D-Day Landings of June 6, 1944 took place. The anthropological investigation employs a theoretical framework that incorporates tourist performance, tourism worldmaking, landscape, cultural memories of war and remembrance. The thesis also examines the tourism-remembrance relationship by way of the various vectors that inform cultural memory, such as the legend of D-Day, national war mythologies and war films, and how these are interpreted and refashioned through tourism.

Adopting a constructivist paradigm the ethnographic fieldwork involves observation of thirteen guided bus tours and the annual D-Day commemorations in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. The research also includes over 50 key informant interviews representing management, visitors, tour guides and veterans in the war heritage force field, along with a visitor online feedback tool. Reflexive journaling is also employed as a central method in collecting and analyzing data. In this context, the research draws upon ethnography as a means of understanding social meaning and behavior as they relate to the cultural phenomenon of war remembrance. This involves researching both the visitor experience and how it is negotiated and mediated by tourism worldmaking agencies such as museums, tour guides and travel guide books.

The research findings demonstrate the complexity of the context, conflicts and contributions of the tourism-remembrance relationship. This thesis contributes to knowledge in several ways. First, it reveals how tourism manifests itself as an act of remembrance, exposing clichés that present tourism as a negative force. Second, the thesis identifies how tourism plays a worldmaking role at different cosmological scales, providing a central role in managing, coordinating, planning and interpreting remembrance. Finally, the thesis also contributes to knowledge by modeling war remembrance as a graduated emotional and cognitive phenomenon. The most powerful form of remembrance involves the emotional and spatial proximity to war memory that is imparted by a mediated tourism experience in a landscape of war.
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CHAPTER 1. Context and Theoretical Framework
Introduction

The aim of this research is to better understand the relationship between tourism, war remembrance and memorialized battlefields. Over the past 20 years, the popularity of commemorating wars has been described as a 'memory boom' (Evans & Lunn 1997; Winter 2006). Sites of memory associated with historic battles, such as Waterloo, Gettysburg, the Somme, Gallipoli and Pearl Harbor continue to attract visitors making thanatourism an intriguing yet controversial subject in the tourism literature (see Seaton 2000; Chronis 2005; Yaguchi 2005; Iles 2006; Scates 2006).

Touring battlefields is intriguing because of the sense of meaning evoked at such sites. As Scates (2006) notes of a visit by an Australian named Jenny to Gallipoli, a World War I battlefield involving Australian and New Zealand troops (ANZAC):

> It was a journey to what many call ‘a sacred place’ and, as Jenny’s [an Australian tourist] experience suggests, involved an emotional ordeal that led ultimately to personal enrichment. There is a sense of a ‘quest’, a journey ‘out of the normal parameters of life [and] entry into a different other world’, a visit to a landscape saturated with meaning…. (p. xix)

This research explores the different other world of a memorialized battlefield that is exemplified with Jenny’s experience. Linenthal (1991) characterizes battlefields that evoke such emotion as hallowed ground, possessing a secular sacredness owing to their significance in the national memory. Like many visitors to battlefields, Jenny engages in what Chronis (2008) refers to as the co-construction of meaning, involving the battlefield as a storyscape that evokes feelings of identity. This co-construction involves markers in the landscape as well as mediating agencies, such as guide books, museums and guided bus tours that represent and interpret history and memory. Thus, to understand tourism and its relationship to remembrance, it is important to examine mediating agencies.
Indeed, tourism is instrumental in constructing and perpetuating remembrance, but at what cost to the memory of war? In the aftermath of World War I, Philip Johnston wrote *High Wood* (1918) as a vision of what tourism would do to war memory:

Ladies and gentlemen, this is High Wood,
Called by the French, Bois des Furneaux,
The famous spot which in Nineteen-Sixteen,
July, August and September was the scene
Of long and bitterly contested strife,
By reason of its High commanding site.
Observe the effect of shell-fire in the trees
Standing and fallen; here is wire; this trench
For months inhabited, twelve times changed hands;
(They soon fall in), used later as a grave.
It has been said on good authority
That in the fighting for this patch of wood
Were killed somewhere above eight thousand men,
Of whom the greater part were buried here,
This mound on which you stand being.... Madame, please,
You are requested kindly not to touch
Or take away the Company's property
As souvenirs; you'll find we have on sale
A large variety, all guaranteed.
As I was saying, all is as it was,
This is an unknown British officer,
The tunic having lately rotted off.
Please follow me - this way ..... the *path*, sir, *please*,
The ground which was secured at great expense
The Company keeps absolutely untouched,
And in that dug-out (genuine) we provide
Refreshments at a reasonable rate.
You are requested not to leave about
Paper, or ginger-beer bottles, or orange peel,
There are waste-paper baskets at the gate.

The poem offers a bleak portrayal of the influence of tourism upon remembrance. On the one hand, the poem evokes an image of the tour guide, emblematic of tourism, as a crude profiteer, prostituting the misery and death of war. The ‘Company’ *owns* the battlefield, thereby refashioning the landscape and associated memory to maximize opportunities for profit by way of souvenirs and refreshments. Tourists can be imagined as disengaged and
uninterested as they wander off the path, ghoulishly intrigued by the remains of a dead body.

The poem is poignant as it is evocative of arguments by Rojek (1993), Diller and Scofidio (1994), Cole (1999), Winter (2006; 2009), Scates (2008) and Edwards (2009). As Winter (2009) explains, cemeteries of the world wars are located all over the world, thus requiring acts of remembrance to include international travel. He describes the ‘business of remembrance’ involving, ‘train and boat journeys to take; hotel rooms to reserve; guides to hire; flowers to lay at graves; trinkets and mementos to purchase’ (p. 66-67). In addition there are war museums where narratives and the symbols of remembrance are purchased. Winter (p. 67) concludes by asking, ‘[w]here does pilgrimage stop and tourism take over?’ This view is shared by Edwards (2009) who frames battlefield tourism to Normandy’s D-Day beaches as a commercial venture. He concludes that:

Battlefield tourism toward the end of the twentieth century represents but another stage in a set of developments which have, in Normandy at least, fused commemoration with commerce. Acts of consumption (that is the purchase of objects as well as travel to, and experience of, specific places) thus become, within the processes of contemporary memory production, acts of commemoration. For in the market place of memory, the product would be the past. (2004, p.78)

The essence of these criticisms is that, through association with tourism, remembrance is undermined, either by way of misrepresentation (see Cole 1999), or by what is seen as morally questionable tourist motivation or behavior (see Hurley and Trimarco 2004; Stone 2009a; 2009b). These arguments cited here do not take into account the voice of the visitor, or for that matter, the voices of tour guides, locals and site managers. The critique also infers that there is a proper way to engage in remembrance, and what is happening at sites of memory does not exemplify remembering in an appropriate manner. As Frost, Wheeler and Harvey (2008, p. 170) note, such arguments ‘reveal judgmental attitudes about degrees of solemnity and moral worthiness.’
It is the juxtaposition of perspective between the power of the visitor experience and the perceived degrading or diluting of memory by tourism that calls for a better understanding of the tourism-remembrance relationship. Specifically, this thesis intends to explore the context, conflict and contribution of tourism in remembrance. It is therefore assumed that tourism is a stakeholder in war remembrance, as suggested in part by Ryan (2007) and Seaton (2009a). What follows is an explanation of the research aim and purpose, as well as focus of field research.

**Aim and Purpose of the Research**

The aim of this thesis is to conceptualize the relationship between tourism and remembrance. This conceptualization is set within the context of visiting a landscape of war, defined by Filippucci (2004, p.41) as,

> a separate ‘landscape’ not only because they are generally set apart from inhabited areas and dedicated to the dead rather than the living, but also because they largely materialize a national rather than local narrative of the war, centred on the lives and death of soldiers and troops and investing part of the …land with national and even international significance. In practice, these sites symbolically co-opt the local landscape through monuments that celebrate the land as the site of suffering and object of the sacrifice.

Thus, a memorialized battlefield becomes a site of memory for national and international audiences. In addition to Verdun (Filippucci 2004), sites such as Culloden (Gold & Gold 2003), Ypres (Saunders 2001) and Gettysburg (Gatewood & Cameron 2004) can also be viewed as landscapes of war.

This research encompasses two interconnected aspects of tourism and remembrance: the role of tourism as a mediating agency in remembrance, representing and interpreting war memory and history, and; visitor meaning-making, referring to the construction of knowledge and opinions based on a personal interpretation (Knudsen, Metro-Roland, Soper & Greer 2008). It is important to mention what the research is not: the research is not an attempt to debate with authors such as Diller and Scofidio (1994) Scates (2006) and Jay Winter (2009) who raise questions about the morality of tourism to
memorialized battlefields, nor will it engage in the debate regarding the commodification of remembrance (Doss 2008; Edwards 2009). Rather, the research seeks to empirically examine, to restate Wolcott’s (1999) famous ethnographic question, what is happening in a landscape of war in terms of tourism and remembrance?

The use of the term relationship as a construct needs explanation. To conceptualize relationship, three perspectives will be used to guide this research: context, conflict and benefit. Context is defined here as the temporal, spatial and cultural context of remembrance and tourism. For this research, this will involve understanding the contemporary context of cultural memories of war, remembrance and the involvement of tourism. Conflict involves exploring discord and controversy involving tourism and its representation and interpretation of war. This will include examining what Seaton refers to as the ‘politics of remembrance’ (2009b) and visitor meaning-making in the landscape of war. Benefit entails how tourism assists or provides greater insight into remembrance relative to other acts of remembrance. Discussion now turns to the purpose of this research.

The purpose of this research is to better understand the significance of tourism, war memory, landscape and meaning in the 21st century and how these phenomena interrelate and influence individuals and society as a whole. This also involves understanding the emotional and symbolic meaning associated with the landscape of war. As Hedges (2002) argues, war is a force that gives meaning. Researching how war is memorialized and remembered, specifically through the experience mediated by tourism, exposes how societies and individuals make sense of the most destructive phenomenon employed by humankind. To this end, remembering war also tells something about the significance of war heritage in shaping the human condition. The next section presents the location and rationale for the fieldwork.
Selecting D-Day landing beaches and the Battle of Normandy environs for this research

For the fieldwork, the area involved in D-Day and the Battle of Normandy, June 6th-August 24 1944, was selected (Figure 1). The battlefield covers an 80 kilometer coastline that spans the regions of the Orne, Calvados and LaManche, and then moves inland by over 100 km. Figure 2 identifies the main sites of focus for this research: the five landing beaches, airborne landing zones around Pegasus Bridge and Sainte Mere Eglise, as well as various sites of memory such as Pointe du Hoc, Abbaye d’Ardenne and Arromanches. Not all aspects of D-Day and the Battle of Normandy can be addressed, given the physical size and duration of the campaign. Instead, sites were selected based on either their prevalence in tour itineraries, popularity with visitors and/or their historical significance. Site selection will be discussed further in Chapter Five.

Figure 1: Normandy landscape of war, site of D-Day Landings and the Battle of Normandy, 1944 (original in colour).
Normandy was selected for four reasons. First, it is one of the most well-known sites of battle of World War II. This is owing to both the historical significance as a turning point of World War II (Keegan 1982; Ambrose 1994; Penrose 2004; Beevor 2009). In addition, D-Day holds a mythic significance in Canadian (Granatstein & Neary 1995), American (Brokaw 1998; Brinkley 2005) and British (Noakes 1998) national cultural memories. This status has been further galvanized by popular films such as *The Longest Day* (Zanuck 1962), *Saving Private Ryan* (Spielberg 1998) and the television series *Band of Brothers* (Spielberg & Hanks 2001), passing on the legendary aspect of D-Day to new generations. As Torgovnick (2005, p. 22) explains, ‘what really counts in Normandy is the symbolism of the place, the way that this sand, these beaches, have become a synecdoche for the Allied victory, for the triumph of democracy over totalitarianism, and, once the Nazi camps.’ Thus, the significance of D-Day is that it embodies both historical and mythic elements that represent World War II. In contrast to this argument, Winter (2009) argues that remembering World War II has its own set of challenges, given the unimaginable horrors associated with the Holocaust and the post-war fear borne out of the atom bomb. In this context, Normandy represents a different memory of the war, separate from the horrors of Auschwitz and Hiroshima. This is explored further in Chapter Two.
Second, Normandy receives a significant number of battlefield tourists. As representative of the Normandy landscape of war, the Normandy American Cemetery draws over 1.5 million visitors a year, making it the seventh most visited cultural site in France (Conseil Regionale 2008). In addition, Normandy is perhaps the most internationally commemorated landscape of World War II, with over 300 memorials, cemeteries, sites of memory and museums (Holt & Holt 2004). The annual commemorations that take place each year around June 6th form a significant motivation to visit Normandy. Over the past two decades, there have been a number of international commemorations to mark events in World War II, some of the most profiled being the D-Day commemorations in 1984, 1994, 2004 and 2009 (see NBC 1984; Pickering 1997; Brinkley 2005). This provides a rich opportunity for empirically explore the tourism-remembrance relationship.

Third, the battlefields of Normandy have not been the focus of much in-depth research, although mentioned by MacCannell (1976) and Lennon and Foley (2000). Two works represent a more detailed examination, although neither Diller and Scofidio (1994) nor Edwards (2009) can be viewed as empirically based. The majority of the battlefield tourism research has focused on World War I sites (see Seaton 2000; Slade 2003; Gough 2004a; Iles 2006; Caroline Winter 2010). World War II represents a different context, often positioned as the ‘good war’ (see Terkel 1984; Pauwels 2002; Granatstein 2005), a just cause that overcame Nazi tyranny. This research can therefore contribute to understanding how this legacy is memorialized, mediated and experienced through tourism.

Fourth, Normandy, like other sites of World War II memory, is experiencing the transition from the period of living memory, embodied in the veteran generation, to the post-veteran era. It is a time when, as Prost (1998) notes, war remembrance evolves from first-person accounts and veteran-focused commemorations to a more mediated educational focus aimed at generations removed from world wars. This evolution has been illustrated in Normandy over the past few years, with a number of new museums and interpretive
centers constructed. This reflects both attempts to anchor war memory in the landscape and the growing significance of tourism in mediating memory, but it also beckons the silencing, forgetting and refashioning of war memories. An understanding of what is remembered, silenced and forgotten is therefore deemed an important element of this research.

In summary, the Normandy landscape of war is rich in military history, memorialization, commemoration and tourism. It also represents multiple national war heritages enscribed onto one landscape, too many to be addressed in this research. The scope of the field research with regard to observation and interviewing of tourists was limited to American, British and Canadian visitors, representing the main allied nations involved in the D-Day landings. The justification of narrowing the focus to these nationalities is threefold. First, the vast majority of memorials and museums focus on the efforts of the allied armies. Whereas it is acknowledged that the German and French tourists are engaged in remembrance, the scope of the research needed to be limited. Second, representing the majority of the international visitors to Normandy, these visitors are readily accessed on group tours and at sites. Third, these tourists are assumed to be at least partially motivated to visit owing to their own national or familial war heritage, an indication that they are more readily engaged in the tourist performance of remembering. The methodological approach, specifically the paradigm, onotology, epistemology and methodology, is presented below.

**Research Methodology: Constructivist Inquiry Paradigm**

As Crandall (1990, p. 221) notes, ‘we can no longer simply discuss knowledge but must instead discuss knowledge within the context of a particular paradigm.’ A paradigm defines ‘the nature of the world, the individual’s place in it, and the range of possible relationships to that world and its parts….’ (Guba & Lincoln 2004,p.21). A constructivist paradigm, also known as naturalist inquiry (Guba & Lincoln 1985) is employed in this research. Guba and Lincoln (2004, p.30) posit that the aim of constructivism as a form of inquiry is,
...understanding and reconstruction of the constructions that people hold (including the inquirer), aiming toward consensus but still open to new interpretations as information and sophistication improve.

A constructivist paradigm is relevant for this research as it involves the examination of elements of the human condition, namely war and its representation and meaning constructed through remembrance and tourist experiences. Reflecting on criteria used by Finn, Elliott-White and Walton (2000) and Hollinshead (2007a) to ascertain the most appropriate inquiry paradigm, this research explores multiple realities, constructed by cultural memories of war, represented and interpreted by the various mediating agencies of tourism and understood through the positionality of the individual. This next section examines ontology, the nature of reality (Guba & Lincoln 2004), that includes presenting the positionality of the researcher.

**Ontology**

Constructivism calls for a ‘dovetailed’ ontological-epistemological approach (Hollinshead 2004, p.88), meaning the relationship between the seeker of knowledge and the knowledge itself, known as epistemology, is informed by the ontological perspective regarding the nature of reality. The research takes a relativist ontological posture, thereby assuming that there are multiple socially constructed realities. Truth is therefore seen as,

...the best informed (amount and quality of information) and most sophisticated (power with which the information is understood and used) construction on which there is consensus (although there may be several constructions extant that simultaneously meet that criterion). (Guba & Lincoln 1989, p.84).

Pivotal in the research is the researcher as designer, instigator and interpreter. Collins (1986, p. 29) argues that researchers can broaden and enrich their research by trusting ‘their own personal and cultural biographies as significant sources of knowledge.’ Positionality is understood as ‘where our personal biography directly informs how we react when we investigate’ (Everett 2010,
p.170), acknowledging that '[w]hat we see depends on our angle of repose' (Richardson, p.934). Morgan and Pritchard (2005, p.35-36) also note the importance of 'self-awareness, the perspective and self consciousness of the researcher as an important part of the [research] process.' Acknowledging positionality also responds to Hammersely's (1983) call to understand the effects of the researcher on the research (p.14-19). What follows is a personal narrative as an expression of positionality, situated within the contextual themes of this research, namely war, remembrance and travel, along with other factors such as nationality.

I am a first generation Canadian, meaning that I have inherited what I would call a British cultural memory of war while growing up in a Canadian cultural setting. I grew up learning about war by way of my parents’ war-time experiences living through the Blitz. The Canadian cultural memory of war was learned through an interest in history, living in different regions of Canada, as well as serving in the military for eight years as an officer in a peace-time navy. However, I have also participated in peace marches, and have had a career in international development, resulting in more of a ‘dove’ than ‘hawk’ worldview. I worked as a Guide at the Vimy Ridge Canadian Memorial Park in France and have guided groups to battlefield sites in France and Southeast Asia. I have traveled to many battlefields around the world, such as Gettysburg, the Somme, in Vietnam, the 9-11 World Trade Center site and on several occasions to the D-Day area, intrigued by the power of such sites of memory.

A multiple-voice approach is employed in the writing of this research to reflect what Hertz (p.xii) describes as a 'visible narrator and co-participant.' Writing in the third person is the primary format, with parts of the analysis in Chapters Six through Ten written in the reflexive first person and italics. As part of the field work, providing the first person perspective allows the researcher to capture the tourist moment (Carey 2004) in its unabridged and subjective form. Tourist meditations on war and death can be a highly personal and emotionally charged matter, as Dunkley (2007) argues. Incorporating a reflexive element in
the research is therefore important to co-participate in the thoughts and feelings associated with a battlefield tourism experience.

**Epistemology**

With an ontological relativist stance, the epistemological relationships between the ‘knower and known are interactive’, that is, interacting to influence one another (Lincoln & Guba 1989, p.37). Thus, this research seeks to understand:

- The role of tourism in representing and interpreting cultural memories of war and the landscape of war, and how the politics of remembrance inform such representations;
- The tourist performance of remembering in a landscape of war
- The transition of cultural memories of war and war remembrance from the veteran generation to the post-war generation, as represented in the landscape of war.

In this context, the research seeks to understand who remembers, when, where and how, what Winter (2006, p. 3) describes as ‘specifying agency’. These three areas listed above are interconnected and will be explained in more depth in the theoretical framework. The framework is founded upon concepts related to tourism, war remembrance, cultural memories and landscape. The four points below reveal some of conceptual challenges facing this research, and also represent gaps in the literature that are examined by this research:

- Tourism literature has not engaged with theories related to war remembrance and cultural memory. This is reflected in arguments about the under-theorized character of thanatourism (see Sharpley and Stone 2009; Seaton 2009b);
- There is limited understanding of politics of remembrance involved in the representation and interpretation of war by mediating agencies of tourism (see Seaton 2009b);
- The voice of the visitor and the meaning of her/his experience is absent in much of the thanatourism literature (Seaton 2009b), and;
- Exploring the marking, interpretation and meaning-making associated with a landscape of war through tourism is not fully understood.

The following section provides a brief overview of the qualitative methodological approach adopted for this research.

**Methodology**

Methodology focuses on the means by which the research aim is examined and represents the theories and approach taken to find out what can be known (Guba and Lincoln 1984). In this case, the constructivist/constructionist enquiry paradigm calls for a qualitative approach. This research is informed by anthropology’s focus on understanding social and cultural phenomena, specifically with regard to rituals associated with commemoration and memorialization (Casey 1987; Virilio 1994), myth and memory (Selwyn 1996) meanings associated with landscape (Knudsen et al. 2008; Seaton), identity (Palmer 1999) and the place of tourism in exploring the human condition (Burns 1999; Leite & Graburn 2009).

Ethnography informs this research because the aim of the research seeks to interpret, reconstruct and elaborate on reality as experienced by battlefield tourists in Normandy, with an understanding emerging through the field work and writing process. The research approach is influenced by the long history of ethnographers striving to ‘grasp the native’s point of view’ (Malinowski 1922, p. 25), as a means of reflexively understanding ourselves (Collins and Gallinat 2010). Authors such as Van Maanen (1988), Tilley (1994), Wolcott (1995) and O’Shea (1997) have employed ethnography in order to holistically understand the human condition, a theme relevant to this research. In addition, ethnographic practices employed by tourism scholars such as Edensor (1998), Palmer (2003) and Seaton (2000; 2002) have been essential to understanding
the role of tourism in shaping people’s identities, in turn inspiring this methodological framework.

A qualitative approach involves a bricolage of strategies (Denzin and Lincoln 2000), employing various ideas, perspectives and methods (Hammersley 1999, p.576). In this research, participant observation, interviews, reflexivity and an online survey tool were used to explore the tourism-remembrance relationship. More information on the methodology is provided in Chapter Five. The theoretical framework is now presented.

**Theoretical Framework for Examining Tourism and Remembrance**

A theoretical framework assists in grounding the research in a set of definitions and existing theory that frame the scope and perspective of the research. This section presents an overview of the main theories and concepts informing this research. Conceptualized in Figure 3, the theoretical framework is characterized as a layering of various concepts and theoretical components. These layers in turn represent the primary themes that form the basis for understanding the tourism-remembrance relationship. The themes are:

- The tourism – landscape – meaning nexus (Knudsen *et al.* 2008)
- Heritage force field of thanatourism, adapted to include stakeholders such as management, visitors, locals, veterans and tour guides (Seaton 2001; Sharpley 2009; Seaton 2009a).
- Cultural memories of war (Sturken 1997; Erll *et al.* 2008), involving consideration of national war memories, the Legend of D-Day and the media, represented by war films.

What binds these layers together is the shared involvement in shaping what Winter (2006, p. 3) describes as the specifying agency of war remembrance: who remembers, when, where and how. This will be explained later in the section entitled *War Remembrance*. Figure 3 is now explained.
Figure 3: Theoretical framework for the thesis (original in colour).

The figure illustrates how the green layer, entitled ‘cultural memories of war,’ is the foundation upon which to understand what is remembered and to a certain extent how war is remembered. The red layer represents the discourse of key stakeholders in the heritage force field and how they interpret and negotiate memorialized representations of war at sites of memory. Seaton (2009b) describes this discourse as the politics of remembrance, reflecting the controversies and multiple perspectives associated with war memories. The blue layer involves examining the relationship between tourism, the landscape and visitor meaning, shaped by cultural memories of war as well as the voices that influence representation and interpretation. The top multicoloured layer represents war remembrance, a concept that has its own distinct definition in the memory studies literature (see Winter & Sivan 1999), but that is also influenced by the other aspects of the framework. Whereas the conceptual layers can be examined separately, what is characterized here is the
importance of understanding the complex interrelationship and symbiotic interaction between the various theories and concepts in order to effectively respond to the research aim. This is explained below, along with key theories and concepts represented in the various layers.

**Key Theories and Concepts**

Four theoretical and conceptual terms are presented in this section: tourism, landscape, cultural memory and remembrance. To define tourism for this research, four interconnected conceptual perspectives are briefly defined here. First, an important influence on this research is Hollinshead (2009, p.139) who argues for,

...deeper and more frequent critical and interpretive inspection of the power and reach of tourism in significantly and variously contributing to the making/demaking of peoples, places, and pasts, rather than just serving as a reproducing authority ... which just mirrors what is already there in each location.

In this context, he views tourism as a worldmaking agency, a mediating force defined as an ‘operational construct to help critically describe the creative/inventive role and function of tourism in the making of culture and place’ (2009, p.139). The term *mediating agencies* (Nickerson & Jennings 2006) is adapted here to encompass tourism entities that have a function in managing, representing and/or interpreting the making/demaking of peoples, places and pasts. For this research, the mediating agencies refer to:

- Managed sites of memory in the landscape of war, specifically museums, interpretive centers and military cemeteries;
- Guided tours and battlefield tour guides, and;
- Travel guide books

The second perspective that informs this theoretical layer is thanatourism (Seaton 1996). Other terms are employed in the literature, such as dark tourism (Lennon & Foley 2000). A review of the theoretical debate is presented in
Chapter Four. One of the reasons for its use in this research is because thanatourism conceptually involves ‘evoking and conserving [the] auratic quality’ of what Seaton refers to as the Otherness of Death (2009a, p. 75). By this, he means that a tourism experience involving a landscape associated with death involves a uniquely universal concept, one that is informed by cultural understandings of death, killing, sacrifice and the afterlife. As such, thanatourism sites and landscapes have a certain aura to them, often framed as a sacred, spiritual or haunted place. The meaning of this war aura and how it is managed, interpreted and experienced is an important theme in this research, linking with conceptual ideas related to landscapes, sense of place and visitor performance.

For tourism managers, auratic quality of The Other of Death needs to be carefully presented and conserved so as not to create a contrived, demeaning or overly commercialized site (Seaton 2009a, p.86-87). This leads to the second rationale for employing the concept of thanatourism: to explore the heritage force field (Seaton 2001; 2009a). This conceptual model acknowledges that there are several stakeholders or voices with varying degrees of power and influence in a heritage or thanatourism setting. Seaton argues that involving stakeholders is necessary to ‘reconcile their interests and perspectives from inception, implementation and maintenance’ (2009a, p. 98). The concept was originally developed in the context of accommodating competing stakeholder interests at slavery heritage sites (Seaton 2001). This research explores those voices and perspectives involved in battlefield tourism sites: site managers, visitors, tour guides, veterans and locals. Tour guides are added to the heritage force field, in light of Selwyn’s (1995) argument that tour guides are important brokers in the ideological interpretation of the landscape. Seaton also includes the media in the force field, addressed in this research by a review of war film literature and popular military books as well as interviewing authors of guide books.

A third theoretical construct related to tourism involves recognition of Knudsen et al. (2008, p.1) who argue the need to re-theorize tourism to focus on the
social construction of meaning in the landscape. They offer the ‘landscape-tourism-meaning nexus’ as a conceptual framework, one that is relevant to this research. To investigate the landscape of war, a range of concepts are employed in addition to the thanatourism concepts mentioned above: sense of place (Tuan 1977), memorializing the landscape (Mosse 1990; Blades 2003; Linenthal 1991; Virilio 2009), and site sacralization (MacCannell 1976). As memorializing the landscape involves material culture, Turner (1967), Pearce (1994) and Palmer (1999; 2003) are used to examine the symbolism and meaning of museum artifacts and relics of war.

Fourth, the concept of the tourist performance of remembering (Edensor 1998) is also relevant to this research. This form of tourist performance involves both the tourist collecting individual memories through interacting with the site: taking photos and buying souvenirs, as well as imagining the past. Tourist reconstruction of the past involves various local, historical and tourist-inspired narratives that are presented and interpreted when visiting a heritage site. Edensor (1998) is a valuable point of departure for examining the activities and practices of tourists at a battlefield and how they inform, express or reflect the meaning-making of the tourist. However, in the context of this research, the term remembering overlaps with the concept of war remembrance. The following section provides a definition of war remembrance, the top layer of the theoretical framework. Whereas this research aims to understand the tourism-remembrance relationship, it is beyond its scope to review the memory studies literature in depth. Rather, definitions are identified and theoretical issue briefly discussed that are relevant to this research.

**War Remembrance**

War remembrance has been extensively explored by Jay Winter (1995; 1996; 1999; 2001; 2006; 2009; 2010) and is therefore a key theoretical source for this research. His perspective is selected because not only is he the prominent scholar in war remembrance, but his epistemology complements the approach taken here, that is, to understand specifying agency: who remembers, when, where and how (2006, p. 3).
Remembrance is employed here as the action of remembering that is an acknowledgement of the war and those who died in it (Winter 2006). For Winter, individuals act on their own accord to remember, in their own way, even if it is done within the setting of a ‘state-invented’ commemorative event, such as November 11th Remembrance Day, the annual day of remembrance for many nations. Thus, remembrance involves public recollection, an ‘act of gathering bits and pieces of the past, and joining them together in public’ (Winter & Sivan 1999, p. 6). Central to Winter’s argument and to this research is that remembering evolves from generation to generation. Table 1 presents Winter’s agents and acts of remembrance (2006). His conceptual model reflects how the acts of commemorating the war dead change from generation to generation, who represent the agents of remembrance. LeShan (1992) describes this phenomenon when he explains remembering by the veteran generation as sensory reality, and by the post-war generation as mythic, or mediated or second-hand, reality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agents of remembrance</th>
<th>Practices of remembrance: the veterans’ generation</th>
<th>Theatres of Memory: the post-veteran generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acts of remembrance</td>
<td>• Photography</td>
<td>• Film and television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Publication of soldier’s letters, poetry, war novels and plays</td>
<td>• Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• War memorials</td>
<td>• Witnesses at war crimes trials, as sites of memory negotiation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Migration within the Commonwealth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Acts and agents of remembrance (adapted from Winter 2006).

Prost’s (1998) study of Verdun notes this evolution in remembering, from a generation’s focus on burial sites to commemorate the war dead to a post-war generation’s focus on museums to teach people why there are war dead at Verdun. In Winter’s model, tourism is absent as an act of remembrance, although inferred in fragmented elements such as war memorials and museums. However, as mentioned earlier, Winter has concerns with tourism as a central element in the ‘business of remembrance’ (2009, p. 62).
Addressing how tourism fits as an agent and as an act of remembrance will be one contribution of this research.

Two other conceptual terms related to remembrance are important to note as part of the theoretical framework: forgetting and silence. As Lowenthal (1999) argues, forgetting is important because it allows the individual to discriminate and select certain memories. It is both a conscious and unconscious practice, one that allows individuals and societies to purge the ‘unspeakable, unpalatable, even just conveniently outdated’ (Lowenthal (1999, p. xii). Rowlands (1999) argues that the role of war memorials is to erase the imagery of violent death or thoughts of dying for a bad cause. This concept is relevant here because remembrance allows for recollection and representation of war in a certain way that involves forgeting about other elements. Between forgetting and remembering is silence. Winter (2010, p. 4) defines it as a,

… socially constructed space in which and about which subjects and words normally used in everyday life are not spoken. The circle around this space is described by groups of people who at one point in time deem it appropriate that there is a difference between the sayable and the unsayable… and that such a distinction can and should be maintained and observed over time.

This is relevant both in terms of the silence that exists in war memory and how that silence may be mediated by tourism. For example, there may be events or moral actions of combatants that mediating agencies of tourism or visitors choose not to verbally discuss. In addition, veterans are often noted as keeping silent on their war-time experiences, perhaps as a form of healing, or perhaps to avoid judgment by others. These concepts are important in that they are part of remembrance and therefore part of exploring the remembrance-tourism relationship.

Related to remembrance, forgetting and silence is the politics of remembrance. This concept is represented by the pentagonal shape on the theoretical framework and explained here. Both Seaton (2009b) and Winter (2006) identify the politics of remembrance as a significant force in representations of war and memory. Winter (2006, p.152) describes this as the ‘multiplicity of
voices’, each offering their own perspective on how war should be memorialized and remembered. For Seaton (2009a, 2009b; see also Sharpley 2009), the issue is framed as a challenge of management at a thanatourism site that needs to take into account the various voices in order to minimize controversy, presented earlier as the ‘heritage force field’ (2009a). This points to Winter’s (2006, p.6) argument that in ‘virtually all acts of remembrance, history and memory are braided together in the public domain, jointly informing our shifting and contested understandings of the past.’ Such braiding leads to conflict in representation and interpretation at museums, such as the Smithsonian Institution’s exhibit on the atomic bomb (Nobile 1995) or sites of memory, such as Auschwitz (see Cole 1999). Seaton (2009b) describes this subject as a lacuna in the tourism literature. Politics of remembrance is particularly important, given the ideological utility of war remembrance and memorialization (see Mosse 1990; Brinkley 2005; Torgovnick 2005; Blustein 2008, p. 178; Doss 2009), raising questions as to the extent to which tourism is part of an ideological reading of the landscape of war.

This point leads to another foundation in this research. The study of cultural memory is described as ‘a promising, but also as yet incoherent and dispersed field’ (Erll et al. 2008, p.1). Part of the challenge is that, given its interdisciplinary nature, various theoretical and methodological approaches have been associated with the field leading to a ‘terminological richness’ plagued with a conceptual ‘disjointedness’ (Erll et al. 2008, p. 1). It is therefore important to conceptually unpack terms such as cultural memory, history, myth and legend for the sake of grounding this research.

Cultural Memories of War

Erll et al. (2009, p.2-4) define cultural memory as ‘the interplay of present and past in socio-cultural contexts.’ The term cultural, as it employed here, is embedded in the anthropological tradition, ‘where culture is defined as a community’s specific way of life’ (Erll et al., 2008, p. 4). Sturken (1997) provides a complementary definition of cultural memory as the social production of social memory by way of images, sites, representation and
interpretation. In this, she reflects the dynamic nature of memory, reshaped by history. Such a broad definition acknowledges what Erll et al. (2008, p.1-3) describe as the ‘umbrella quality’ of cultural memory, allowing the inclusion of a range of associated terms and concepts relevant to this research: myth, legend, heritage, sites of memory, film as mediated memory, memorialization, commemoration, museum artifacts as well as personal and collective acts of remembering.

As part of the memory studies field, there is a growing emphasis on the cultural memories of war. Relevant works for this research include Fussell (1976), Ersteins (1989), Mosse (1990), Evans and Lunn (1997), Sturken (1997), Vance (1997), Noakes (1998), Ashplant, Dawson and Roper (2000) and Winter (1995, 2009). These authors explore what is remembered within various fictive kinships (see Winter 2006) as well as through media such as art, literature, film, memorials and commemorations. Of note is Sturken (1997) who examines the interaction between Americans’ meaning-making regarding the Vietnam Veterans’ War Memorial in Washington, DC and cultural memory of the war:

[The] process of cultural memory is bound up in complex political stakes and meanings. It both defines a culture and is the means by which its divisions and conflicting agendas are revealed. To define a memory as cultural is, in effect, to enter into a debate about what that memory means. This process does not efface the individual but rather involves the interaction of individuals in the creation of meaning. Cultural memory is a field of cultural negotiation through which different stories vie for a place in history (p. 1).

Sturken’s views are relevant here because cultural memory is negotiated and dynamic, a debate between various representations of war memory that results in a refashioning of the past. Tourism becomes part of that negotiation. By taking into account cultural memory, this research expands to incorporate debates regarding the representation of war and ‘the question of how popular culture has produced memories of wars….’ (Misztal 2003, p. 131). This is interesting because, as Blustein (2008) notes, cultural memory is in large part
derived from myth. This next section introduces how myth and legend are defined and included in this research.

**Myth and Legend as Elements of Cultural Memories of War**

Myth and legend are constructs employed to explain phenomena in a pre-scientific world. As Selwyn notes, (1996, p. 8) ‘tourism is filled with myths’, as are the cultural memories of war (see LeShan 1992; Hedges 2002; Wood 2006). In this context, whereas myth, as cultural memory, informs what is remembered, tourism plays a role in both making and mediating myths (see Selwyn 1996).

Myth is examined in this research with regard to cultural war memories, inspired by Calder (1991, p. 2) and his book entitled *The Myth of the Blitz*. He characterizes telling the story of the bombing of London in the traditional form of a myth, involving heroes and ultimately a victory of Good over Evil that leaves out some of the contradictions. In this context, myth is a useful concept because it represents taking a complex event such as war and, as Selwyn (1996, p. 3) explains, resolving it emotionally and intellectually. In this context, Barthes’ (1957, p. 142-143) perspective is employed: ‘[m]yth does not deny things, on the contrary, its function is to talk about them; simply, it purifies them, it makes them innocent’ and ‘(abolishes) the complexity of human acts, it gives them the simplicity of essences….’ Myth is therefore an important element to understand what is remembered and mediated through tourism as well as memorialized in the landscape of war.

Legends, as described by Rosman, Rubel and Weisgrau (2009, p.264) are often based in historical fact, and are ‘…about heroes who overcome obstacles, slay dragons, and defeat conquering armies to establish the independence of their homelands.’ Whereas legend and myth are similar in their meaning, Bascom (1965, p.4) argues that legends are ‘prose narratives which, like myths, are regarded as true by the narrator and his audience, but they are set in a period much less remote, when the world was much as it is today.’ Legend has been employed to characterize battles of the 20th century.
by Welborn (1982), and Campion (2009) as well as to describe World War II generals such as Montgomery (Hamilton 1987) and Patton (Blumenson 1985). The term is used in this research as another form of *history you can remember* to characterize the folkloric storytelling of D-Day as an historic event, illustrating how certain narratives, symbols and images of history become highlighted and recounted to represent the entire story.

In summary, cultural memories of war involve representations of history and memory that come in many forms including myths, legends, war films as well as living memory, the voice of veterans. To better understand these influences on what is remembered of war, this research employs the concept of vectors of memory (Rousso 1991) to review the literature regarding:

- The Legend of D-Day, representing a popular narrative of the historical event;
- National war memories, acknowledging the mythic perspective of the nation linked with the D-Day landings and World War II, in Canada, Great Britain, the United States and France;
- D-Day war films, representing an opportunity to further examine the role of media in influencing a tourist performance and understanding of a destination (Crouch, Jackson and Thompson 2005; Ryan 2007);
- The voice of veterans, recognizing the perspective of the witness of war and their influence upon cultural memories.

**Conclusion**

This chapter has outlined the research aim, purpose and methodology along with the theoretical framework employed to examine the relationship between tourism, remembrance and landscapes of war. Such a relationship involves consideration of what is remembered and how it is remembered. In the context of tourism, the what and how involves examining the focus and ways in which war is represented and interpreted by tourism mediating agencies, as well as the tourist performance of remembering. An ethnographic approach informed
the methodology, involving a bricolage of methods which includes fieldwork in the Normandy landscape of war. What follows is an outline of the structure of the thesis.

The thesis is presented in eleven chapters and summarized here. Chapter Two, entitled the *Cultural Memories of War* presents a review of the literature regarding what is remembered of World War II. The chapter is organized into specific vectors of memory, such as the Legend of D-Day, national war memories, war films and the voice of veterans. This review considers what is remembered in the landscape of war through tourism and the tourist performance.

Chapter Three is organized into two sections. The first section focuses on reviewing the concept of landscape as it relates to memorializing markers such as cemeteries, relics of war and commemorations. Exploring the concept of auratic quality (Seaton 2009a) associated with thanatourism sites, the section continues by reviewing literature on the intangible sense of place that is socially constructed at sites of memory. The second section reviews the literature regarding conceptual elements that inform this research, namely tourism as a worldmaking agency (Hollinshead 2007a; 2009a), heritage dissonance, politics of remembrance, the heritage force field and issues related commercialism. The mediation of meaning at battlefields and war heritage sites is also reviewed, specifically with regard to war museums, the role of tour guides and travel guide books.

Chapter Four is also organized into three parts. The first part reviews the literature regarding tourist performance as it relates to remembering and meaning-making. The second part reviews some of the conceptual debates regarding battlefield tourism and thanatourism and two models presented by Sharpley and Baldwin (2009) that conceptualize remembrance and tourism. The third part reviews the battlefield tourism literature to identify three meaning lenses: national identity, social identity and death and war. These meaning lenses are then employed to analyze aspects of the field research.
Chapter Five presents the approach to primary research. The field work component took place over seven weeks, spread between 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. This involved observing conducted bus tours, conducting interviews, reflexive experience at participating in commemorations. In addition, the approach taken for interviewing, guide book content analysis and an online survey are presented. Issues such as field work duration, interpretation, trustworthiness and conducting field work in a second language are examined.

Chapter Six presents an analysis of the context of Normandy’s remembrance tourism sector, assessing statistical information and the roles of Normandie Mémoire and the Committee of the D-Day Landing. In addition, the historical evolution of battlefield tourism in Normandy is analyzed. This context helps to understand the role of various forces involved in developing tourism, and their relationship to remembrance.

Chapter Seven is organized into two sections. The first section presents a content analysis examining themes found in generalist and specialist travel guide books. Highlighted is the way in which guide book narratives exemplify and inform cultural memories of war. The second section analyzes the group tours that were observed, from two perspectives. First, the structure and content of tours are assessed, focusing on the selection of sites of memory and the sense of place associated and/or constructed. Second, observation of the tour guides themselves reveals the role of battlefield tour guides in mediating the landscape and visitor meaning.

Chapter Eight analyzes three commemorative areas in the landscape of war: Pegasus Memorial Museum and environs, Arromanches and the Canadian sector. The focus is to explore how cultural memories of war are represented, interpreted and experienced. This section employs reflexive observations as well as commentary from interviews. The chapter also helps to explore various concepts such as politics of remembrance and how sense of place and acts of remembrance are experienced by the visitor.
Chapter Nine focuses on military cemeteries and their relationship to tourism. The analysis draws upon interviews with management at the Normandy American Cemetery as well as the German and Commonwealth War Graves and site observation. The chapter provides insight into how the various organizations view the meaning associated with cemeteries in the 21st century, along with management perceptions as to the present and future role of tourism in remembrance.

Chapter Ten examines visitor meaning-making in the landscape of war with regard to motivation and memorable sites. The chapter explore both the familial and non-familial experience, and how visitors connect with both the tangible and intangible aspects of the landscape of war. In addition, interviews and responses to the online survey provide insight into visitor post-trip perceptions.

Finally, Chapter Eleven draws together theoretical and primary research to conceptualize the relationship between tourism and remembrance. Contributions to knowledge focus on describing tourism as both an act and agent of remembrance. The concluding chapter also offers two conceptual models, one called the cosmology of tourism and remembrance, the other focusing on the resonance of remembrance. The role of reflexivity in empirical research is also presented as a contribution to knowledge. Finally, themes for further research are identified.
CHAPTER 2. Cultural Memories of War and what is Remembered
Introduction

Edensor (1998, p. 69) argues that the tourist performance entails the construction and transmission of various narratives drawn in part from history, memory and the global media. Other authors have built upon this notion, further acknowledging how cultural memory shapes the production of space (Sturken 1997; Lefebvre 2006) as well as the co-constructed meaning in a landscape of war (Chronis & Hampton 2008). To understand these recollected pasts, this chapter reviews the literature with regard to what is remembered of World War II and, where available, of D-Day. The intention of the chapter is to gain insight into what is remembered in order to examine how history and memory are represented and interpreted in the landscape of war by tourism agencies and tourists.

In the Great War and Modern Memory, Fussell (1975) points to the various ways the memory of World War I is manifested through literature and the arts, and how these create and sustain myth and rituals related to the war’s memorialization and commemoration. In examining French cultural memory of war, Rousso (1991) takes a similar approach by examining the influence of the media such as literature and film, what he describes as vectors of memory, that collectively reproduce as well as refashion memory. Rather than a singular, clearly defined memory of war, as Rousso (1991, p. 272) explains, ‘it is impossible to state precisely what collective memory of an events is, because there is also a zone of obscurity, of individual difference, which no model can reduce and no sociology can penetrate.’ Rousso’s concept of vectors of memory is adopted here: the identification of various vectors of memory, selected here as popular military history literature, national war memories, film and the voices of veterans. Collectively, they form the cultural memories of war, pluralized to reflect a range of dynamic, culturally-bound perspectives on what is remembered, why, how and by whom. Each vector can represent a cultural memory of its own, conveying its own tone and emphasis. Within a vector there is a range of meanings, encompassing contrasting or conflicted perspectives.
The vectors of memory reviewed below are defined as follows:

- The legend of D-Day: this comprises identifying key themes in popular accounts of the battle, involving specific stories and symbols that are often emphasized to represent and simplify the more complex historical account;
- National memories of war: this section involves reviewing the literature regarding the national mythologies and history of World War II, of which the events of the summer of 1944 are often an integral part. The war memories of Canada, Britain, the United States and France are examined, each reflecting a distinct experience with the war that in turn informs representation, interpretation and visitor meaning in the Normandy landscape of war;
- War films: as a representation of media, selected war films are reviewed to understand how they influence what is remembered in the landscape of war. Whereas film can influence a national war memory, it also has an international influence and is better understood in this research as a separate vector of memory;
- Witnesses: as part of this research, various Normandy veterans were interviewed. As living memory, they convey first-hand experiences, memories of the sensory reality (LeShan 1992). They also inform, along with some of the other vectors of memory, the positionality of the researcher. It is unusual to include primary research in a literature review. However, it is justified here because the living memory provides a personal and often sobering perspective on war that is distinct from the other vectors of memory.

Each of these vectors is reviewed below.

**The History of D-Day and the Battle of Normandy**

A review of popular historical accounts and imagery of the battle give D-Day a legendary status. Popular history books offer a range of perspectives, details and insights into the history of D-Day, many of them serving as reference
materials for this research as a means to gain purchase on the scope and
details of the battle. What follows is a short factual account of D-Day and the
Battle of Normandy, representing the essential pieces of historical information.

On June 6 1944, American, British, Canadian and other allied forces launched
an amphibious and airborne invasion on the Lower Normandy Coast in an effort
to open a second front against Nazi Germany, with the ultimate aim to liberate
continental Europe (see Wilmot 1952; Hastings 1984; Beevor 2009). Frontal
assaults took place across five beaches – Sword and Gold (British), Juno
(Canadian), along with Omaha and Utah (American) – and preceded by
airborne landings on the eastern (British) and western (American) flanks of the
assault (see Crookenden 1976; Ambrose 1992). The beachhead represented
a 90 kilometre front of attack. Two years in planning, D-Day marks the largest
amphibious assault in the history of war, with over 6,900 ships and landing
crafts involved in the first wave and 5,000 allied aircraft (Wieviorka 2008, p.
186, p.189). Over half of the landing force was made up of Canadian and
British forces (see Copp 2004; Zuehlke 2005a). Over the course of June 6th,
156,000 allied troops landed, with casualties for day reaching over 10,000 killed
or wounded (Wieviorka 2008, p. 200). Over the next 80 days, a range of
military offensives took place to break through the German defenses. Caen
was finally liberated on July 19, and the German Army in Normandy was
ultimately decimated at Falaise. A few days later, Paris was liberated on
August 25, marking the end of the campaign. Since June 6, over 437,000
soldiers of all nationalities had been killed or wounded (D'Este 1994, p.517)
along with approximately 20,000 French civilians (Beevor, 2009, p. 519). By
May 8, 1945, 11 months after the D-Day landings, the war in Europe came to
an end with the unconditional surrender of Germany.

As a factual historical text, it reflects what White (2000, p. 506) describes as
having ‘no determinate meaning and certainly no given emotive significance for
individuals.’ White (2000) employs the metaphor of internalization to
conceptualize how narratives gain a personal emotional significance. A
narrative becomes entextualized (Silverstein and Urban 1996 cited White 2000,
p. 507) when it is routinely employed, publicly recited and institutionalized. The repetition of a narrative is what gives it an emotional force, embedding it in cultural memory and inscribing it with both national and personal significance and meaning. What follows is what can be described as the emotionalization of a war history narrative, by way of repetition and institutionalization, leading to what is referred to here as the formation of the legend of D-Day.

The Legend of D-Day

Figure 4: One of the iconic photos taken by Robert Capa of Americans landing at Omaha Beach (Robert Capa/Magnum Photos).

The legend of D-Day is not embedded in the numbers who participated or who were killed. As Linenthal (1982, p. viii) argues, ‘the facts of war are less evocative than the stories we tell, the heroes we venerate….’ The D-Day landings gain the status of legend because of the massive scale as well as sheer drama of the event. As Doherty (2004, p.281) writes, ‘Whatever arguments persist about the Normandy campaign, one fact can never be disputed: the D-Day landings represent the greatest military operation ever.’ This view is echoed by other authors (see Ryan 1959; Keegan 1984; Ambrose 1994), giving it a special epic profile in both history and memory. This is augmented by some of the most iconic images of World War II, specifically the
photos taken by Robert Capa, American war photographer, of Omaha Beach (Figure 4). As the only photographs taken of the landing at Omaha, the blurry granular quality of the photo conveys a mystical feel of the chaos of battle.

The legend of D-Day involves what White (2000) describes as emotional remembering, a narrative that is publicly valorized and that evokes individual and a collective pride in the nations that participated in the invasion. One example of the institutionalization of the legend of D-Day, for the 50th commemoration of D-Day, the Imperial War Museum published a case-bound resource kit entitled The D-Day Experience (Holmes 1994). The kit includes a CD of veteran accounts, replicas of famous documents as well as photographs of various objects associated with D-Day, such as: General Eisenhower’s famous ‘Order of the Day’, exalting the troops with ‘You are about to embark on the Great Crusade’ (p. 23) (Figure 5); pictures of allied aircraft marked with invasion stripes (Holmes 1994, p. 16) (Figure 6), and; the ominous concrete bunkers and beach obstacles known as the Atlantic Wall (Holmes 1994, p. 10, 11).

The resource kit effectively represents the reproduction stage in site sacralization (MacCannell 1976), the stage where images, stories, objects and landscapes are reproduced and widely circulated. For Turner (1967, p. 28) these refers to as a ‘forest of symbols’ associated with D-Day, a collection of instrumental symbols that are understood as a collective of ‘significata’ that can be unified to form a dominant symbol. In this case the dominant symbol is D-Day, with both emotional and ideological meanings. D-Day symbolizes axiomatic values associated with a just war between good and evil, as well as the success of D-Day as a turning point in defeating Nazism.
Figure 5: ‘You are about to embark upon the Great Crusade’: Order of the Day, June 5 1944 (Courtesy of the Dwight D. Eisenhower Presidential Library & Museum, accessed July 2 2010 original in colour).
However, the legend of D-Day can also be seen to represent what Scates (2008) refers to as mono dimensional history, filtering what Wieviorka (2008, p. 270) describes:

Certainly [the soldiers'] courage and valor cannot be denied; but too often the myth has obscured their frailties and suffering, which found expression in the form of psychiatric disorders. In the face of unbearable violence, minds and bodies rebelled – not out of cowardice, but because a yet poorly understood psychophysical limit of endurance had been exceeded.

Wieviorka cites an American study (1945) that found upwards of 70% of men in some units suffered from a form of post-traumatic stress (2008, p. 270). Perhaps in an effort to better understand this more personal aspect of the war, veterans’ oral histories (see Terkel 1984; Ambrose 1992, 1994; Barris 2004; Brinkley & Drez 2004) and memoirs (see Burgett 1967; Stewart 2000, 2002) have proven to be valuable references in gaining insight into an aspect of war has often been silenced. These accounts provide a first person perspective of battle, capturing a sense of the soldier’s struggle to overcome and survive. These individual stories aside, the collective generation’s sacrifice and heroism
is also refashioned to infuse the legend of D-Day, evoked in Brokow’s *The Greatest Generation (1998, 1999).* Pickering (1998) observes how Brokaw interprets the stories of veterans emphasizing certain passages to highlight acts of bravery that also silences other conflicting elements of what their narrative. Much to the discomfort of D-Day veterans, they are placed on a pedestal of heroes, while other campaigns were forgotten, such as the Canadians fighting in Italy, referred to as the D-Day dodgers (see Dancocks 1991). Thus, whereas the individual stories exist, it is argued that the legend of D-Day is what is predominant in cultural memories of war. Further discussion of veterans’ accounts is found at the end of this chapter. The legend of D-Day is also a focus in the politics of remembrance in Normandy, as discussed with regard to the Juno Beach Centre, in Chapter Eight.

As a reflection of the popularity of the legend of D-Day, the legendary aspects of the battle have led to a steady stream of popular publications. Torgovnick (2005, p.2) describes these accounts:

> Narratives of D-Day… tend to fall into the genre I call guy talk: a blend of historicity, retrospective, confidence in victory at odds with narrative suspense, casual insouciance, jokes that mask the shock of death but seem too good to be true – the wartime equivalent of big fish stories.

Table 2 offers a small sample of the range of books on the topic of D-Day and the Battle of Normandy. Whereas there are military history books that provide an in-depth detailed account of strategies, popular history books are what feed the legend of D-Day.
| Popular history  
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Military history  

Table 2: A sample of historical accounts of D-Day and the Battle of Normandy reviewed for this research.

Drawn from the literature in Table 2, Table 3 represents a summary of the central narrative themes and symbols that form the more popularized legend of D-Day. It is argued that these themes are what shape the D-Day narrative that is part of the tourist performance in Normandy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Symbols and stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The enemy prepares</td>
<td>• The ‘Atlantic Wall’ (constructed defensive system marked by concrete bunkers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The allies prepare</td>
<td>• Learning from the Dieppe raid (1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Planning of the landings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material symbols of D-Day:</td>
<td>• Artificial Harbour ‘Mulberry’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Hobart’s funnies’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Invasion stripes on aircraft (see Figure 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Higgin’s boats (flat bottomed landing craft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dakotas and Horsa gliders (aircraft)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iconic leaders</td>
<td>• Winston Churchill, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Adolf Hitler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Ike’ (Eisenhower), Bradley and ‘Monty’ (Montgomery)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘The Desert Fox’ (Rommel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codenames</td>
<td>• ‘D-Day’, or Departure Day or ‘Day of Days’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sword, Juno, Gold, Omaha and Utah (landing beaches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operation Fortitude (deception operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operation Neptune (seaborne operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Operation Overlord (landing operations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The airborne landings</td>
<td>• Paratroopers and gliders landing at night</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• the ‘Band of Brothers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pegasus Bridge, Ste Mere Eglise, Merville Battery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The beach landings</td>
<td>• Landing craft coming ashore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Soldiers seasick and wading ashore, no cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Beach obstacles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Bloody Omaha’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Climbing Pointe du Hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other 78 days</td>
<td>• Consolidate the beachhead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The artificial harbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The ‘break-out’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bombing and liberation of Caen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Closing the Falaise Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberation of…</td>
<td>• Paris and France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concentration camps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Western Europe from Nazi tyranny</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Legend of D-Day: themes and components

The legend of D-Day is one vector of memory that informs the cultural memories of war. The next section reviews the literature regarding the national war memories of the three nations involved in the invasion and the French
national memory. A broader review is first offered regarding war memories of World War II.

**Situating National War Memories of World War II**

With regard to World War II, what to remember has been viewed as problematic. Whereas the memory of the Great War was about mourning the ‘glorious dead’, memory from the Second War was about ‘never again’ (Mosse 1990). Winter comments that the search for ‘meaning’ after the Somme and Verdun was hard enough; but after Auschwitz and Hiroshima that search became infinitely more difficult’ (1995, p. 228). The trauma of mass death, achieved in shorter periods of time, is viewed as a principal memory of World War II (Torgovnick 2005). However, Cappelletto (2005, p.1) sums up the memory of World War II for the former allies as embedded in the ‘grand narrative’ of nations united in a heroic struggle against German Nazism and Italian fascism.

It is important to consider how national war memories take a certain form. Mosse (1990, p.7) argues that a major theme in national war memories is the ‘Myth of the War Experience’, constructed by the state and the media, which refashions war memory, making it politically and socially palatable (Mosse 1990, p. 7). This perspective aligns with Boym (2001, p. 54) who asserts that myths ‘are not lies but rather shared assumptions that help to naturalize history and make it livable, providing the daily glue of common intelligibility.’ Whereas a legend represents what is popularly known and recounted, Hedges (2002, p. 23) writes that myth in the context of war ‘allows us to make sense of mayhem and violent death’. A national war memory is a generalized narrative, free of complexities yet silencing contradictions and certain nuances. However, it is important to note that war memories are not solely fabricated by the state. For example, in the aftermath of World War I, Vance (1997, p.267) argues that Canadians,

...did more than just embrace a myth: they helped to create it. By their very actions, each of these people played a role in nurturing the nation’s
memory of the war and giving it life in the consciousness of Canadians. That memory did not come from above; it spouted from the grief, the hope and the search for meaning of a thousand Canadian communities.

Whereas one finds similarities between national war memories, each allied nation ultimately had its own unique experience in the war. What is offered here is a brief overview of different national memories of war that are relevant to this research: the memories of Britain, Canada, the United States and France. How these national memories are defined and manifested varies within the literature, with some authors examining film as an outward demonstration of national war memory (see Paris 2007; Hewitt 2008), and others looking to memorials (Borg 1991; Brinkley 2004), presidential speeches (Noon 2004; Brinkley 2005), popular military history and public controversies (Weisbord 1991; Doss 2008). From the point of view of Sturken (1997), all of these are legitimate sources of influence on cultural memory. What follows is a review of each national war memory.

**Great Britain**

The popularity of the 50th anniversary commemorations of D-Day and V-E Day demonstrate that the memory of World War II remains significant in Great Britain (Pickering 1997). Participation and conflict over the right way to commemorate typifies ‘the centrality of the war to ideas of British identity’ (Noakes 1998, p.1-2). The predominant theme in the national war memory is ‘national unity in a time of adversity’ (Noakes 1998, p. 23), which overcame class, politics and internal divisions. Heritage sites and exhibits at war museums such as the D-Day Museum in Portsmouth embody these ideas (Noakes 1998, p. 46). For Calder (1991), national unity is built upon the myths of Dunkirk, the Battle of Britain and in particular the Blitz, iconic events that represent a fight for the nation’s survival against significant odds. It involved ‘standing alone’ when everybody ‘pulled together’, ‘got on with it’ during Britain’s ‘Finest Hour’ showing ‘British pluck’ and bulldog determination (see also Clarke 1996, p.207-215; Francis 2009). Along with the central hero, Sir Winston Churchill (Addison 2005), the People’s War is also populated with personages such as ‘The Few’, the wartime pilot heroes, what Francis (2009)
describes as a complex mythical embodiment of British masculinity, chivalrous yet light-hearted, a flyboy yet a merciless killer of the brutal 'Hun', and the British Tommy. These narratives, and the sites associated with them, can be viewed as embodying a sense of national identity (see Palmer 1999; 2003), and forming some of the ongoing commemorative mythology. As such, these memories may shape the perspective of British visitors to Normandy. This is important to understand because as Chronis (2008) notes, the visitor plays an active role in co-constructing meaning of a heritage site, a topic explored in Chapter Ten.

There are however competing interpretations of war memory. Common to all the victorious nations is the war myth that can be called upon in a nostalgic manner, ‘as an antidote to both the disappointments of the present and the uncertainties of the future’ (Vance 1997, p. 266). Yet rather than a simply benign yearning for the past, some view war memory as prone to political abuse, a means to avoid confronting the reality of modern life (Lowenthal 1989, p. 20). Politically, World War II can be called upon to justify, rationalize and/or to bolster the support for any number of government policies. For example, the ‘just war’ themes of egalitarianism, human decency and the fight for democracy can be aligned with supporting the notion of the welfare state (Eley 2001, p. 819-822), while at the same time notions of the Battle of Britain and defending the Empire can be called upon to stir nationalism as it was during the Falklands War (Noakes 1998; see also Francis 2009). This issue is relevant to this research because it points to the agency of remembrance, specifically what is remembered and why. This may also be relevant as in examining the meaning constructed at memorial sites, preserved battlefields and war museums, and whether they evoke feeling related to, for example, a mythic glorification of national identity (see Bell 2002), or the selling of war (see Buffton 2005).

**Canada**

Many popular history books in Canada reflect the sense of national pride, accomplishment and nation-building significance of its participation in World War II and in particular of D-Day, as the following titles attest:
• A nation forged in fire: Canadians and the Second World War 1939-1945 (Granatstein & Morton 1989)
• Normandy 1944. The Canadian summer (McAndrew 1994)
• D-Day Juno Beach: Canada’s 24 hours of destiny (Goddard 2004)

The war memory often emphasizes Canada, geographically removed from the war, voluntarily coming to the aid of Britain as an independent nation and out of a sense of moral obligation (Granatstein & Neary 1995, p.1-2). A nation of twelve million people, one million male and female volunteers enlisted. Tasked with its own beach on D-Day, Keegan (2004, p. xiii), notes the taking of Juno Beach as ‘an extraordinary achievement for a country of Canada’s modest population to provide a force large enough to assault so large a sector…a source of enormous Canadian national pride.’ Malone (1983, p.11) sums up the Canadian war effort: ‘Canada’s contribution in the air, at sea, and with her land forces, was outstanding.’ As a result of its war effort, Canada gained international prominence as an independent nation, further loosening its ties with Great Britain.

However, there is also another perspective to Canadian war memory and how it is represented. For example, Robertson (2001, p.102) argues that state-initiated efforts to remember and memorialize the war strive to offer a ‘singular narrative of Canadian History….’ Greenburg (2008) notes the boom in construction over the past 10 years in Ottawa of new war memorials, a new war museum and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. The memorialized landscape of the nation’s capital conveys an underlying message that to be Canadian involves remembering the nation’s military history. With the rise in multiculturalism in contemporary society, Greenburg argues that the relevance of Canada’s war heritage comes into question.

In addition, the Canadian war experience involves some dark memories: the surrender of Hong Kong and the imprisonment of Canadian soldiers; the disastrous raid on Dieppe leaving 60% either killed, wounded or captured; the
intensification of the English-Quebecois divide owing to the conscription debate; and the internment of Japanese-Canadian citizens (Granatstein & Neary 1995). In 1992, the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) aired a three-part documentary series entitled *The Valour and the Horror* (McKenna 1992). Presenting Canada’s involvement in World War II in a more interrogative tone, the series sparked national controversy. The series aimed to raise war memories which were either forgotten or silenced. For example, one episode raised questions as to whether Canadian soldiers executed German prisoners of war in Normandy, while another debated the value of the allied bombing of Germany. A government investigation was convened to examine the documentary, its claims as well as its accuracy. Taras (1995, p. 726) views this as an example of the struggle between the ‘guardians of ‘official’ war history [the government and veterans’ groups]…against a powerful media organization [the CBC] – and journalists who zealously defended the right to question and deflate what they saw as Canada’s war mythology.’ Despite the government report recommending that *the Valour and the Horror* never be broadcast again, and an independent historian concluding that it represented ‘bad history’ (Bercuson and Wise 1994, p. 10), it received several awards by the Academy of Canadian Cinema and Television. The controversy reflects the dynamic and dissonant voices involved in Canadian war remembrance. This research provides an opportunity to examine how Canada’s cultural memory of war is represented and mediated in an overseas landscape such as Normandy.

**United States**

In comparison with other wars in American history, World War II stands out as a ‘good war’ for a range of reasons: it involved a fight against a clearly delineated and unequivocally evil foe; with the sudden need for war materiel, the war led to economic growth and ended the Depression (Pauwels 2002, p. 237-251), and; the role of the state as a global power was ‘thrust upon it’ with the surprise attack by the Japanese at Pearl Harbor (Noon, p. 345). Authors such as Terkel (1984), Ambrose (1994) and Brokaw (1998) inspired the mythic image of courage, individuality and morality of the General Issue soldier, or GI,
that struck a particular chord with Americans. In short, World War II was a political, economic and social transformation for the United States, both domestically and internationally. Thus, the war and, in particular, D-Day, are described by Noon (2004, p. 341) as ‘the mythic summit of [American] national virtue.’ This research is interested in how this is reflected through tourism in Normandy.

In contrast, Torgovnick (2005, p. 2-19) proposes to reveal what she describes as clichés, omissions and distortions of the American cultural memory of World War II. Doss (2009, p. 14-17) criticizes the ‘love’ Americans have for D-Day, citing memorial costs, films, war memorial construction, computer games and attendance at the National D-Day Museum in New Orleans (re-named National World War II Museum). In addition, the National World War II Memorial, unveiled in 2005, was controversial in its symbolic positioning between the Washington and Lincoln Memorials, interpreted as reflecting the centrality of war in defining the nation. Doss (2009, p. 315) also criticizes to the National D-Day Memorial in Bedford, Virginia, unveiled in 2000, as embodying the ‘spectacle of gratitude’ with ‘all the humble solemnity and commemorative decorum of a water park’ (Doss 2009, p.13-15). In this sense, the memorial reflects what Doss describes as war porn and its fetishistic quality that represents an ‘American lust for militarism’ and romanticizing soldiery (p. 17-18). The American memory of World War II is therefore not impregnable from criticism, raising questions relevant to the research as to how the American involvement in the war is memorialized in Normandy.

These arguments and criticisms characterize the post modernist critique of war memory. Part of this critique is informed by the American war memory of Vietnam that ‘subverts earnest declaration of high national principle’ associated with World War II (Ehrenaus 2001, p. 321). That the Americans played a pivotal role in World War II cannot be questioned. What the literature points to is a tone of tension in the American cultural memory, exemplified in the critique of President George W. Bush who employs D-Day and World War II to legitimize the war on terror (see Noon 2004).
France

Whereas the previous cultural memories are discussed to understand the performance of Canadian, American and British tourists to France, reviewing the French war memory is to gain some insight into how the French may participate in the memorialization and commemoration of the Normandy landscape of war. Like other European countries that were occupied, France struggles with its war memory, vacillating between the memories of resistance, collaboration, deportation and indifference (see Hewitt 2008). Rousso (1985) offers the phrase, Vichy Syndrome, to refer to the state’s attempts to forget complicity in the German occupation only to have it resurface in the cultural memory through various vectors of memory such as film and literature.

Turning to the cornerstone of the literature on French memory, Nora does not include the D-Day landscape as a lieu de memoire, nor any other World War II sites. For Nora, the memory of World War II is ‘thoroughly divisive’ (Nora 1996, p. 616), reflecting the larger challenge of the state and society in finding closure on its war memory. This divisiveness is framed by questions of who resisted and who collaborated with the Germans. The end of German occupation in August, 1944 led to the branding of French women who had fraternized with the enemy, trials of Nazi sympathizers and the imprisonment of those involved in the Vichy government (Williams 2005). The following sixty years have involved the French government and society as a whole coming to terms with its culpability in the incarceration and killing of French political prisoners and Jews who were deported to work and concentration camps (see Ophuls 1972; Rousso 1991).

What is particularly relevant here is how D-Day and the Battle of Normandy are memorialized and mediated by the French. Gordon (2005) argues that the French government saw the importance of the story of liberation as a way to re-frame the French war memory, to celebrate its resistance and liberation rather than the memory of defeat, occupation and collaboration. The national government’s motivation included a desire to re-configure the recollections of the war, highlighting French resistance and the liberation of France embodied
in the Normandy landings (Gordon 2001, p.240-241). Footit (2004) argues that closer inspection of the French experience during the Battle of Normandy reveals conflicting views about the allies that influences the war memory of liberation. She goes on to argue that the allied bombing of cities and towns (see also Beevor 2009), soldiers looting farmhouses, fraternization and worse led to problematizing what is to be remembered and what is forgotten. In Chapter Six, the role of the French government in establishing memorials and commemoration in Normandy is further assessed in order to better understand one particularly influential element in the construction of the landscape of war.

Rousso identifies film as a vector of memory that has influenced French war memory. Media has been identified as shaping cultural memory (Sturken 1997; Erll et al. 2008), a motivation to travel as well as influencing meaning (Beeton 2005; Ryan 2007), and, in the case of war films, as an act of remembrance (Winter 2006). In addition, Crouch et al. (2005) argue film informs the imagination of the tourist, an example of how the media provides a visual imprint of what happened. It is for these reasons, that the literature on three D-Day films is reviewed.

**War Films as a Vector of War Memory**

Many authors argue that war films reflect the evolving relationship between societies toward war, and are the predominant influence on cultural memories of war (Whiteclay et al. 1996; Cole 1999; Paris 2007; Hasian 2001; Bodnar 2001). However, Winter (2001) suggests that this is too simplistic a view of how memory and film interrelate: people watch a film but it does not become their memory of the war. Rather, film acts as a mediator of war memory of particular groups, that ‘challenges conventional categories of thought’ ultimately ‘(disturbing) as many narratives as it confirms’ (Winter 2006, p.187-188).

Whereas war films are often positioned as ‘based on a true story’, interpretation of that history often reflects contemporary controversies (Toplin 1996) and is shaped by social and artistic forces (Manchel 1995). It is within this context that three war films relevant to this research are examined: *The
Longest Day (Zanuck 1962); Saving Private Ryan (Spielberg 1998) and the HBO Series, Band of Brothers (Spielberg & Hanks 2001). Whereas there are other war films on D-Day, these three are the most popular in the literature and represent two of the most recent films on the subject. Of interest here is the literature that critiques these war films. This in turn provides a context for how these films, as a vector of war memory, contribute to the construction of symbolic meaning in the landscape of war (Lefebvre 2006) and the visitor experience.

The Longest Day (Zanuck 1962) represents the most expensive black and white film ever made, involving a long list of stars, and an equally significant list of military advisors to ensure a degree of military and historical authenticity (Ambrose 1996:97-100). Artistic license in several scenes served to emphasize the dramatic rather than the accurate (Ambrose, 1996, p. 101-03), including the distortion of what happened at Pegasus Bridge, discussed in Chapter Eight. Nevertheless, the film framed the legend of D-Day into the memories of its audience (Raymond 1995). In contrast, Saving Private Ryan (Spielberg 1998) represents the journey of the war film genre, changed by the experience of the Vietnam War to focus more on individual morality rather than the difficult and patriotic task of commemorating gallantry and victory (Bodnar 2001, p.507). The first 26 minutes of Saving Private Ryan are often separated from the rest of the film, owing to what Bodnar (p. 805) and others view as the visceral realism of combat in stark contrast to The Longest Day, criticized as portraying a sanitized version of war (Ambrose 1994, p. 396).

Saving Private Ryan also reflects the late 20th century’s turn toward ‘the singular person in the past, present and future’ (Bodnar, p. 507), and that individual actions can make a difference. Hasian (2001) takes a different perspective, arguing that Saving Private Ryan represents a nostalgic longing for the moral message of the goodness of World War II. Nostalgia gains purchase in the film by way of achieving authenticity in the horrors of warfare, without ‘denigrating the motives of those who participated in the conflict’ (p.
The ‘realism’ of film then becomes a legitimizing force in the broader message provided.

In 2001, the $120 million (US) television series *Band of Brothers* (Spielberg & Hanks 2001), was released focusing on the story of Easy Company of the 506th Parachute Infantry Regiment of the 101st Airborne Division. Three episodes deal with the period of June 5 - June 13, 1944. Based on Ambrose (1992), the series is characterized as a docudrama, and can be viewed as both ‘an elegy and a memorial’ (Paget and Lidkin 2009, p.94). As elegy, *Band of Brothers* offers a valediction to the ‘Ryan generation’ (p. 94) individuals who are now reaching the end of their lives. As a memorial, the series embodies the growing interest in oral history (see Terkel 1984; Ambrose 1994), with veterans offering the perspective of the witness to start or end each episode. Overall, the effectiveness in conveying the memory of the war is through a form of triangulation possible in docudramas, as argued by Dovey (2000):

- First-person witness – the recounting of actual testimony (the documentary base);
- Actors bearing witness as dramatic protagonists (enacting a script based on testimony);
- Audience witness (the context of reception as memorialisation/reflection).

Whereas American films such as *Saving Private Ryan* and *Band of Brothers* are criticized as an Americanization of the D-Day memory, *The New Statesman* provides a British perspective on the series and a reflection on national war memories:

If you had to summarise the difference between British and American attitudes to the Second World War, you could just say that while America was making *Saving Private Ryan*, Britain was rerunning *Dad’s Army*. This is not a case of American bombast versus British modesty. If anything, the myth of war is even more deeply embedded in the British psyche than in the American. It is just that we are so certain we saved civilisation that we can afford to make jokes about it. America, at least in
that era between the Vietnam war and 11 September 2001, has been so nervous about whether it has used its superpowers for good that it needs to talk to itself sternly from time to time. Americans must remind themselves that, once upon a time, brave men moved among them. (Billen 2001, para 2).

The relevance of this quote is that war films are a powerful means of framing national war memory in a contemporary context. Films gain more leverage as time passes, and the voice of the veteran generation passes away. The role of the witness in war remembrance is echoed by Winter (2006) is a separate and distinct perspective on remembrance. In the next section, the voice of veterans as a vector of war memory is offered. Whereas it is unusual to include primary research in a literature review, it is justified here because it not only provides another perspective on war memory that is distinct from the other vectors of memory, but it also demonstrates the perspective that will be lost with the passing of the veteran generation.

The Voice of Veterans as a Vector of Memory

I have interviewed 12 World War II veterans for this research, each with his or her own unique story of D-Day and World War II. In part, their stories inform my war memory, voices that speak to the ‘who’ and the ‘what’ of remembrance. As such, as Hartman (1994) and Winter (2996) argue, it is important to hear their voice. Their narrative represents fragments of historical events, the individual perspective of war that, as one veteran noted, is ‘10 feet wide and 50 feet ahead’. Some of these narratives have been published (see Ambrose 1984; Stewart 2000; 2002; Brotherton 2009) but many rest only with their families, friends and now, with me. These fragments of stories frame and colour my perspective on the Normandy landscape of war. The sequence is as the historical evolution of the battle, starting midnight of June 6th.
June 6th 1944, just after midnight: Jim Wallwork, Glider Pilot Regiment (British), piloting a Horsa glider toward Pegasus Bridge

When we hit the coast of France...[the towing aircraft pilot] says five, four, three, two, one, cheers, I pull the plug and pull up nose. As soon as the course and speed are right, I shout ‘On!’ and Johnny [co-pilot] starts to count with the stopwatch.... Johnny says to me prepare to turn, five, four, three, two, one, go and ... I do a controlled right turn to starboard 90 degrees.... I could see the bridge, I could see everything on the crosswind leg.

June 6th 1944, first wave landing at Juno Beach: Neil Stewart, Fort Garry Horse Regiment (Canadian) in a Sherman amphibious tank, driving toward Juno Beach

It was almost three miles riding in the darn things. You had to hang on to your nerve when you are in [the tank], because they are low in the water, but that was a danger but it also protects you because you know, it was so choppy that day I am sure the Germans had trouble seeing us at all. And then it sure is a comforting sound or feeling to feel the track bite the sand. We were ordered to hang in there until the flails [tank designed to sweep for mines] came along to clear the mines. But when we came ashore, we said to hell with this, we are going to get off this beach.

June 6th 1944, late morning at Juno Beach: Cullis Lancaster, Canadian naval officer on board Landing Craft Infantry 135 (LCIO 135)

We went in on D-Day with the North Nova Scotia Highlanders.... We’re two-and-a-half miles offshore, and they said ‘hands to your beaching stations’. Eleven twenty started to come to shore. [reads from his notes] Unable to stop, port ramp put out manually, starboard unable to go out. Twelve forty five, we were off the beach.

Mid June 1944, north of Caen: Paddy Brennan, Irish Guards, commanding a Sherman tank

My first experience: we were on top of this hill and looking down. There was a wheat field ahead of us. Then I felt this thing explode at the side of me. ‘Silly bugger, what are you shooting at?’ And I had that attitude for awhile and then I upped my periscope and there’s tanks burning left
and right and I thought ‘what’s going on ‘round here?’ And then we got hit. We were out for the rest of the day, between two armies shooting at each other all day long. And you, sitting in the middle of it. God, it was crazy.

Crossing the Seine River, August 24th or 25th, 1944: Jack Webb, Berkshire Regiment (British), rifleman.

Oh come on, Jack, pull yourself together [speaking to himself, clears his throat]. I haven’t told this to anyone, so count yourself lucky. We came around this corner and there was this tank that had exploded. There was something hanging in a tree. I wanted to believe that it was a sheep, but it wasn’t. Hanging from the tree, there were the blackened remains of an arm and there was this golden wedding ring on the finger that was glistening in the sunlight. If you want my memory of war, that was it. You write that down.

The voices of veterans personify history, and exemplify the power of oral histories such as Terkel (1984), Ambrose (1994) and Brotherton (2010). White (2000) explains how the survivor narrative is often institutionalized in documentary film or at memorial sites such as the Pearl Harbor Memorial or the Hiroshima Peace Memorial, in the form of first-person narratives in order to achieve an ‘emotional remembering’. Their voices represent an individual rendering of history while at the same time their institutionalization enscribes them as constituting the narrative of the nation. How the voices of veterans are experienced in the Normandy landscape of war will be explored later in this research.

**Conclusion**

This chapter addressed the cultural memories of World War II and D-Day by examining a number of vectors: D-Day as legend; war mythologies of the allied nations; war films, and; the voices of veterans. The objective of this review was to provide context for this research with regard to the meaning of war and of D-Day and what is remembered. In general, the literature review in this chapter offers a spectrum of interpretations, a reflection of how history and memory are dynamic.
Several vectors of memory were selected and explored. Key conclusions are now summarized. The legend of D-Day frames a nostalgic, heroic and adventurous memory of war. It reflects the special profile and status that is unique to D-Day, embodied in the ritual symbols, iconic events and individuals uniquely associated with the invasion. The national memories of World War II share a nation-defining transformative character, a source of political, social and cultural meaning. For the allied nations, it is a coveted and protected memory, as illustrated in the Canadian case, whereby revisionism or re-interpretation of the past is hotly contested. However, there are signs of the limits of war memory and how it is memorialized and used, as illustrated in the controversy surrounding the American World War II Memorial, and the use of war memory by the British government during the Falklands war. The war memory of France has a more traumatic tone relative to the other allied nations, given its experience of occupation, mass deportations and the legacy of collaboration with the Nazis.

The war films reviewed in this chapter do not convey a singular narrative about D-Day. It is argued that *The Longest Day* informed the legend of D-Day, but the movie was later criticized as not reflecting the realities of war. *Saving Private Ryan* and *Band of Brothers* represent universally distributed films that present American stories of Normandy that suggest the cultural memories of D-Day are becoming Americanized.

The voice of veterans is a personal and individual history that is often characterized by a visceral, stark and traumatic tone of war. These were presented as fragments of memory to convey the influences on the positionality of the researcher, explored later in the thesis. In addition, they reflect the richness of the witness recollection that will be lost in time.

The nature of war memory is that it is incomplete by way of its selected narrative. The brevity of each section in this chapter reflects the fragmented, chaotic, dynamic and imprecise nature of the cultural memory of war. Whereas this chapter has presented these separate and distinct vectors, they actually
overlap in the Normandy landscape of war, informing memorialization and commemorative discourses. As well, it is argued that cultural memories of war inform the Canadian, British and American tourist performance. The next chapter focuses on understanding the literature as it relates to the commemoration and memorialization in the landscape of war and as mediated by tourism.
CHAPTER 3. War Remembrance in the Landscape of War: Markers and the Role of Tourism
Introduction

This chapter reviews the literature to contextualize remembrance in the landscape of war. This involves considering memorialization and commemoration and their relationship to tourism in managing, representing and interpreting war memory. The review provides both the context for this research, as well as an opportunity to identify gaps in the literature regarding the tourism-remembrance relationship. The chapter is divided into two sections explained below.

Section One explores how landscapes of war are memorialized. Literature related to markers in the landscape, specifically relics of war, military cemeteries and commemorations, is reviewed to gain insight into their significance in memorializing the past. This involves considering the symbolic meaning of the markers. Also considered is sense of place, what Seaton (2009a) refers to as the ‘auratic quality’ of the Otherness of Death. This section explores the literature related to naturescapes and other sensory elements of place in order to better define auratic quality, to acknowledge that the power of memorialized battlefield involves both constructed and natural settings. Where possible, the context of the landscape and sense of place related to Normandy is explored.

Section Two reviews the literature regarding the role of tourism as a mediating agency in the landscape of war. First, the context of tourism and battlefields is reviewed, specifically with regard to criticisms of commercialism, heritage dissonance, the politics of remembrance and the heritage force field. Second, literature regarding mediating agencies of tourism, represented here as guide books, tour guides, museums and other managed heritage sites, is explored, particularly with regard to how they manage, represent and interpret the symbols, rituals and the auratic quality of the landscape of war.
Section I: Remembrance in the Landscape of War

This section is divided into contextualizing the concept, ‘landscape of war’ as well as employing the literature to conceptualize sense of place as it relates to sites of war memory. The relationship between place and memory is a significant subject of research in geography (Tuan 1977; Mels 2004) and anthropology (Basso 1996; Bender 2001). Place is also significant in terms of how we understand the past. As Halbwachs (1992, p. 146) asserts, ‘we can understand how we recapture the past only by understanding how it is preserved by our physical surroundings.’ Cosgrove (1988) also sees landscape as a source of memory, containing a set of narratives told from generation to generation that help to determine identity. Yet, whereas Nevins (2005, p. 268) argues that all memories have a geography, Misztel (2003, p. 128) points out that sites of memory ‘do not simply arise out of lived experience but instead have to be created.’ The meaning of a place is therefore one that is constructed, pointing to the importance of not only memorials, museums and physical markers, but also the stories associated with the natural environment that are narrated through tourism.

A landscape is defined by how individuals conceive it (Huff 2008, p. 20). It can therefore be viewed as an ‘inscribed surface…the most generally accessible and widely shared aide-memoire of a culture’s knowledge and understanding of its past and future’ (Kuchler 1993, p.85). The term, ‘landscape of war’ is employed by Filippucci (2004) to delineate between civilian landscapes in the Argonne region from those memorialized and inscribed with national and international memory of the Battle of Verdun. This definition is relevant to this research because, in the context of Normandy, its memorialization has international significance for three allied nations: Britain, Canada, and the United States. Normandy is also significant in that, to coin a term employed by Lambeck (2005, p. xii), it is a heritage landscape that is geographically ‘dis-located’ from the respective homelands. As the Battle of Normandy campaign is characterized by the deployment of the allied armies into various geographic sectors, this in turn is reflected in the national memorialization within specific areas in the region. There is little in the academic literature that examines this
characteristic of war remembrance, however national perspectives are often a delineating theme in guidebooks (Holt & Holt 2004; Copp & Bechthold 2008) and battlefield tours. This topic will be examined later in the thesis.

As was described in Chapter One, a landscape of war is created in part by the construction of war memorials, monuments and cemeteries and the establishment of commemorative rituals. Lowenthal (1985, p.324) argues that monuments and memorials aim to remember the past, constructing ‘a landscape of commemoration’ that informs national identities (see Bender 1993; Linenthal 1991). For example, memorialized sites such as Glencoe (Knox 2006) and the USS Arizona Memorial (Kelly 2000, p.45) all serve as sites that ‘enshrine’ national identity. Landscapes of war are therefore important in that they function as what Linenthal (1993, p.1) describes as ‘ceremonial centers’, a focal point for veneration based on the belief that ‘the contemporary power and relevance of the ‘lessons’ of the battle are crucial for the continued life of the nation.’ To serve this function, the landscape is not only the site of ceremony, but is ‘memorialized, preserved, restored and purified’ (Linenthal 1993, p.1-3), a hallowed or sacred ground that represents the ‘transformative power of war and the sacrificial heroism of the warrior.’

Bell’s (2002) reference to the Somme battlefield as a mythscape acknowledges the idea of sacred status and meaning associated with certain battlefields. Battlefields are not simply tourist attractions, but places where national memory along with moral and political narratives are presented and consumed.

However, whereas there are many battlefields from history, many have been forgotten. Blades (2003, p.53) argues that a battlefield is remembered when it is able to ‘stir the greatest passion and interest if the issues being contested by force of arms then are perceived as having relevance now.’ In the case of Normandy, it is memorialized as the site of liberation of France, but over the years it has been a symbolic backdrop for more contemporary political purposes. For example, there was an increase in visitors to the Civil War battlefield of Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 (Chronis and Hampton 2008). Blades describes this phenomenon of
contemporary representation as the 'nonphysical ideological' aspect of a landscape of war that creates a new sense of relevance. Thus, the memorialized landscape of war also involves an intangible element, what Chronis refers to as the 'embodiment of the narrative' (Chronis & Hampton 2008, p.117) that is essential to sacralization of a battlefield. Representation and interpretation of war, as embodied in the memorialization of the associated narrative can therefore be viewed as a highly politicized aspect of national identity and heritage (see Anderson 1983; Lowenthal 1986; Connerton 1989).

However, Blades (2003, p. 47) argues that there are different categories to describe military landscapes, configured by how they are marked and consequently remembered. There is the historical landscape, such as the World War I battlefield at Beaumont Hamel that is designated a Canadian park (see Gough 2004b), a site that reflects the same topography at the time of the battle, perhaps including remnants of war; the memorial landscape, such as Waterloo (see Seaton 1999) defined by the physical memorializing and interpretation of the battlefield, and; the modern landscape, the unprotected, unpreserved and uninterpreted battlefield, such as areas of the World War I western front (see O'Shea 1997), where meaning has survived owing to individual informal efforts. All of these landscapes are relevant for this research, given the vast geographic expanse of Normandy involved in the D-Day landings. Delineating meaning in the landscape are markers. The next section focuses on the form and meaning of markers in the landscape of war.

**Memorial Markers as Symbols of War/Battle**

War memorials, monuments and cemeteries are all examples of physical markers found in the landscape of war. Lowenthal (1986, p.109-110, 112) argues that the marking of the landscape designates a space as a site of note, forming the message and giving significance to the site. War memorials are designed to evoke the memory of war and the memory of the fallen. As Gold and Gold (2003, p. 108) note, more often than not:
Battlefields scarcely merit a second glance for their inherent landscape qualities once the debris of war has been cleared away. Despite that, battlefields and other sites associated with war and violent conflict have a profound significance—serving as mnemonics of political, social and cultural history (Gold and Gold 2003).

The viewer receives a narrative that involves both affective and cognitive understanding (Ryan 2007a, p.4). In their study of the enshrined battlefield at Culloden, Gold and Gold (2003, p. 112) delve deeper into the role of markers, arguing that they evoke:

…narratives [which] help clothe the world of the past with meaning, making sense of sequences of events, resolving ambiguity, and, not infrequently, identifying heroes and villains. Thus, embedded in the battlefield marker is a narrative, which defines and interprets accounts of actions and events. At the same time, they are sources of power.

It is the role of the marker, or more precisely a set of markers that are situated in and therefore fashion the memory of the landscape of war that is of particular interest for this research. In the tourism-remembrance relationship, the focus is on how these markers are:

- Symbols of the war/battle, and how they are collectively situated in the landscape of war;
- Mediated by tourism, and;
- Understood and interpreted by the visitor.

The latter two points are discussed in Section Two of this chapter and Chapter Four respectively. The set of symbols used to memorialize war/battle and how they are situated in the landscape of war is examined below. The symbolic meaning given to a landscape of war is largely dependent upon physical markers, be it a military cemetery, war memorial, monument, plaque, or an interpretive board. The literature on these forms of memorialization is reviewed here.
Creating a monument or memorial effectively establishes a place to go to mourn and honor the dead (see King 1999). For example, markers in the landscape of war allow for the interaction between next of kin and those killed in battle, inspiring pilgrimages to battlefields (see Lloyd 1998; Scates 2006) in an attempt to seek solace and closure in the mourning process (see Daines 2000). This interaction might involve the touching of engraved names and leaving mementos (Greenspan 2002; Sturken 1997), representing attempts to personally connect with the dead (see Bachelor 2004). Markers are also sites for public commemoration. Originally established by the state and social agents such as families and veterans (see Winter 2006), the challenge was to remember the dead while forgetting the images of violence and carnage of war, and replacing them with notions of sacrifice, honour, valour and justice (Borg 1991; King 1999; Shipley 1987). Mosse (1990) regards markers as important devices in transmitting what he refers to as the Myth of the War Experience, and the Cult of the Fallen, topics discussed later in this section with regard to war cemeteries.

The tourism literature has also examined the role of markers as focal points for tourism. Referring to battlefield markers, MacCannell (1976, p.129) argues that there is,

…a standard set of markers, including The Cemetery, The Museum (with its display of rusted arms), The Monument to a General or Regiment, The Polished Cannon with its welded balls, The Battle Map and the (optional) Reconstructed Fortification.

These markers may be viewed as commonplace to a landscape of war, but the comment also infers a certain dismissive characteristic as to the complexity of their symbolic meaning. Contrary to MacCannell’s comment, memorials and monuments do take many forms, as noted by authors such as Borg (1991) and Michalski (1998). Ryan (2007a, p.3) also acknowledges their complexity when he argues that there are multiple truths to a battlefield, owing to one’s own cultural memory of the war, and therefore markers are not as simply interpreted as they are identified. Markers are nevertheless significant in that they can initiate what MacCannell (1976) describes as site sacralization. Seaton (1999
2000) and Slade (2003) have employed this concept to describe the evolution of sites such as Waterloo, the Somme and Gallipoli.

Diller and Scofidio (1994, p. 47) employ the concept of markers in their critique of the Normandy landscape of war:

The battlefield … becomes an ideologically encoded landscape through the commemorative function of the ‘marker.’ As a marker inscribes war onto material soil, it becomes the sight. Without the marker, a battlefield might be indistinguishable from a golf course or a beach. Guided by a system of markers and maps, the tourist/strategist reenacts the battle by tracing the tragic space of conflict by foot or by car.

However, as Seaton (1999) notes, in addition to marking, social conditions and ideology are necessary in giving the marker its meaning and to attract the attention of visitors. Nevertheless, understanding memorialization as a set of symbols in the landscape of war is an important step in understanding the history and memory of the battle. A number of methods can be used to ‘mark’ or denote the landscape of war that represent varying degrees of subtlety, yet all sharing the elements of the space upon which a narrative is placed (Gold and Gold 2003, p. 112). Relics of war and military cemeteries are two notable forms of markers and are briefly discussed below, followed by a section on commemoration, another important form of marking the war memory. Another marker, museums, is discussed in Section Two of this chapter.

Certain landscapes of war are marked by a particularly unique relic of the war or battle. For example, O’Shea (1997) and Gough (2004a) write about the trenches that still mark the landscapes of World War I, symbolic of four years of static trench warfare, No Man’s Land and the mud and horror associated with that war. Normandy also has relics of war that mark the landscape, notably the artificial harbor at Arromanches and the remains of the Atlantic Wall (Figure 7), a set of fortifications constructed by the Nazis to defend against allied invasion. In Bunker Archaeology, Virilio (1975, p.40) explores the memories and meaning associated with the remnants of the Atlantic Wall in 1970’s France. He describes the Atlantic Wall as fashioning ‘a new geography … created with
the concrete shelters as its markers.’ Virilio views these edifices, exemplified in Figure 9, as the embodiment of Third Reich’s notion of total war in its ‘mythic dimension’, (p. 12), whereby ‘the monolith was its monument’ (p. 40). They also evoke the memory of German occupation, ‘buildings that brought upon themselves the hatred of passersby’ (p.13), and yet constructed to stand the test of time. Virilio’s work is relevant in that it represents an ethnography of relics of war. He writes of his own experiences visiting various bunkers along the French coast, intrigued by their form and meaning. This work is relevant to this thesis because it illustrates how war remnants reflect not only a period of history, but how they are able to trigger deep emotional reactions and memories that are framed within a certain national war memory.

Figure 7: Part of the Atlantic Wall defences, Longues sur Mer Battery, Normandy (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).

Whereas relics of war may evoke memories of the war, military cemeteries evoke the memory of the fallen killed in battle (Figure 8). Separated from civilian cemeteries, military cemeteries are not only viewed as shrines to the military war dead but are symbolically enveloped in the legitimacy and sanctity of the state and religion by the employment of symbols, narratives and commemorative practices (Mosse 1990, p.46). The fallen are mythologized using diction and imagery that both lionizes and sanctifies them (Fussell 1976),
employing what Winter (1995) refers to as the language of mourning. It is therefore important to consider the symbolism and meaning associated with the design of cemeteries.

Figure 8: Beny sur Mer Military cemetery, Normandy (Source: the author 2006 original in colour).

In the case of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, the organization mandated to construct and maintain the military cemeteries, its guidelines (see Kenyon 1918) do not mask the realities of death, but rather aim to honor the fallen in an appropriate way (see Gibson & Ward 1989). Kenyon (1918) recommended four guiding principles for the design of cemeteries: each soldier should have their name engraved on a headstone or memorial; cemeteries and memorials should be permanent; headstones should be uniform, and; soldiers should be buried as equals, without regard to rank, regiment, social class or race. The same principles were continued with the construction of World War II cemeteries. The German and American agencies responsible for war graves, the Volksbund Deutsche Kriegsgräberfürsorge (VDK) the American Battle Monuments Commission (ABMC) follow similar principles of uniformity and equality. However, as Foster (2004) notes, there was a pragmatic element to this approach, allowing for the mass production of the various architectural elements at a lower cost.
These symbols form what Mosse (1990) refers to as the Cult of the Fallen, a socially and politically constructed perspective that redefines the realities of death caused by war, aiding the mourning process of individuals and of society as a whole. Mosse's perspective can be viewed as skeptical with regard to the sincerity and intent of military cemeteries, and that it was in the interests of the military and the state to associate glory, sacredness and the legitimacy of war to the memorial narrative. However, Mosse (1990) notes that the Cult of the Fallen lost momentum soon after World War II. Into the 21st century, the relevance of World War II cemeteries is certainly a central issue with regard to remembrance, a topic explored here.

The meaning of a military cemetery, what Seaton (2000, p. 68) describes as a “hub of signifiers,” cannot be underestimated, nor can it be readily dismissed as a form of state propaganda. Atkinson (2006, p. 22) describes Arlington National Cemetery as,

...a liminal place, a threshold where the living meet the dead, and where national history is intertwined with personal loss. Yet Arlington also is a shrine to valor and sacrifice, to service and fidelity. Those interred here tell a story...of a transcendent ideal, conceived in liberty and reconsecrated in every new grave dug, every benediction murmured, every commitment into the hallowed ground.

For Atkinson, the meaning of the cemetery exists at different levels: individual loss, national history and embodying principles such as valor and sacrifice. For Richard Dunkley, a veteran of the 6th Airborne Division, the meaning at the cemetery is quite clear when he states, ‘... if you wish to know the true story of the 6th Division in Normandy, don’t go to the history books, go to the Airborne cemetery in Ranville, and read the tomb stones, that’s where the true story lies’ (http://www.nvafriends.nl/index.php?cid=38&vid=31). Dunkley’s assertion illustrates the power of military cemeteries to evoke collective national sacrifice, with ‘row upon row’ of gravestones (Figure 8), what Turner (1967) might describe as a dominant symbol of sacrifice for the nation, and the humanism of an individual tombstone as an instrumental symbol. Turner (1967, p. 31) defines a dominant symbol as a shrine, as Atkinson (2006) also describes a
military cemetery, ‘consisting of several objects in configuration.’ Instrumental symbols are the means by which the goals of the dominant symbol are attained (Turner 1976, p. 32). Dunkley focuses on the gravestone as the source of ‘truth’. Atkinson and Dunkley both convey the significance of a cemetery in a different light than Mosse (1990), but are these perspectives relevant in the 21st century?

As one response, in their examination of the Commonwealth war cemetery in Singapore, Hamzah and Yeoh (2007) point to how the site has evolved from a site of ‘imperial’ identity and ‘individual’ mourning to one that has been re-appropriated by contemporary Singaporeans as a national and global narrative. This is illustrative of the evolving meaning of war cemeteries and how society is able to refashion the relevance of a site over time. Muzaini and Yeoh (2007, p. 1298) note that the location of the cemetery is what is important and relevant to Singaporeans, that these foreign soldiers died protecting ‘Singapore soil’. This points to how the dominant symbol of such sites of memory can evolve over time, and ‘manufactured ‘from below’ [by local people] rather than just instigated by those in positions of authority….’ (Muzaini and Yeoh 2007, p. 1301). This argument is supported by Sturken (1997) who argues that the cultural memory of a memorial site such as the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is defined by various voices, and not specifically by the media or the government. It is therefore unclear as to the meaning of the dominant symbol represented by cemeteries in the 21st century, despite the attention they receive by visitors. This will be further examined in Chapters Nine and Ten.

McGeer (2008) does provide some insight into the timeless significance of a military cemetery by focusing on the instrumental symbol of the personal inscription of the gravestone. He notes that the,

…abundance and diversity [of] individual expressions of sorrow and consolation, touching, heartfelt, and permanent, spoke more poignantly than any memorial for the burden of loss borne by thousands of parents, wives, and children for the rest of their lives. (2008, p.v)
A personal inscription cited by McGeer (p.16) is for Trooper Robert Lawrence Morton, 24 years old, (Figure 9), and exemplifies the personal mourning and a sense of solace of perhaps a fiancé or a wife:

*A beautiful future planned, only to end in a dream.

*Dear, my thoughts are ever of you and what might have been*

Such moving inscriptions are unique to Commonwealth gravestones, but nevertheless it signifies the individual element that is present in a military cemetery: the death of a human being as an instrumental symbol. This symbolism also provides some insight into the potential influence on visitor meaning-making at such sites.

Figure 9: Gravestone of Trooper Morton, Beny sur Mer Canadian Military Cemetery (source: Guerin 2010 original in colour).
Figure 9 also presents the typical format of a Commonwealth gravestone. To
refashion a phrase by Turner(1967), the gravestone represents a forest of
identities, with the individual identified by his family and familial names, rank,
regiment, age, religion and nationality, all of which represent forms of kinship to
which the visitor may associate her or himself (see Palmer 2005). In addition,
there is the narrative of love and loss with which McGeer (2008) identifies.
Collectively, these identities cosmologically frame one man, providing a number
of triggers that may engage the onlooker. The next part of the section focuses
on a different form of marker: the ritual war commemoration.

**Commemoration as a Memorializing Marker**

An important element of remembrance is the commemoration. Annual
commemorations attract significant numbers of international visitors who
participate for a variety of reasons: as a marker of the anniversary of the battle,
as ritual and as part of the tourist performance. With a review of meaning
associated with commemoration explored in the next chapter, several other
perspectives are examined here: defining commemoration and its role in
remembrance; state involvement in major commemorations, and; sustaining
commemoration as an act of remembrance through fictive kinship.

The practice of commemoration is different from other markers in that it is
situated in a place at a specific time. As such, it is relevant to this research
because commemorations act as a high point in the Normandy tourism
calendar, attracting visitors who participate in the range of events organized by
local authorities, various groups and veterans’ associations. In this context,
commemorative events are a motivation to visit as well as a time to participate
in the ritual acts of remembrance. The form and meaning of commemorations
is of interest to this research, particularly with regard to how tourism and
tourists are involved in commemoration of the landscape of war.

A commemoration is defined as a ritualized social practice that takes place at a
site of memory. For Casey (1987, p.216), commemoration involves two
components: a formal eulogy and participation in a liturgical service. This
‘intensified remembering’, involving ritual and a narrative text, leads to what is described as ‘a cult enacted’ (Connerton 1989, p. 70). As a cult enacted, individuals participate in a ritual of commemoration and feel a sense of belonging. For Connerton (1989, p.53), the symbolism and meaning of commemorative practices is where ‘myth and ritual diverge’ where the voices of the state and religion, veterans and the community at large come together and formally remember.

However, for Winter & Sivan (1999) commemoration, as a form of collective remembrance, may involve gathering as a group on a particular day, but what is remembered varies from individual to individual. There can be dissonance in the meaning of commemoration, as Frost et al. (2008) note, based on various stakeholders participating in the memory work. Their research, involving a case study of commemorations related to ANZAC Day, acknowledges growing criticism of what is viewed as inappropriate behavior at commemorative events, coupled with conflicting ideas of what is being commemorated. This infers that a certain degree of ‘solemnity and moral worthiness’ (Frost et al. 2008, p.170) is expected at such events, leading to gatekeeping with regard to who should be allowed to participate and how. Whereas tradition largely shapes the form that commemoration takes, what is remembered is defined by who is involved in organizing, as well as those participating in, the memory work (Winter & Sivan 1999). In explaining these points, two perspectives are offered below: the multi-vocal character of commemorations, and; sustaining fictive kinship in war memory.

**Multi-Vocal Character of Commemorations**

A characteristic of commemorations is their employment as a political instrument. In this context, Hobsbawm and Ranger (1983) point to the invention of various ceremonial traditions as a way of legitimizing the state. Examples of these are the two-minute silence and the wearing of poppies (see Cannadine 1981; Iles 2008). Alternatively, public commemorations may involve various political interests, an example being November 11th Remembrance Day, a Commonwealth holiday, that may evoke the heroic
memory of individuals fighting for the nation juxtaposed by the pacifists’ call ‘Never again’ (Winter & Sivan 1999). Related to this is the appropriation of sites of memory for new causes, reflecting the multi-vocal character and evolution of memorialized sites (Winter 2008, p.63-64; see also Koshar 2000). Ultimately, Winter (2009, p.64) argues that commemorations dealing with war remembrance represent ‘a chorus of voices…some louder than others, but they never sound alone.’ Thus, there are top-down and bottom-up elements to commemoration, with regional and local twists to the commemorative discourse, what Sturken (1997) might refer to as representing the dynamic, contested element of cultural memories of war that plays out in the ritual of commemoration.

Commemoration regarding World War II has been embedded in the liturgy of November 11th as well as Memorial Day in the United States. However, in the Normandy landscape of war, D-Day is also commemorated on its anniversary, June 6th, followed by commemorations throughout the summer to mark the Battle of Normandy. Of international significance are the major ‘0’ anniversaries between 1984 and 2004, the 40th, 50th and 60th anniversaries attracted massive media attention, the return of veterans and the involvement heads of state. These commemorations are viewed as regenerating interest in the war for the post-war generation (Miszal 1999; Brinkley 2005; Paris 2007, p. 1). However, as Pickering (1997, p. 200) observed with the 50th anniversary commemorations in Normandy, the event ‘(shows) public memory still in the making, (emerging) from the contest of official narrative and vernacular interpretation.’ In other words, commemorations must struggle to accommodate, or consciously forget, the dissonance in cultural memories of war. Chapter Two notes some of the conflicts within various vectors of memory. There is also a dissonance between vectors, as Footitt (2004) exemplifies with regard to French and American interpretations of their collaboration during the Normandy campaign (see also Olson 2010, p. 329-333).
A commemorative act aimed at accommodating conflicting cultural memories of war is best illustrated in the symbolic act of French President Mitterand with the German Chancellor Schroeder. At the D-Day commemoration in 1994, the two leaders held hands, symbolically bonding their two nations in a new Europe (Torgovnick 2005). Another example is the elevation of the World War II memory as a way to silence memories of other wars. For examples, Brinkley (2005) presents the speech by President Reagan at the 1984 D-Day commemoration at Pointe du Hoc as one of the most seminal moments in his presidency. With veterans present, Reagan, along with the careful scripting of the speech, setting and media, was able to evoke the New Patriotism, pushing aside the memory of defeat in Vietnam by evoking the mythic imagery of the ‘Boys of Pointe du Hoc’:

We stand on a lonely, windswept point on the northern shore of France. Behind me is a memorial that symbolize the Ranger daggers that were thrust into the tops of these cliffs. And before me are the men who put them there. These are the boys of Pointe du Hoc. These are the men who took the cliffs. These are the champions who helped free a continent. These are the heroes who helped end a war.

Reagan was therefore able to effectively employ the commemoration as a means to recall the memory of D-Day in a contemporary context, galvanizing support for re-election as well as launching the era of mythologizing ‘the greatest generation’ (see Brokaw 1998). Despite the massive world-wide interest in these major commemorations, and the potential for political messaging they represent for heads of state, this next section focuses on the challenges of sustaining remembrance through commemoration over time, and in particular from generation to generation. This is relevant in that tourists may also be viewed as agents in sustaining remembrance, a topic explored in Chapter 10.

**Sustaining Commemoration through Fictive Kinship**

Winter (2000) offers the concept of the commemorative process, the means by which ritual becomes established, as central to sustaining the war memory
over time. The process is described as involving the following requirements:

- Construction [employment] of a physical marker;
- Routinization of ritual, involving both establishing a narrative and;
- Establishment of ritual in the calendar.

These acts point to the role of the state in mediating major commemorations. However, there are many towns with their own war memorials and commemorations. Winter (2006) argues that it is often a local collective of individuals who have come together to memorialize and commemorate. This fictive kinship is formed because they share a common experience, either as next of kin (see Sériot 2004) or veteran comrades to those who were killed. The challenge to sustaining remembrance is whether the commemorative ritual is adopted by the next generation. A lacuna in the literature is the role tourists play as part of the fictive kinship and the role tourism plays in sustaining commemoration in landscapes of war overseas. These issues will be examined in Chapter Eleven.

In his study of the Verdun as a site of memory, Prost (1998) provides a different perspective on the evolution of the commemorative process. He recognizes that there is an evolving process of remembering that involves a range of communities and forms of commemoration. For example, ceremonies at Verdun offer ‘three distinct and complementary memories of the battle: the official, patriotic narrative; the veterans’ meditative, memorial memory; and the historical memory that is imparted to tourists’ (Prost 1998, p.394). The distinction between official and veterans’ memory is discussed by Pickering (1997) who notes how the veterans’ narrative can stand in contrast to the official narrative, stripped of hyperbole, and presenting events in more personal terms (p. 205). Thus, over time, the official narrative gains hegemony with the passing of the wartime living memory, as the community involved in memory work evolves and responsibility for the memory is committed to the care of the
Farmer (1999) illustrates this when she describes the involvement of the state in establishing the martyred village of Oradour-sur-Glane, where the townspeople were massacred and the village destroyed by the Nazis in June, 1944, as a national memorial.

Indeed, commemorations add leverage to the aural quality of the landscape of war. Marshall (2004, p.40) notes the experience of commemorations, arguing that ‘state sanctioned remembrance has been characterized by a specific, and for the most part, unchanging series of sounds used at every scale, ranging from music to its counterpoint silence.’ Marshall describes commemoration as a ritual engagement of the senses: the music, the footfalls of soldiers and veterans, mirroring almost the sound of marching to war, singing, last post, national anthems and prayer; the language of ritual also combines the collective ‘we’, and; appropriate poses are also seen as part of the ritual: salutes, the bowing of heads in prayer, the lowering of flags by flag bearers. All of these observations point to the sensual aspect of ritual commemoration that emphasizes the sense of memorialized place and time. Whereas physical and commemorative markers serve to focus remembrance in space and time, the sense of place is argued here as another element of the landscape of war, and is therefore discussed below.

‘Auratic Quality’ of the Otherness of Death: the Sense of Place in the Landscape of War

Seaton (2009a, p.96) argues that what distinguishes thanatourism from other forms of tourism is the ‘auratic quality’ of the site, what can be defined as a socially constructed meaning attributed to the site by its association with death. This Otherness of Death, ‘the most powerful of all Others’ owing to the universality of death’ (p. 83) is ‘the defining feature of thanatourism and that evoking and conserving its aural impacts are the central tasks of management’ (p. 75). Auratic quality can involve four attributes. First, it exists in people’s imagination, and is collectively shared by a community (see Anderson 1991). Second, the meaning of the space is socially constructed through the influence of individuals, groups and cultures. Third, the meaning of
space is temporal, changing over time. Finally, the significance of the site is subjectively attributed by the individual in the manner he or she chooses, ‘often without much reflection’ (Seaton 2009, p. 96).

Seaton is concerned with how tourism manages this aura, which involves addressing issues of commodification as well as the politics associated with remembrance (2009a, p.75 2009b). Before reviewing these issues, a better understanding of auratic quality is sought. Whereas Seaton notes the need for new ‘word coinage in the language of anthropology and cultural geography’ to describe such spaces (p.85), auratic quality of the landscape of war is not a phrase yet employed in the literature: a more familiar term is sense of place. Sense of place refers to the subjective and emotional attachment people have to a place (Agnew 1987). For Linenthal (1993, p.4), sense of place is evoked when the intangible ‘evocative power’ of a battlefield leads to its veneration. This is reflected in the feelings described by Haswell (1979, p.9) who starts an historical account of D-Day by noting, ‘[i]t is said that when the clouds are low and the wind is in a certain quarter you can hear the sound of battle on Omaha Beach; but many battlefields … have their legends of haunting.’ In the case of Normandy’s landscape of war, auratic power takes different forms, from sacredness of cemeteries, to beaches, fields and laneways that evoke a disrupted or unsettled feeling of past violence, noise and death.

A range of academic literature explores how landscapes are socially constructed to possess an emotional and spiritual quality. For example, Tilley (1994, p.35) examines the social construction of meaning of landscape in aboriginal societies, to:

…underline the affective, emotional and symbolic significance of the landscape and highlight…the relationship between people and the land, and the manner in which it is culturally constructed, invested with powers and significances, and appropriated in widely varying ‘natural’ environments and social settings.

It is from this perspective, to understand the affective, emotional and symbolic significance of the landscape, that the literature is examined, and to better understand Seaton’s concept of auratic quality. This will set the context to later
examine the socially constructed meaning associated with being in the landscape of war.

Whereas relics of war and war cemeteries are physically constructed markers, sense of place represents an intangible and socially constructed form of marking. Several authors note the power of natural environment in creating a sensory experience. For example, Mels (2004) links sense of place to what he refers to as the geography of rhythms, a resonance fostered from the significance of a place, the interconnecting of sensory feelings from the experience - seeing, smelling, touching, tasting and hearing - to meanings of the human condition. In the context of landscapes of war, the natural environment plays a significant element in imagining the past. For example, in describing Gallipoli battlefield, Scates (2006, p.40) notes that ‘… much of the wonder of Gallipoli has to do with…its natural setting.’ Gough (2004a, p.252) argues that the power of the Somme is created by its very emptiness, noting the ‘cherished open spaces…[that] should not become littered with ill-considered ‘monumentalia.” Pierkarz (2007, p.29) is also encouraged by the lack of materiality at the site of the 1685 Battle of Sedgemoor, as it allows ‘for the field to act as a canvas on which one’s imagination can play….’ Each of these examples reflects what Tuan (2004, p. 45-46) defines as a sense of place, established with three criteria: a perception of permanence, a sense of history that has an emotional quality; and finally, an ‘intimate tie between place and self.’ This is relevant to this research because it is the sense of place that is part of the tourist performance of remembering and that is mediated by tourism agencies. This theme will be further explored in Chapters Six to Ten.

What is also relevant is to decode what elements in the natural environment create sense of place. For example, the ‘cherished open spaces’ of the Somme noted by Gough are constructed from rural landscapes, perhaps a wooded area, a farmed field or a rugged, desolate coastline. In such an environment, Bunkse (2004, p.71-85) talks about sense of place being linked with the natural rhythmic resonance such as the seasons, the sea, birdsong and ‘tree voices.’ Not only are these natural elements powerful in evoking
meaning, but they have also been intentionally employed, such as in military cemeteries, to draw on nature’s resonance to signify peace in the afterlife (Mosse 1990). Whereas their presence may evoke meaning, their absence may also be deemed significant. For example, Gold and Gold (2003) note that Culloden landscape of war is known as a place where no birds sing. In contrast, O’Shea’s (1996) travelogue of walking the Western Front or Faulkes’ World War I novel *Birdsong* (1994) both evoke descriptions of nature’s resonance serving as a peaceful contrast to the brutality of war. For Foran (2007), a soldier in Canada’s North Shore Regiment his poem, *The Day a Robin Sang at Carpiquet* (1944), symbolizes a moment of peace and hope after the fierce fighting at Carpiquet Airport:

…rotting corpses of the enemy littered the field…the sun would rise to vaporize a morning dew and that on a small bush I would see a robin sing his song of hope, of renewal, in the face of all this carnage.’ (Foran 2007, p. 121)

In the context of the sense of place of D-Day, beaches are a prominent iconic site of memory but their power is not always perceived in the same manner. For Cartier and Lew (2005, p. 3) a beach is often viewed as a touristed landscape, one that is associated with joyful family summer holidays. In contrast, Diller and Scofidio (1994) present the holiday beach as in conflict to remembering: the sun bathers, a macabre parallel of bodies lying in the sand, in dissonance with the war memory. Such an interpretation leads to asking what is appropriate in maintaining the auratic quality of the landing beaches that, at the height of the summer, are populated with families enjoying the seaside. Whilst Lefebvre (1991, p.310) notes that beaches are often viewed as a landscape for the purpose of pleasure, they are also evocative places (Baerenholdt 2003) and warrant further understanding beyond what is provided by Diller and Scofidio. As Carson (2000, p. 2) notes, ‘the edge of the sea is a strange and wonderful place’ and is ‘an elusive and indefinable boundary’ between sea and land. All of these comments point to both the contested meaning of the landscape, but also of its power to evoke meaning. This is interesting because this research allows for further understanding as to the
power of the beaches as site of memory, and how visitors themselves interpret these places. Chapter 10 explores visitor meaning-making as it relates to sense of place.

What makes auratic quality so important from Seaton’s perspective is that it is an integral characteristic that needs to be managed in order to avoid conflict or dilution of the meaning of the site. Section Two takes up this point by focusing on how tourism, as a worldmaking entity, makes and manages the landscape of war with regard to what is remembered and how it is remembered.

Section II: Tourism as a Mediating Agency in a Landscape of War

This section reviews how tourism interacts with war memory in the landscape of war, namely through three mediating agencies: tourism guide books, tour guides, museums and other managed sites. First, it is important to present key theories and concepts that frame the tourism-remembrance relationship in this research: tourism as a worldmaking agency, heritage dissonance, commercialism, and the politics of remembrance. Through this review, there is the discussion can be redirected as to the benefits, and conflicts of the tourism-remembrance relationship.

Tourism as a Worldmaking Agency

Tourism as a worldmaking agency (Hollinshead 2007) is useful in conceptualizing and revealing the role tourism plays in remembrance. Building upon Meethan (2001), Hollinshead defines worldmaking as an ‘operational construct to help critically describe the creative/inventive role and function of tourism in the making of culture and place’ (2009a, p.139). Tourism interacts with remembrance in a number of ways, summarized here as the managing, representing and interpreting of war memory in the landscape of war. It is argued that by engaging in war memory, tourism becomes an integral part of staging memory work and therefore becomes imbricated in issues of influencing the politics of remembrance, specifically what is remembered, and
in influencing the aural quality of the landscape of war. Tourism therefore is viewed here as influencing the cultural memories of war.

What is also relevant to this research is the recognition by Hollinshead (2007, p. 170) of the complexity of tourism that results in ‘dog-eared theories … that position tourism itself as a common and irreversible agent of cultural decline.’ A so-called dog-eared theory is what Hollinshead (2007, p. 188) terms a grand cliché, ideas and arguments that pervade the literature as unfounded assumptions. Hollinshead aims to overcome certain ‘grand clichés’ in tourism studies (2009a, p. 145-147) that oversimplify tourism, as well as to point to a research agenda that focuses on better understanding how tourism, as a worldmaking or mediating agency, represents and interprets sites, people and places (2009a, p. 142). This represents an important theoretical foundation for this research, both to reveal the grand clichés in the tourism-remembrance relationship as well as to gain insight into tourism as a worldmaking agency.

Three common arguments in the tourism and war remembrance literature are now discussed: heritage dissonance, commercialism and the politics of remembrance.

**Heritage Dissonance**

Heritage dissonance (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996) is defined as the discord or conflict between the presentation of history as heritage and its interaction with the commercial and marketing elements of tourism. Relevant examples of dissonance are the representation and interpretation of the Holocaust in museums and sites of memory (see Linenthal 1995; Cole 1999) or the selling of souvenirs at the 9-11 site (see Lisle 2004; Sturken 2004). Tourism is often characterized as an undermining force of remembrance. For example, Cole (1999) argues that tourism to Auschwitz causes amnesia because history is summarized and neatly packaged into a tour. What the tourist sees at the site is not necessarily authentic and therefore the full scale of the atrocity cannot be fully remembered. This partly reflects the challenge with battlefields as with other heritage sites, as they do not represent one value or meaning but are polysemic in that a site holds different meaning for different audiences (Seaton...
2009a, p. 96). As a result, Seaton argues that managers of thanatourism sites need to anticipate and negotiate contradiction and conflict in order to maintain the auratic quality of the site. This is discussed later in this chapter. Managing a thanatourism site also involves avoiding dissonance through commercialism. What follows is a review of issues related to commercialism, themes that begin to reveal what are later defined as grand clichés in the tourism-remembrance literature.

Commercialism

For this research, the issue of commercialism is addressed with regard to the extent to which it impinges on the tourist performance of remembering. Edwards (2009, p. 77) argues that war commemorations in Normandy can be a focus of criticism as a form of commercialism, what he describes as the ‘(fusing) [of] commemoration with commerce.’ This perception is also shared by Scates in his analysis of Gallipoli when he argues, ‘[h]istory, it seems, has been held to ransom by tourism, the memory of war popularized to the point of forgetting’ (2008, p. 57). Scates does not venture too far with this observation, but it is similar to what Cole (1999) argues with regard to Auschwitz concentration camp.

However, there is an epistemological lacuna in the research with regard to how tourism is understood with regard to remembrance. Despite the argument that tourism undermines remembrance, it is nevertheless viewed by Iles (2006) and Caroline Winter (2010) as a meaningful tourist experience. The perspectives of commercialism and dissonance leading to amnesia echo Hollinshead’s grand clichés related to commodification, authenticity, and consumption. For example, he comments that tourism is often assumed as a negative influence upon culture, characterized as encroaching or interfering (Hollinshead 2009a, p. 146). This does not directly link with the argument about tourism and forgetting but it does raise a counter argument to the views of Cole (1999) and Scates (2008). Another example of a cliché relevant to this research is to perceive marketing as ‘predominantly an outcome of the clever manipulation of tourists by all-powerful transnational corporations in league with local/state/national
governments’ (Hollinshead 2009a, p. 146). In this context, the arguments of Diller and Scofidio (1994) that suggest the manipulation of war memory for the benefit of tourism is unfounded. This issue will be revisited in the conclusion.

Other authors consider commercialism from a more pragmatic perspective. In the context of thanatourism, Seaton (2009a, p. 87) identifies three aspects to commodification: the extent to which a site should be kept free of financial transactions, such as admission or a gift shop; who benefits from the commercialism, and; given the need to generate revenue to run heritage sites, how can commercialism be introduced in a manner that avoids impacting auralic quality? These criteria are relevant to this research because they underline the acceptance of a certain level of commodification as not only necessary but acceptable. This view is shared by Chronis and Hampton (2008) who argue that site managers need to avoid overt levels of commercialism as they are perceived by visitors as hindering authenticity.

Associated with commercialism and preserving the auralic quality of a site is the accommodation of various constituent and participating stakeholders, a topic that is reviewed below. The politics of remembrance (Seaton 2009a) can involve disagreements related to representation, interpretation and commercialism. Seaton (2009b) argues that interaction of stakeholders in remembrance is a gap in thanatourism research. To conceptually frame this issue in relation to this research, the literature on the heritage force field is now reviewed.

**Politics of Remembrance: the Heritage Force Field**

Remembrance involves a range of memory activists (Winter 2006) such as next of kin, local communities, regimental associations as well as the state. As Squire (1994) argues, there are also many stakeholders and entities involved in the creation of the spectacle that is tourism. Seaton (2009a) and Sharpley (2009) both examine the politics of remembrance of thanatourism sites by re-modeling a heritage force field of stakeholder interests: site management and owners, visitors, locals and those individuals represented by a heritage site; in
this research, the veterans (Figure 10). Seaton also adds the media as a stakeholder owing to the positive or negative attention that may be placed on a site. An example of this is the newspaper editorial by Granatstein (2004) when he criticized the Juno Beach Centre in an article entitled, *War stories told badly*. This rationale for including tour guides in the force field is now explained.

The push and pull dynamic of a force field to reach equilibrium is useful in this research for three reasons. First, the research focus is the overlap between tourism and remembrance in the form of various stakeholders who participate in these dual contexts. Second, this research occurs at a point in time when the heritage force field related to remembrance of World War II is going through a significant transformation with the passing of the veteran generation. The memory of World War II is no longer able to sustain itself with living memory of the veterans. Their voice in the heritage force field is soon to be silenced, leaving other stakeholders involved in managing battlefield-related sites to speak on their behalf, to educate visitors and to perpetuate the memory (see Farmer 1999, p. 212).
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Figure 10: Heritage force field (adapted from Seaton 2001, p. 123 original in colour).

Third, whereas the five stakeholders, along with the media, are relevant to many sites in the Normandy landscape of war, it is argued that tour guides
should be included as stakeholders in their own right. Citing Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Hollinshead (2006b, p. 301) argues that those working in the local tourism industry, such as battlefield tour guides, are the ‘undersuspected mediative agency/authority/power…[who] collaboratively make ‘places’….’ The making of a place by guides is well illustrated in Selwyn’s (1995) account of tours in Israel organized by the Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel (SPNI), where guides play a crucial role in mediating political and cultural readings of the landscape.

To take all of these stakeholder perspectives into account is to better understand what is happening with tourism and remembrance in the landscape of war. Each of these voices is heard by way of interviews and field observation and then represented and examined in Chapters Six to Ten. In addition to the heritage force field, tourism is also explored from the perspective of mediating the visitor experience. Three mediating agencies of tourism, specifically museums and their objects, tour guides and travel guide books, all play a worldmaking role in representing and interpreting war history and memory to visitors. The following section considers key themes relevant to this research and identifies notable gaps in knowledge.

**Museums and their Objects: Education, Authenticity and Boundaries of Representation**

Bruner (1993) has argued that museums and tourism share several characteristics, including the production and exhibition of culture, and dependence on an audience. Kirshenblatt-Gimblett presents museums as a ‘highly performative meaning producer’ (Hollinshead 2006b, p.301). Broadly interpreted, museums and interpretive centers in the landscape of war are employed to educate future generations of in terms of what happened here. As Prost (1998, p.394) argues, the establishment in 1967 of a museum at the World War I Verdun battlefield marked the transition from commemoration driven by veterans to a phase of historicizing and educating visitors in order to perpetuate memory of the battle. Following a similar parallel with the passage
of time from World War II, to date, a gap exists regarding the evolution of museums in Normandy with regard to remembrance.

Museums and interpretive centers as both an agent of remembrance (Winter 2006) and as Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998, p.7) describes as ‘high density’ tourism attractions, creating the sense of ‘hereness’ necessary to convert a location into a destination. In this sense, museums can be seen as a commemorative hub of tourism activity and meaning-making in the landscape of war. Museums also serve to orientate the tourist in the context of the immediate locale by way of exhibiting a collection of objects representative of the war/battle.

In the context of a war museum, the central question posed by Winter (2006, p.226) is, ‘how is it possible to represent battle? How is it possible to represent war?’ The challenge with museums, and particularly in responding to Winter’s question is what Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998, p. 35) refers to as the ‘semiotic see-saw’ of display dealing with life and death. As Malvern (2000, p. 178) war museums are mandated to ‘(celebrate) the uncelebratable (sic)’ while at the same time ‘burdened with political and ethical implications almost to excess’ (Malvern 2000, p.178).

Museum collections and the manner in which they are presented therefore become a study in ethnography by virtue of how the objects are detached and contextualized (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998, p.3). Objects of military material culture, such as a helmet, uniform or a rifle can work as message-bearing entities, acting as ‘an intrinsic sign and as a metaphorical symbol… is capable of a very large range of interpretations….‘ (Pearce 1994, p. 21) Pearce studies the semiotics of viewing a military uniform worn at the Battle of Waterloo, illustrating the ‘virtuality’ of its interpretation, or the evocation of multiple meanings, that can occur. Pearce’s work is relevant in that it demonstrates how objects are not only passive in their meaning, but that can be actively constructed through the interaction between the viewer and with the object. Another example of the virtuality of meaning associated with objects is
presented by Linenthal (1995) who explores the creation of the US Holocaust Museum. This museum struggled with a range of issues as to how to represent and interpret the Holocaust, from whether to exhibit human hair (Linenthal 1995, p.210-215), to whether censoring Nazi symbols was necessary to avoid “public fascination with the Nazis…”(p. 200). Such debates point to the challenge of war museums in presenting history and memory in a thought-provoking exhibit that also challenges what Smith (2006) describes as the authorized heritage discourse.

Pearce (1994) also argues how semiotic meaning can be accumulated with the passage of time. It may also be argued that, particularly in the context of war-related objects, certain political meanings may be forgotten as time passes. This is exemplified in the approaches taken by war museums of the two world wars. Starting with Winter (2006), he argues that representation and interpretation of World War I are effectively addressed at the Historial de la Grande Guerre, at Péronne, France. It is interesting to note that the design of the Péronne museum involved advice from academics of the three main warring nations: France, Germany and Great Britain (Winter 2000), resulting in a different interpretive approach than typically found at war museums. Employing Chartier (2007), Winter argues that the Historial is effective in offering a narrative about war because it taxonomically organizes the war, employs objects that are symbolic and those objects that are metaphoric. For example, military uniforms are exhibited in depressions in the floor, as opposed to upright in an exhibit case (Figure 11). Presenting the uniforms in this way goes beyond the presentation of an historical artifact, but engenders an image of dead soldiers. Thus, the museum avoids ‘pseudo realism’ and ‘appeals to the familiar and comforting’ (p. 226), instead aiming to evoke multiple readings of an object, from its historical context as a military uniform, to associations with death and killing.
Whereas the Péronne museum challenges traditionally accepted views of history through its representation and interpretation of different objects, it can also be viewed as revisionist. Davison (2006) argues that museums are susceptible to controversy when they represent history from a new perspective, what Kohn (1995) calls the history or culture wars. Yet, there seems to be no controversy with regard to the Péronne museum, in contrast to what World War II related exhibits. Representing World War II through objects and exhibits represents its own unique set of challenges. This challenge reflects what Winter (2009) argues, that remembering World War II is difficulty owing to how war was waged, including the bombing of civilians and the Holocaust. It is important to review some of the controversies associated with museums and their exhibits in order to contextualize the observation of museums as part of this thesis.

Controversy arises when the traditional historical narrative is questioned. For example, a conservative backlash was experienced by the Smithsonian Institute with their exhibit questioning the value of dropping atomic bombs on Japan. The centerpiece of the exhibit was the frontal fuselage of the Enola Gay, the bomber that dropped the bomb on Hiroshima in August, 1945, along
with “a probing explanatory script, and an array of evocative photographs and artifacts from Ground Zero” (Nobile 1995, p. xiii). The exhibit was ultimately closed through the lobbying efforts of veteran and conservative groups, with the Smithsonian Director losing his job (Hubbard & Hasian 1998). This example points to how interpretation of objects and the history associated with them can be viewed as an ideologically charged. For example, in his examination of the firearms exhibit in Cody, Wyoming, Drost (1993) argues that objects and how they are represented reflects a conservative ideology that celebrates guns. In this context, the exhibit reflects the interests of those who are responsible for the exhibit.

However, stepping away from ideological positions can also lead to controversy. This is best exemplified with the USS Arizona Memorial at Pearl Harbor, where the Japanese attacked the United States in 1941. Kelly (2000) notes that in the 1950’s, the context of the Cold War led the interpretation to include commentary on the need for national vigilance, to be prepared. By the 1970’s, Linenthal (1991, p.199) notes that the US Parks Services removed that interpretation in an effort to provide “forthright, honest and… accurate interpretations of the historical events….” Nevertheless, this change led to formal complaints from conservative groups (Linenthal 1991; Kelly 2000). From the perspective of cultural memory, such controversies represent the contemporary challenge of representing and interpreting World War II. All of these examples reflect that, in contrast to World War I museums, museum representations of World War II memory and history can evoke political controversy, due in part to the presence of those groups, such as veterans, who wish to guard against alternative interpretations. The significance for this thesis is that, with the veteran generation passing on, the heritage force field finds itself in a dynamic transitional state, while at the same time new museums explore what stories to tell, who should tell them and how.

Battlefield tour guides are also involved in the representation and interpretation of war. Whilst a museum is a fixed site, representing history with objects and the immediate landscape, battlefield tour guides work across a larger
geographic area. They may employ museums in their interpretative approach, but also read the memorials, monuments and viewscapes in the landscape of war. They may also employ a number of devices to make meaning of a place, such as photographs, military history and stories (Caroline Winter 2010). This is particularly valuable when the tourist is experiencing Normandy, involving a large area along with immense mobile armies. The literature is reviewed to situate the role of the battlefield tour guide.

**Battlefield Tour Guides and Interpretation**

Tour Guides play a number of ‘interwoven and synergistic’ roles: leader, mentor, educator, public relations representative, host and conduit (Pond 1993, p. 76; see also Schmidt 1979; Erik Cohen 1985). Pond (1993) also views the guide as sharing many of the roles of an adult educator, facilitating learning and possessing content expertise, a view supported by Ryan (2007a) and Iles (2006). Indeed, Iles (2006, p. 166) argues that battlefield tour guides are ‘central to the construction of an imaginative and sensuous engagement with the commemorative landscape….’ These perspectives support earlier arguments (Fine & Speer 1979) of the guide performance and narrative as a form of site sacralization, a term coined by MacCannell (1976) and discussed later in this chapter.

Major and Mrs Holt Battlefield Tours are often cited (Seaton 2000; Iles 2006) as the first major company dedicated to battlefield tourism. This company employed many interpretive techniques, under the description of mobile theatre, to describe the approach to itinerary development and the overall culture created on a tour. Iles (2006) goes on to identify a number of activities and tactics employed by this tour company: the use of music, photographs, maps, video clips, all which aim to evoke the period of the war, historical characters and the carnage of battle in the tourist imagination. This approach reflects the techniques first espoused by Tilden (1977, p. 14) who defined interpretation as follows: ‘an educational activity which aims to reveal meanings and relationships through the use of objects, by first-hand experience, and by illustrative methods, rather than simply to communicate factual information.’
The work of Kelly (2000) and Chronis (2006) reflect the American perspective on guiding, particularly at national battlefield parks such as Pearl Harbor and Gettysburg respectively. As part of the National Parks Service, the guides at these sites employ techniques espoused by Larsen (2003) and referred to as ‘meaningful interpretation’. Inspired by Tilden (1977) meaningful interpretation involves anchoring narratives within a universal concept, an idea or situation that is relevant in a contemporary context and that enables the individual to empathize with the story. Larsen (2003, p. 63) argues that, ‘[t]he job of interpretation is to undermine the complacency of how most people relate to the landscape’ (Larsen 2003, p.63). Authors such as Christie and Mason (2003) argue that, in the context of nature based tourism, guides can play a transformative role, not only educating people but in changing the visitor’s perspective with regard to issues of sustainability. In this context, transformative learning refers to the re-evaluation of past beliefs and involves questioning previously held assumptions (see Mezirow 2000). In the context of battlefield tourism, whereas it is accepted that guides play an educational role, the extent to which transformative learning with regard to war remembrance is experienced is unclear. This research will provide insight with regard to this issue in Chapter 11.

It is clear that guides possess considerable influence over the tourists’ historical perceptions. For example, Selwyn (1995) provides a good example of the persuasive commentary and meaning-making provided by Israeli tour guides, making moral and patriotic links to the landscape for visitors. Iles (2006, p. 177) cites Kirshenblatt-Gimblett who suggests that tourism is about ‘the intangible absent, inaccessible, fragmentary, and dislocated’ and therefore the role of the guide is to ‘animate a phantom landscape on the back of the one toward which attention is directed.’ Moscardo (1996) describes this animation another way, emphasizing the importance of interpretation to promote and nurture ‘mindful’ tourists. Travel guide books are also a popular source of information for the tourist. For this research, travel guide books used by visitors to Normandy are examined in Chapter Seven. The existing academic
literature is reviewed next, with the aim of revealing the role of guidebooks in mediating visitor meaning.

**Travel Guide Books**

MacCannell used a guide book as the primary reference in *The Tourist* (1975), noting that guide books mark specific sites as tourist attractions. In his study of guide books on Vietnam and their narrative regarding the Vietnam war, Laderman (2009, p. 8) also argues that travel guide books, tourist maps and brochures influence in ‘constructing or shaping historical consciousness and memory’ of the traveler. This view echoes Edensor (1998, p. 71) who argues that guide books reproduce ‘authoritative narratives’ that are not wholly consumed by tourists but meaningfully negotiated. This perspective relates to the notion of co-constructed meaning (Chronis 2005), whereby agencies of tourism represent and interpret a landscape and its history. The tourist then receives that information, making meaning of the narrative in terms of their positionality.

In this context, Laderman (2009, p. 11) argues that analysis of guide books exposes ‘how states and people have crafted historical narratives, how travelers have experienced landscapes riven with memory, and how battles over remembrance can erupt among tourists exposed to alternative stories of the past.’ The social control embedded in guide books (Dann 1996; cited in Siegenthaler 2002, p.1116) is found in the brief context-setting narrative that channels tourists to selected activities of a destination (Siegenthaler 1995, p.1116). The guide book thus acts to configure a certain cultural landscape manifested in, for example, a recommended itinerary or in the coding or ranking of sites and activities (see Nousy 1990). As Palmer (1998) citing Smith (1986) explains, this in turn reflects a certain national and moral outlook. This view is echoed by Laderman (2009, p. 11) who argues that the abridged narrative of a guide book is often biased toward an American or western global perspective which in turn reflects a circumscribed ideological narrative of a place.
Conclusion

Whereas landscapes of war are memorialized and commemorated in predictable ways, it is the sense of place, socially constructed and encumbered with the Other of Death, that can augment the sense of ‘hallowed ground’ of a battlefield. The significance of this is that this aura of war makes a place and its meaning memorable. The literature tangentially offers some insight into the sense of place in this context, but there is a need to better conceptualize the war aura of a place. Examining this dimension would help address the issue identified by Prideaux (2007) in defining what comprises a battlefield.

Issues of dissonance, commercialism and the heritage force field were also reviewed to contextualize themes analyzed in this research. The concept of tourism as a worldmaking agency is useful in that it reconsiders the role of tourism while at the same time questioning certain clichés that have positioned tourism as a negative force. Arguments that construe tourism as a negative force in remembrance may be considered as clichés. This topic is revisited in the final chapter, taking into account the fieldwork experience.

In addition, various agencies that mediate the visitor experience were explored: war museums, battlefield tour guides and travel guide books. In particular, the chapter reviewed relevant perspectives related to the management, representation and interpretation of war memory and the landscape of war. The lacunae identified are:

- Conceptualizing sense of place in war remembrance, and how it informs visitor performance of remembering
- Politics of remembrance, tourism and the management of sites of memory
- The role of museums, battlefield tour guides and travel guide books in mediating war remembrance
The argument that sites dealing with death have a unique management context is a central premise for exploration in this research. This assumes that to understand the relationship between tourism and remembrance, examination of how tourism contributes and conflicts with managing the aural quality of a site associated with death is a central point of debate. In addition to managing sites such as war museums and cemeteries, mediating meaning-making by way of representing and interpreting war is another role of tourism.

Tour guides represent an underappreciated yet valuable element in meaning-making, particularly with regard to battlefields without any memorial markers. Despite the efforts to physically memorialize the Normandy battlefield, there are simply too many stories to remember. This research will contribute to knowledge by providing a conceptual framework that illustrates the role of tourism mediating agencies and their relationship to remembering. Second, museums can be viewed as hubs of historical and commemorative intensity, established when the war-time generation deems it necessary to create an entity to continue the remembrance and meaning-making at a battlefield. Controversy can arise at war museums when there is a shift in the heritage force field to the point where the interests of the stakeholders are not in balance. The existence of controversy characterizes the political dynamic of war memory of not only what is remembered but how it is remembered. As Seaton argues that this is an important area to address, this research will therefore examine controversy as it relates to how D-Day and the war, and how that controversy manifests itself in the context of Normandy.

Third, travel guide books are another form of mediating agency. There is a need to better understand its narrative in framing the tourist understanding of the landscape of war. By way of a literature analysis of general tourist and specialist battlefield tourist literature on Normandy, the contribution to knowledge will be a framework identifying key themes and their context in tourism worldmaking and remembrance. This analysis will respond to understanding how war memories are mediated by tourism.
In the next chapter, a review of the literature on thanatourism and battlefield tourism identifies theoretical gaps relevant to this research. A review of visitor meaning-making at battlefields will provide context as to what is understood in terms of the battlefield tourism experience. The tourist performance of remembering is also reviewed.
CHAPTER 4. Tourist Performance of Remembering, Thanatourism and Visitor Meaning-Making
Introduction

This chapter examines the literature relating to visitor meaning co-constructed in landscapes of war. It is divided into two sections: Section One reviews the literature regarding meaning, remembrance and defining tourism involving battlefields; Section Two reviews the battlefield tourism literature with the intention of identifying meaning constructed through visiting battlefields that is relevant to remembrance. The performance of remembering is also reviewed. In addition to helping to frame the research, the conclusion identifies various lacunae and topics for consideration when analyzing the research.

Section 1: Framing the Tourist Performance of Remembering: Power, Knowledge and Discourse

Even now, (the D-Day beaches) have a stillness about them, a solemn air that makes you inclined to tread softly and keep your voice to a whisper. You go mindfully when you explore the landing grounds, as if you were in a church. And it is not hard to tell where this sense comes from: it is the sanctity of spilt blood. You can still sense it, though the tides have washed over the beaches forty thousand times since the day of battle. (Bastable 2004, p. 8)

This quote speaks to the nature of the unique experience of visiting a battlefield, in this case a D-Day landing beach (Figure 12). For Bastable, his battlefield tourism experience reflects Iles (2006, p. 165) when she argues that ‘[t]he draw for tourists is not so much a simple desire to sight-see but rather a wish to identify and empathize with its symbolic, commemorative spaces.’ The voice of being there evokes a number of meanings associated with remembrance in a landscape of war: a reverence for the dead, a sense of experiencing the hallowed, haunted place. Urry (2002, p. 146) notes that various forms of scapes interconnect to produce a ‘sensed environment.’ Thus, meaning constructed involves experiencing not only finding meaning through a visionscape, as Porteous (1990) and Basso and Feld (1996) argue, but through touchscapes, soundscapes and smellscapes, all of which are part of the multisensory nature of experience (Morgan & Pritchard 2005, p. 41).
the context of a battlefield, Chronis and Hampton (2008) describe this complexity of symbols and meaning as a storyscape, a place where the tourist and the mediating agencies interact to co-construct meaning. Like Edensor (1998) and his work at the Taj Mahal, a focus of this thesis is on how meaning of place interacts with the tourist performance of remembering.

Figure 12: Visitor walking on Juno Beach, June 2004 (photo source: the author 2004 original in colour)

Much of the tourism research dealing with meaning is related to Foucault's understanding of power and knowledge, the power of knowledge founded upon the ‘structural arrangements which surround the discourse’ (Knudsen et al. 2008, p.1). In the context of this research, the power of knowledge is founded upon the cultural memories of war. Another perspective of Foucault that is relevant here is how he gave greater significance to seeing, ‘le regard’ or ‘the gaze’ (1973, p. 89) as a human sense. Urry (1990) builds upon Foucault's work, conceptualizing “the gaze” in the context of tourism whereby a tourist searches for objects or landscapes that are different from his or her day-to-day life. Various authors (Dann and Jacobsen 2003; Haldrup and Larsen 2003;
Everett 2008) have expanded the concept of the tourist gaze to include all of the senses. In the context of this research, Iles (2006, p.163) argues that a battlefield terrain has historically been experienced as “a landscape of the senses.” In this regard, meaning-making in a landscape of war can be a complex, intense and multi sensual experience, where, as Footitt (2004) observes with regard to war commemoration, language, emotion and imagination play essential roles.

In broadening the conceptualization of meaning and how it is created, Edensor (1998; 2001) argues that ‘[t]he meaning and purpose of space is reproduced, or contested,’ by the concept of tourism performances (1998, p. 202). He identifies four forms of performance: walking, gazing, photographing and remembering, embodying what Iles (2004, p. 165) citing Cosgrove (1988) describes as ‘a way of feeling and a way of doing.’ Of interest here is the tourist performance of remembering, involving both the tourist collecting individual memories through interactions with mediating agencies, photography (see Sather Wagstaff 2008) and the reconstruction of the past through imagination that occurs in certain tourist spaces. In the context of the power/knowledge discourse, Edensor argues that the tourist performance involves consuming the inscribed narrative, what Laurajane Smith (2006) calls the authorized heritage discourse, informed by the power of the state and media. Central to the debate in war remembrance is what power predominates in remembrance: the state through invention (Hobsbawn and Ranger 1985; Connerton 1989; Mosse 1990;) or the social agency approach as first espoused by Winter & Sivan (1999), involving developing and maintaining commemoration through the creation of fictive kinship. As Winter (2006, p. 6) argues, ‘[i]n virtually all acts of remembrance, history and memory are braided together in the public domain, jointly informing our shifting and contested understandings of the past.’

Two issues arise in the debate that are relevant to this research. First, the tourist performance of remembering and the concept of the fictive kinship of remembrance that infers a relationship between the tourist and remembrance,
one that is explored in Chapter Ten. Second, the issue of how meaning, as it relates to remembrance is constructed.

**Meaning-Making and Remembrance**

The literature interprets meaning-making and remembrance in a landscape of war in different ways, yet often in the context of the markers. For example, symbolic places can serve as condensation sites (Cohen 1985; Edensor 1998), where authorized narratives and performances of remembering take place in a condensed and powerful manner. This supports the relevance of what was presented in Chapter Three, with regard to the significance of markers. In contrast to this argument, Lisle (2004) assesses the relationship between memorialization, remembrance and tourism at the World Trade Center site, arguing that the ‘juxtaposition of tourism and reverence in the same place is perplexing’ (p. 11). Lisle argues that visitors to the World Trade Center site are searching to touch something real, to connect with the landscape and go beyond what has been only experienced through the media. However, the raw form of ‘the real’ gets lost in the commodifying nature of tourism which, through its mediation, provides what Lisle calls a depoliticized authenticity (p. 16). The result, Lisle argues, is that the gazing visitor to Ground Zero is interpreted as voyeuristic, and by their performance of photo taking perhaps even debasing the memory of those who died there.

Lisle’s argument is limited methodologically, focusing on observing tourist practices, such as picture taking and gazing without actually interacting with the visitor. In contrast, Laurajane Smith (2006) states:

> Increasing sophistication in writing about tourism has also lead to the realization that heritage tourists and other heritage visitors are far more active and critical – or ‘mindful’ – than have previously been portrayed. Tourism may have more deeply layered or nuanced cultural and social meaning and consequence than its characterization as a leisure activity and economic industry often allows (2006, p.5).
Smith (2006, p. 34) argues that the perception by some scholars of the thoughtless visitor obscures the perspective of commentators such as Nora (1989), Urry (1996) and Bagnall (2003) who identify the tourist meaning-making that occurs at heritage sites. In a similar vein, Harrison (2003, p. 27) argues that tourists want ‘intellectual, physical even spiritual stimulation from their travels.’ In their research of the Gettysburg Battlefield National Park, Chronis (2005) and Chronis and Hampton (2008) note the involvement of the tourist as central to the co-construction of a storyscape. They argue that the narrative is ‘negotiated, shaped, and transformed through the interaction of producers and consumers’ (2008, p. 389). The term, co-construction, is adopted in this research to acknowledge the visitor as a collaborator in the tourism – remembrance relationship. They argue that the preserved battlefield holds fragments of narratives, pieces that are engaged by way of tactile exploration, acoustic, and other embodied experiences. For Chronis and Hampton (2008), socio-cultural values and beliefs embodied in the visitor help to influence the meaning of the experience, but it is the interpretation of memorializing markers provided by mediating agencies that collaborates in the co-constructing of the tourist’s storyscape.

Several authors outside of the field of battlefield tourism offer further insight. For example, Basso (1996, p. 34) notes, ‘knowledge of places is… closely linked to knowledge of the self, to grasping one’s position in the larger scheme of things, including one’s own community, and to securing a confident sense of who one is as a person.’ Tuan (2004, p. 45) echoes this sentiment when he argues that ‘in trying to understand sense of place, I am also trying to understand what it means to be human.’ These perspectives emphasize the emotional element of remembering (see White 2000), involving feelings of connectedness with history, memory and the landscape of war. In this context, meaning-making involves not only learning about history and memory, but also about oneself beyond notions of national identity. In the next section, the literature conceptualizing battlefield tourism as an act of remembrance is explored.
Conceptualizing Remembrance and Tourism to Battlefields

In examining tourist meaning-making at battlefields, there is much debate as to the most appropriate terminology and theoretical foundation to employ. A range of terms are employed to characterize tourism associated with sites of death: thanatourism (Seaton 1996), dark tourism (Lennon & Foley 2000; Sharpley and Stone 2009) and battlefield tourism (Iles 2006; Ryan 2007). From one perspective, these terms configure the theoretical debate between a post-modernist phenomenon or one that has deeper historical influences. For example, Rojek (1993) coined the term, blackspot tourism, focusing on the tourist curiosity with sites of death as a fascination with 'hyerreality', things that are out of the ordinary to the extreme. Lennon and Foley (2000) also followed the argument as to the post-modernist curiosity with sites of death. However, Seaton (2009b) counters this position, pointing to the long history of thanalogical themes associated with tourism that started in the medieval period, influenced by evolutionary cultural trends associated with Christian doctrine, antiquarianism and romanticism.

From another perspective, the theoretical debate focuses on attempting to conceptualize motivations of visitors as well as the meaning of the thana / dark tourism experience. Authors such as Seaton (1996), Lennon and Foley (2000) and Stone (2006) have attempted to identify different conceptual categorizations based on perspectives of supply or demand. For example, Stone (2006) employed criteria such as authenticity and location to identify various forms of dark tourism sites, placing them across a spectrum from darkest to lightest. Such a model is limited, first with regard to the use of terminology that infers light and dark forms of tourism and as Seaton (2009b) argues, is a value judgment as to the singular meaning associated with a given site.

However, it was Seaton (1999; 2000) who focused on the experience of thanatourism to battlefields. In response, Slade (2003) concluded that thanatourism was not a relevant concept, arguing Australians and New Zealanders are motivated to visit Gallipoli battlefield owing to national identity
rather than an interest in death. Seaton (2009b, p.522) responds to Slade’s critique by arguing that thanatourism is in fact relevant to discussing battlefield tourism when two continua of intensity are taken into account:

- whether or not tourists are motivated to visit by a single or by multiple reasons;
- the extent to which the visitor is personally or generally associated with the dead, and therefore linked to the site of battle.

Seaton argues that, whereas death is a universally understood phenomenon, individual meanings associated with death can result in varying degrees of connection with the ‘pure thanatouristic element’ (Seaton 2009b, p.523). Thus, a visit to a battlefield may be motivated by national identity, but it is still connected to thanatourism. As Seaton (2009b, p.535) argues, thanatourism may also be viewed,

as travel undertaken to maintain or construct individual identity, however temporarily, through remembrance of people and things past, real or imagined, at locations associated with or dedicated to them …[or] … undertaken to view the constructions of other people’s identity in commemorative locations (Seaton 2009b, p. 535).

The concepts underlying thanatourism, such as auratic quality and the Other of Death make this literature relevant to this research. However, a number of scholars advocating dark tourism and battlefield tourism nevertheless assist by revealing aspects of the tourism-remembrance relationship. Noted here is the work of Baldwin and Sharpley (2009) who argue that history and non secular pilgrimage are core motivations for battlefield tourists. Using axes to reflect intensity of the visitor experience, they offer two schematics to situate grieving and military history (Figures 13 & 14). The authors acknowledge the schemata lack empirical support. Nevertheless, they point to two themes related to remembrance and the battlefield tourist - grieving and learning about history - as well as to a range of intensity of motivations. However, there are a number of assumptions that are made, as explained below.
Figure 13: Pilgrimage, grieving and battlefield tours (Baldwin & Sharpley 2009, p. 201).

Figure 13 presents a spectrum of grieving, delineated by private and public acts of remembrance and association to the dead, as echoed in Seaton’s definition of thanatourism. The model differentiates between the various dimensions of remembrance and battlefield tourism by identifying private and public acts of remembrance, and low to high levels of emotional intensity. The model is limited in that it associates a singular motivation to an individual, offers a limited perspective on the role of other influences such as cultural memories of war on meaning-making and does not readily define what low and high emotional intensity means. In addition, there is an assumption that the more personal and private the experience of remembering, the more intense it will be. For example, Scates (2006) shows how present-day backpackers participate in an emotionally intense experience when visiting Gallipoli. As well, the model does not take into account fictive kinship and how that may inform an individual’s response to battlefield tourism. It nevertheless acknowledges a spectrum of meaning-making with regard to remembering the fallen.
Figure 14 represents the spectrum of interest related to military history, a motivation that may be associated with Seaton’s (2009b) perspective that visitors are motivated by a single or by multiple reasons. Baldwin and Sharples argue that the model may help to conceptualize the various markets and their motivations related to battlefield tourism. Again, the model is useful in that it places importance on learning, another foundation of remembrance particularly for the post-war generation. However, as it stands, without empirical support, it raises more questions than answers. For example, whereas the model may reflect a motivation to go on a tour and infer the structure and theming of the tour itself, the level of intensity is ultimately left to the visitor. As Iles (2006) notes, many individuals with little interest in military history still describe the battlefield tourism experience as powerful. Despite their weaknesses, these two models acknowledge the challenge in conceptualizing the range of meaning-making in visiting a battlefield, issues that will be explored in the analysis.

Conceptualizing tourism to a battlefield essentially represents an attempt to clarify the motivations and meanings associated with the experience. It is interesting to note that in its advertising of the Normandy landscape of war, Normandie Memoire, the Norman agency responsible for promoting
remembrance, employs none of these terms, preferring instead ‘remembrance tourism’, using the catch line ‘exploration & emotion’ (Figure 15). Images used in the brochure include a mix of iconic sites, including Point du Hoc, the site where US Rangers scaled the cliff to knock out a German battery, and the Longues sur Mer gun battery, representative of the German Atlantic Wall fortifications. In addition, a grouping of flags, a veteran speaking to the post-war generation, grave markers and a black and white photo of war-time soldiers underline the brochure page. Collectively, the images evoke themes such as liberty, history, sacrifice, remembrance and heritage. The images also convey both history and memory experienced in the landscape of war. In itself, the brochure represents the official rendering of the Normandy landscape of war as both a site of remembrance and of a site of historic significance for France and the allied nations. Thus, ‘to explore’ may involve not only visiting a foreign landscape but also perhaps exploring one’s own identity and heritage. In effect, exploration and emotion involve both learning and feeling history and war memory in terms of the self and the nation. However, aside from Ryan’s (2007) reference to battlefield tourism as an act of remembrance, no scholarly works can be found that employ remembrance tourism, leaving it as an interesting yet theoretically unfounded notion. This concept will also be revisited in the concluding chapter. The next section reviewed the literature related to the tourist performance at battlefields in order to elucidate the meaning-making associated with the phenomenon of remembrance.
Section 2: Lenses of Meaning and the Tourist Performance of Remembering

This literature review identifies a set of meanings, referred to here as lenses of meaning, which are co-constructed by visitors to landscapes of war. The identification of lenses assists the analysis of the visitor experience in Chapter Ten by defining what is presently associated with tourist meaning-making and remembrance. There is also an opportunity for a comparison between the visitor experience in Normandy and the meaning gained from other selected battlefields.
Chapter Three reviewed the literature dealing with markers in the landscape of war, as well as the worldmaking agencies of tourism in terms of how they mediate meaning. Seaton (2009a; 2009b) insists on the multiple meanings associated with thanatourism sites. However, whereas a landscape is open to many interpretations, what is of interest here is the ways in which a landscape of war is read that reflect how war is remembered.

Knudsen et al. (2008, p. 4) refer to similarities of readings of the landscape as congruencies and concordances. Congruencies and concordances are important here because they illustrate meanings that are ‘created, recreated and contested’ in the landscape of war (Knudsen et al. 2008, p. 4). In exploring the literature related to touring battlefields, three lenses reflecting congruencies and concordances were identified: national identity, social identity/nostalgia and death and war. Whereas it may be argued that national and social identities overlap, Smith (1991) and Huddy (2001) argue that they can be viewed as separate and distinct with regard to how they are constructed and how they manifest themselves. This perspective is adopted here, in order to better explore meaning associated with battlefield tourism. Through these lenses, cultural memories of war are shaped and refashioned, as explained below.

National Identity

National identity is defined as a sense of political community that implies a common set of institutions, a code of beliefs, rights and duties that exist within established boundaries that form a territory or state (Smith 1991, p. 9). Reviewing the literature readily establishes the prevalence of national identity associated with battlefields. For example, Linenthal (1993) notes how battlefields in the United States are focal points where Americans vie for ‘ownership of powerful national stories and … argue about the nature of heroism, the meaning of war, the efficacy of martial sacrifice, and the significance of preserving the patriotic landscape of the nation’ (1993, p. 1). For Bell (2002), the Somme is a mythscape that informs British identity, what Illes (2008, p. 150) describes as a ‘confirmation of British nationhood’. Some sights can evoke nationalistic feelings that relive the war. For example, Kelly
(2000) and Yaguchi (2005) focus on the discord in war memory at Pearl Harbor, examining how American and Japanese visitors draw different national meaning from the war memory. Whereas the controversy of representing the war/battle at Pearl Harbor has evolved over time, a site such as the World Trade Center, still raw in the American cultural memory, can be seen as a contested site in terms of its meaning in relation to national identity, and consequently with the perception of tourists and their behaviour (see Zelizer 2002; Sturken 2008). Although many nationalities were killed in the 9-11 attacks, the site has become a focal point for American nationalist fervor that questions the appropriateness of tourists, viewed as outsiders, coming to gaze at the site (Lisle 2004).

Exploring national identity as a form of meaning is important in this research because it allows for an opportunity to consider the similarities and differences in how national identities represent and interpret war memory and the ways in which Canadian, British and American visitors interpret meaning in Normandy. Normandy is perhaps unique in this regard, given the range of nationalities recognizing the significance of the site. However, people identify with places and objects in a number of ways, reflecting the multiple identities and roles of the individual tourist. It is therefore important to consider the second lens, social identity.

**Social Identity**

Social identity is defined by Jenkins (2004) as a way to classify or to associate oneself with something or someone else. It is relevant not only as a lens through which individuals make meaning, but it is essential in the context of understanding the role of tourism in shaping and framing the human condition (Palmer 1998; Burns and Novelli 2006). Jenkins (2004, p. 5) argues that identity is a process of being and becoming, involving reflexive construction through interactions and institutions. This dynamism parallels the process associated with cultural memory as explained by Sturken (1997), that in turn points to the importance of the tourism experience in shaping both social identity as well as cultural memory.
Identity involves distinguishing similarities and differences between individuals and groups (Jenkins 2004, p. 5). One way that this occurs is through identifying symbols that generate a sense of shared belonging (Cohen 1985). Symbols and sites related to heritage are therefore important in informing a sense of identity.

As Smith (1991) argues, individuals have multiple identities, and various authors have explored war memory and its relevance in forming a sense of belonging by way of gender (Braudy 2003), ethnic and community identities (Coy and Woehrle 2000), ritual (Fussell 1976), religion (Aslan 2009) and kinship (Ambrose 1992; 1997; Kershaw 2004). These perspectives are useful to illustrate the breadth of visitor meanings associated with the battlefield tourism experience.

Another theme associated with social identity is nostalgia (Sierra & McQuitty 2007). Boym (2001) argues that reflective nostalgia is a form of remembrance involving a mythic view of cultural memory and a longing for the past. Both Boym and Edwards (2009) cite globalization and the resultant discontinuity as feeding a desire for nostalgia during a time of certainty. This is interesting with regard to this research, given the popularity of visiting the Normandy landscape of war. Nostalgia can thus be perceived as a defensive mechanism, but there is also unpredictability to nostalgia, particularly when touring. This is noted by Boym when she speaks about how nostalgia can evoke both happiness and sorrow simply by seeing familiar places that ‘open up mental maps and space folds into time’ (p. 50). This phenomenon points to the importance of observing and interacting with individuals while they are touring as a means of learning how nostalgia is evoked by various places, objects, smells and other sensory experiences.

There are a range of examples of nostalgia elicited through war remembrance, as noted below. For example, Chronis (2005) notes the reinforcement of social cohesion experienced by Americans visiting Gettysburg after 9-11, reflective of the anxiety caused by uncertainty. Brinkley (2005) argues that the memory of
Normandy was employed by President Reagan in his 1984 commemorative speech to nostalgically evoke a time of moral clarity for Americans, one that could be regained in the contemporary context. Reflective nostalgia may also be ascribed to the meaning made by returning veterans. For example, Crookenden (1976, p.286) recounts the ‘pilgrimage’ of British, Canadian and American airborne soldiers in Normandy in 1974:

Together with the people of the Norman towns and villages where they had fought, these ... ex-soldiers went to mass and visited rows of headstones in their cemeteries; they marched past their old generals and remembered in fields, woods and orchards how frightened or how surprisingly brave they had been; they drank and sang in the cafes at night and they remembered a unity of spirit and of action, which they sought but seldom found in their present-day life. They had all been Airborne and they wished they were still.

Beyond veterans, Pickering describes nostalgic reflection, triggered by the public commemorations of D-Day in 1994, of her own personal history in the war, specifically related to her gender identity (1997, p. 182). This example takes an individual’s experience of a war commemoration that in turn becomes a personal journey where she reflects on her own life journey. This reflects Winter and Sivan’s (1999) argument of the personal nature of collective remembrance, indicating another level of meaning associated with war memory. In addition to national and social identities, meaning associated with death and war is another prominent theme in the battlefield tourism literature.

**Death and War**

This thematic lens recognizes the thanatouristic characteristic of battlefields and how meaning-making involves reflecting upon death and war. With regard to death, Seaton (2009a, pp.76-82) describes the Other of Death that defines a thanatourism site. The term, ‘The Other’ refers to what is different from the self. One perspective of ‘Otherness’ (see Jamal 2000; Bruner 2005) considers the influence of tourism in defining and representing other cultures, reinforcing differences between, for example, rich and poor. However, other authors (see Galani-Moutafi 2000; Boskovic 2007) view Otherness as a two-way process of
identity formation, whereby experiences and relationships play a central role in defining who we are. It is this perspective that Seaton adopts when he presents the Otherness of Death. However, rather than viewing it as the contrast from one culture to another, the Other of Death is understood as ‘a universal opposition that transcends culture – that between life and death’ (Seaton 2009a, p. 84). It is something that cannot be experienced, owing to its absolute character, and therefore it maintains its mystery. Thus, it is ‘the greatest and only universal Other’ (Seaton 2009a, p. 106).

With regard to returning next of kin and veterans, thoughts of the dead and of the war may be more pronounced, given their association (see Lloyd 1998). For example, Scates (2006) discusses how parents were motivated to travel to Gallipoli in order to gain a sense of closeness as well as to seek closure with sons killed in battle. However, as Chronis (2005) points out with the Gettysburg battlefield, the power of these sites is not limited only to next of kin, as stories of human suffering related to a battle that occurred 150 years ago still evoke strong emotional reactions based on empathy.

Nevertheless, the meanings associated with death are still unclear. For example, Stone and Sharpley (2009) argue that dark tourism involves confronting death, a response to the sequestered nature of death and dying in the modern era. Stone (2009) goes further, arguing that thoughts of death that occur in dark tourism can be unsettling, reminding people of their mortality and leading to questions about the meaning of life. Seaton (2009b, p.526-529) counters this perspective by arguing that thanatourism is not a modern phenomenon, and that death has become a highly visible aspect of contemporary life through media. Indeed, what makes thanatourism special is that it provides the time to reflect upon the subject of death (Seaton 2009b, p. 534), making it one of the most commonly shared motivations for international travel (Seaton 2009a, p. 84).

Both perspectives point to the significance of death in meaning-making. They may also point to the relevance of the concept of mortality death salience.
(Greenberg et al. 1990), that thoughts of death represent a threat to an individual's worldview. As thoughts of mortality can generate a sense of insecurity, the individual engages in acts of fight or flight, reflecting a desire to protect the integrity of one's worldview. As psychological research, it is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, it is relevant in terms of understanding how death and its association to war is negotiated and understood by the visitor.

War and death are entwined in remembrance, with the legitimacy of war often shaping the legitimacy of the fallen. For example, MacCannell (1992) and Sturken (1997) explore the meaning associated with the Vietnam War as mediated by the Vietnam Veterans' Memorial in Washington, DC. The controversy around the memorial, with the names of dead American soldiers engraved on the minimalist memorial made of black stone, is that it is demeaning to their sacrifice, symbolizing the war as a black scar in American memory (Hagopian 2009, p. 102). Seaton (2000) and Caroline Winter (2010) both explore reactions of tourists to the Somme battlefield, as they reflect on the cost of human life and the rationale and utility of the Great War. Chronis (2005) also touches upon the meaning of war when he observes an increase in the number of visitors to Gettysburg after 9-11, suggesting that tourist meaning is framed by, and in turn informs, contemporary understandings of war.

Rather than a fascination with death, what is happening with tourism to battlefields involves a negotiation of the meaning of life and death in the context of war. Part of that meaning is informed by the visitor's perception of the legitimacy of war and what is worth living and dying for. Despite the peripheral nature of war in the 21st century in contrast to the total war of World War II followed by the threat of global nuclear annihilation during the Cold War era, authors such as LeShan (1992) and Hedges (2002) argue that war continues to be a very significant human and social phenomenon that shapes our worldview.
Conclusion

This chapter reviewed the literature regarding the tourist performance of remembering, thanatourism and visitor meaning-making. Section One reviewed the literature to frame the notion of the tourist performance of remembering, and how power, knowledge and discourse interact with regard to war remembrance. This involved taking into account the debate on state-invented versus the social agency approach of war remembrance, and raised the question of the role of tourists as part of the fictive kinship in sustaining remembrance. Co-construction of meaning is a useful term to employ in that it recognizes both the positionality of the mindful tourist and the interpretation of the landscape of war as a storiescape by various mediating agencies.

In reviewing the literature related to battlefield tourism, the intention is to reveal how existing concepts inform the tourism-remembrance relationship. Thanatourism is useful in understanding the association to death, although further research is required in understanding tourist motivation to visit battlefields. Theories associated with dark tourism dealing with the intensity of the tourist experience at battlefields are also useful in highlighting the breadth and depth of visitor meaning, but are empirically not supported. Remembrance tourism is a term employed in Normandy, but it has no theoretical grounding as yet.

Section Two focused on identifying meaning lenses from existing thanatourism literature. Three broad meaning lenses were identified: national identity, social identity/nostalgia and death. These lenses are employed in the analysis in Chapter 10 where it is argued that they form a key part of a conceptual tourism-remembrance framework.

The gaps in the literature defined in this chapter are:

- The role tourists play in sustaining remembrance and commemoration;
• The evolution of a World War II battlefield as a tourism destination and site of memory, and;
• Conceptualizing the performance of remembering in relation to war remembrance.

This concludes the literature review chapters of this research. Chapter Five presents the methodological approach employed in this research. Chapters Six to Ten provide an analysis of the research. Chapter Eleven will summarize the findings and present the contribution to knowledge.
CHAPTER 5. Methodology
Introduction

The chapter discusses the qualitative methodological approach adopted for this research. This research is inspired by ethnographic practices as proposed by Seaton (2002) and Palmer (2005; 2010). Fieldwork was conducted in Normandy in 2004, 2006, 2008 and 2009. A number of methods augmented participant observation, namely interviews with key informants and visitors, an online survey tool and reflexive journaling. Each of these is discussed in this chapter, along with methodology, the use of photographs as visual evidence, interpretation of data, trustworthiness, triangulation, and ethical issues.

In recent years, a number of authors have called for more innovative approaches to tourism research, (Ateljevic et al. 2007; Phillimore & Goodison 2004;), acknowledging the complexity of tourism (see Hollinshead 2006a). In response to this critical turn in tourism studies, various authors (Ritchie, Burns & Palmer 2004; Ateljevic et al. 2007; Jennings 2009; Palmer 2010) have provided innovative conceptual approaches to guide tourism researchers. As part of this movement, Pritchard and Morgan (2007) argue that tourism research must explore alternate sources of knowledge creation in order to expand the breadth and depth of the field. This is often cited as the case in research related to thanatourism, that it lacks a robust theoretical base (see Wight 2006; Sharpley & Stone 2009; Seaton 2009). With this context in mind, the aim of the research is presented and then discussed with regard to the methodology.

The aim of the research is to understand the relationship between tourism and war remembrance in a landscape of war. Wolcott (1999) presents two questions that form the basis of ethnographic investigation: what is happening here, and; in terms of what? An ethnographic approach is employed in order to explore, paraphrasing Wolcott (1999), what is happening in the landscape of war in terms of tourism and remembrance. This research therefore differs from Diller and Scofidio (1994) and Edwards (2009) in their critiques of remembrance in Normandy by exploring the various stakeholders or voices involved in constructing and performing tourism as an act of remembrance. In
this context, the research draws upon ethnography as a means of understanding social meaning and behavior (Geertz 1973; Wolcott 1999; Palmer 2005) as they relate to the cultural phenomenon of war remembrance. This involves researching both the visitor experience and how it is negotiated and mediated by tourism worldmaking agencies such as museums, tour guides and travel guide books. The methodology is now introduced, including examination of the relevance of ethnography to this research.

**Methodology: Inspired by an Ethnographic Approach**

Ethnography has been defined in several ways. Hobbs and Wright (2006, p.x) argue that it is about ‘engaging with others on their own turf, exotic or otherwise, in order to describe their cultural practices, understandings and beliefs.’ In this context, ‘the turf’ is the Normandy landscape of war. Atkinson and Hammersley (1994, p.248) argue that ethnography is an ill defined term, better characterized by several features. First, there is an emphasis on exploring the nature of certain social phenomena. Second, the data is typically not coded when it is collected, nor are a closed set of categories employed. Third, only a few cases are investigated. Fourth, analysis involves interpretation of the meaning and actions of individuals and presented as a verbal description or explanation rather than by employing quantitative methods.

It is argued that the research aim and the best means to address it align with these characteristics. Remembrance and tourism, as social phenomena, require understanding human actions related to the construction of meaning, based on interacting with certain symbols and narratives related to war memory. The meanings associated with war memory can evoke much reflection, aligning with Wolcott’s (1999) view of ethnography. As he explains, ‘[e]thnographic accounts arise not from the facts accumulated during fieldwork but from ruminating about the meanings to be derived from the experience (Wolcott 1999, p.12).
This research also aligns with the perspective of Nash (2007, p.1) who argues that ethnography needs to be judged on how well it assists in understanding evolving elements of culture. It is argued that remembrance and its meaning is an element of culture that is constantly evolving. Creighton (2008) argues from another perspective, arguing that an ethnography involves incorporating ideas related to the soul, rather than focusing on factual information. In the context of remembrance, White (2000) frames remembrance as an emotional experience, as does Casey (1987). Thanatourism also involves meaning-making of a personal and potentially deeply emotional nature, as argued in Chapter Four. In addition, the landscape of war and its sense of place impute meaning and have become an important element in defining culture (Hirsch & O’Hanlan 1995), war memory (Linenthal 1991; Gough 2004b) and tourism (Knudsen et al. 2008).

Thus, it can be readily argued that ethnography is relevant to this research. Turning to how tourism research has employed ethnography, a number of authors have demonstrated how it can be adapted to a range of contexts (see Jack & Phipps 2003; Bruner 2005; Palmer 2005; Mathers 2008). In exploring war memory and tourism, this research builds on the ethnographic work of Seaton (2000; 2002), Andrews (2005), Palmer (2005), Tucker (2005) and Sather-Wagstaff (2008). Seaton uses ethnography when explaining his research of conducted bus tours in the Somme (2000; 2002), while Sather-Wagstaff (2008) employs it to adopt a tourist-centred perspective, one that allows for an exploration of travel to commemorative sites. Palmer (2005) employs ethnography to understand how identity is formed through tourism by examining the relationship between heritage tourism and national identity.

However, several perceived challenges arise in this research when employing ethnography, specifically: the duration of the fieldwork, and; access to tourists. Wolcott (1999, p. 182-184) acknowledges the trend toward speeding up ethnography, while at the same time there is the concern of maintaining validity. He offers a set of indicators to assess whether sufficient data gathering has been achieved in the field. For example, saturation is reached when the ethnographer is not learning anything significantly new. The fieldwork involved
a different language (French), geography and multiple heritages that were familiar to the researcher. As well, observation of guided bus tours, as proposed by Seaton (2002) and Iles (2006) ensured extended contact and interaction with visitors. Saturation was therefore achieved over the seven weeks of fieldwork conducted in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. This point is discussed further under ‘Prolonged Engagement’ (p. 163). Wolcott (1999, p. 184) also notes that it is important to take into account enough time for data analysis: in other words, to emphasize field research over analysis is to create another challenge with validity. For this research, in addition to the daily writing and review of notes while in Normandy, dedicated analysis occurred over a year, involving analyzing field notes, photographs, digital voice files and transcripts and writing of multiple drafts that assisted in evolving various narrative themes.

For Frohlick and Harrison (2008) and Palmer (2010), where to access tourists in order to engage in meaningful sustained encounters is the central challenge, further complicated by ethical limits of accessing tourists visiting museums and other sites of memory such as cemeteries. However, several authors have offered ways of countering this issue. Seaton (2000; 2002) responds to this challenge by conducting an ethnography on a bus tour, an approach adopted by Iles (2006). However, Sather Wagstaff (2008) argues that, given the mobility of the tourist, the meaning of the travel experience is constructed in multiple sites, both while travelling and upon returning home. The challenge then becomes how to access tourists/individuals across these multiple sites of memory and once they return home.

Whereas remembrance can be seen as a particular act, such as participating in a commemoration, meaning from that act evolves over time. Furthermore, the challenge of exploring meaning of the transient tourist is also complicated by nature of the experience, namely to do with war and death. With this in mind, Seaton’s ethnographic strategy to participate in bus tours is employed, facilitating access to visitors for an extended duration and involving various sites of memory. In addition, telephone interviewing and an online survey tool
were employed to access visitors upon their return home. Table 4 presents the research activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Duration in Field</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2006 | 4 days            | - Exploratory visit for site selection  
- Observe June 5-7<sup>th</sup> commemorative services; general observations |
| 2007 | 3 days            | - Seek approval from site management for interviews, observation  
- General observations in Normandy  
- Face to face interview with 1 cemetery manager, Washington, DC |
| 2008 | 3 ½ weeks         | - Observed 11 guided tours involving approximately 70 visitors  
- Observed June 5-8<sup>th</sup> commemorative services  
- General reflexive observations  
- Field interviews with 11 site managers, 6 guides, 1 veteran  
- Phone interviews with 3 site managers, 2 guides, 3 visitors, 1 veteran  
- In Canada face to face interviews with 1 guide, 2 visitors, 6 veterans  
- 37 visitor responses online |
| 2009 | 2 ½ weeks         | - Observed 2 guided tours involving 16 visitors  
- Observed June 5-June 8<sup>th</sup> commemorative services  
- General reflexive observations  
- Field interviews with 1 site manager, follow up interviews with guides  
- In Canada face to face interviews with 2 guides, 3 veterans  
- Phone interviews with 4 guides, 3 visitors  
- 5 visitor responses online |
| 2010 |                  | - Phone interviews with 2 guides, 1 visitor |

Table 4: Schedule of research activities, 2006-2010.

In addition to tourists, other voices situated in the landscape of war are involved in the tourism-remembrance relationship. These voices include site managers of museums and cemeteries, tour guides, veterans as well as the local voice of residents. Schmid (2008) takes a similar approach in his ethnography, examining the relationship of guides, government and tour operators in the formation of tourist enclaves. His work is relevant in that he identifies the
importance of understanding a range of voices and how they interact with one another. In the context of the Normandy landscape of war, not only are there various voices as mentioned above, but there are also various national landscapes. Torgorvnick (2005) and Edwards (2009) both focus their studies of Normandy on the American sector. This provides for a limited scope as to what is happening in the broader historical context of D-Day and the international significance of the Normandy landscape of war. Thus, another dimension to address in the research is representation from the three allied sectors, British, Canadian and American along with the French perspective. By taking this approach, a multi-national perspective of meaning associated with the landscape is gained.

In addition to accessing visitors and other voices, the fieldwork also explores the meanings associated within the Normandy landscape, with its memorials, war relics, cemeteries and commemorative practices as experienced by visitors. This can be looked upon as deciphering a universe of symbols and meanings (McCall 2006, p.4) that represent or interpret the carnage and chaos that is war. In visiting the landscape, individuals draw from a range of cultural memories, as discussed in Chapter Two, aspects of which might be culturally unique while others collectively shared. By observing and interpreting what is happening in the landscape of war, the complexity of meaning-making can be better understood. The next section presents the various research methods employed.

Research Methods

The ethnographic research methods employed are:

- Observation of guided bus tours: Involving observation of visitors and tour guides on day-long tours;
- Reflexive observation: involving personal observations of experiences in the landscape of war as a tourist/researcher, including taking guided tours, attending commemorative events, interacting with locals, management, guides, tourists and veterans, involving the
recording of thoughts and photographing experiences during the two periods of fieldwork, as well as away from the field;

- Semi-structured interviews of visitors, tour guides, site managers, locals and veterans.

Augmenting the ethnographic method was an online commentary tool, serving as a repository of ideas and thoughts of tourists’ experiences. Some interviews with visitors, tour guides and site managers were also conducted by phone, allowing for a continuation of data collection as well as more reflective observations about the visitor experience.

**Interviews**

Interviewing visitors, management, guides, tour operators, and veterans is aimed at capturing the various voices involved in remembrance in Seaton’s heritage force field (2009a). The voice of the locals is embedded in the interviews of French guides and site managers. This multiple perspective approach attempts to address Hollinshead’s call for fifth moment thinking that is critically aware, action oriented and reflexive (2004, p.69) and that reveals the context of the research. As well, it responds to Ryan (2007) who calls for consideration of the voice of management in battlefield tourism, and the identification of the gap in research with regard the visitor voice and the multivocal politics of remembrance (Seaton 2009b). Whereas there was a common core set of themes to the questions posed, interviews were customized to take into account the unique perspective offered by each group. A list of questions is provided in Appendix A.

Table 5 identifies the voices to be explored in this research, as well as the perspective that they provide. The table illustrates what Ryan (2007, p. 3), citing Denzin (1989, 1992), emphasizes as important to battlefield tourism research, that is to take account of ‘the voices, emotions and actions… of the life experiences to which people attribute importance and which shapes their personal meaning and understanding of the world in which they live.’ Inherent in interviewing these voices is the opportunity to examine the politics of
remembrance and the heritage force field, a lacuna identified by Seaton (2009a; 2009b) and addressed here. More discussion on voices involved in this research will be examined later in this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voices</th>
<th>Methodology needs to explore and interpret the following:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Management</td>
<td>- Meaning associated with D-Day and cultural memory of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Their role with regard to remembrance and tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How does visiting affect remembrance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- How is the war represented at the site / landscape?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What do they (site managers) observe in the performance of tourists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns with remembrance and what is happening with tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>- Meaning associated with D-Day and cultural memories of war from their experience of the landscape of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- what is memorable and why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meaning of their experience: thoughts and feelings, its significance with regard to remembrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns with remembrance and what is happening with tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guides</td>
<td>- Meaning associated with D-Day and cultural memories of war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Their role as a guide, its meaning and significance of a guided tour in remembering the war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What guides do and say to interpret meaning of the landscape of war for visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What they observe in the reaction and meaning-making of visitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns with remembrance and what is happening with tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans</td>
<td>- Meaning associated with war memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Meaning of returning to visit with regard to remembrance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- What they wish to see and experience when visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Concerns with remembrance and what is happening with tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Voices of the heritage force field and what they may offer to the research

Table 6 provides a breakdown of those interviewed, categorized by voice and by nationality. In total, 54 semi-structured interviews, lasting anywhere from 45 minutes to three hours, took place, with some interviews conducted over several telephone calls or face to face meetings. An active interview approach was employed (Holstein and Gubrium 1995), the interactive discourse particularly suited to interviewing key informants who were interviewed.
Appendix B provides a list of all of those interviewed. Returning veterans can also been seen as visitors, offering commentary on the experience of visiting the landscape of war, but they are separated given their unique perspective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tour Guides</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans (returned)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterans (not returned)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtotals</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Interviews conducted by group, categorized by nationality.

Wight (2006) cites several authors writing during the post-modernist era (Tunbridge and Ashworth 1996; Hollinshead 1999; Dobbs 1999) as arguing about the manipulative dimension of dark tourism sites and their ability to evoke certain political and social meanings and learned outcomes as a result of management’s careful interpretation. Related to this is the question of who is to be entrusted with memorialization (see Langer 1998). With this in mind, understanding the perspective of management with regard to the role of tourism in remembrance is an important aspect of this research. Management interviews were conducted related to six sites, with anywhere from one to four managers individually interviewed:

- Pegasus Memorial Museum
- Juno Beach Centre
- D-Day Museum at Arromanches
- The Normandy American Cemetery (including one manager at the head office of the American Battle Monuments Commission in Arlington, Virginia)
- The German Cemetery at LaCambe
- Commonwealth War Graves Commission (at Maidenhead, England)

Two managers involved in coordinating commemoration in the region were also included, namely Normandie Mémoire and the Committee of the Landings, discussed in Chapter Six.

Interviewing visitors was one of four methods employed to access the visitor voice. Interviews were conducted either by phone or in person. Visitors volunteered to be interviewed by providing permission on the online comment repository to contact them, or were approached in person. In comparison to the other methods, interviewing visitors provided for a deeper discussion and personal reflection of the experience. In the analysis, separation is made by indicating interview responses with ‘interview’ along with nationality and gender, visitor comments while on tour with ‘tour’ along with gender and nationality, and online responses with a ‘online’ and a number. In some chapters, tables are employed to list sample comments. This approach was employed to capture the amount of exposure to the visitor experience.

Tour guides were approached for an interview either in person or by phone, with some preferring to respond to questions during lunchtime, over the course of the day or after work. The main focus was battlefield tour guides, self-proclaimed experts in military history with expertise in the landscape of war and guiding. About half of the guides interviewed were living in Normandy.
Veterans provided three perspectives for this research. First, with regard to Seaton’s heritage force field, they are the focus of what is remembered, their actions memorialized and commemorated in the landscape of war. In addition, veterans have played a political and fundraising role in driving memorialization and commemoration, be it the construction of memorials or museums (see Noble 1997; Mills 2004), or in expressing how the war is to be remembered (see Joly 2000). Second, they too represent visitors to the landscape of war, more readily referred to as pilgrims (see Lloyd 1998), providing a unique perspective to tourism and remembrance. Third, interacting with veterans provided an opportunity to experience and learn from the memory of witnesses to war (Figure 16), and therefore a way to reflect upon what will be lost when the war generation is no longer here to express their memories of World War II, the Normandy campaign and how it should be remembered (see Fussell 1976, 1990; Winter 2006). One challenge with interviewing veterans is that memories fade, and can be forgotten.

In the context of this research the local voice refers to those working in management positions and as guides. Of particular importance was speaking
to those immediately involved in managing acts of remembrance in the region that had the potential to involve tourists. Three officials representing the state – the Mayor of Arromanches who oversees the local museum, Admiral de la Perrière, the President of the nationally legislated Committee of the Landing, and Frederique Guerin, the Secretary General of Normandie Mémoire, were all interviewed. In addition, six other French managers and guides offered their own professional as well as personal, or local, views of various matters. Various French individuals living in the area were met during the course of a particular fieldwork period and offered informal commentary that was also recorded.

Most of these interviews were conducted in French. Whereas the researcher has an advanced level of fluency, the nuances of meaning of terms within the Norman and French cultural context could lead to multiple interpretations in translation. To address these concerns, phrases not understood during the conversation were identified, with a request to clarify. Upon return to Canada, a translator was used to provide due diligence with regard to certain passages and phrases.

**Participant Observation and Reflexivity in the Landscape of War**

This section outlines two overlapping approaches to the fieldwork: participant observation of guided bus tours and reflexivity. These two methods are separated to acknowledge the specific focus of data collection of each approach, while acknowledging their complementary nature. As Cole (2004) notes, participant observation ‘involves attempting to understand and interpret the meanings and experiences of a group’(p.64). Whereas the fieldwork took place in Normandy, the focus of observation was on those aspects of local culture and related groups involved in battlefield tourism. Before reviewing the guided bus tour ethnography (Seaton 2002) and reflexivity employed in thanatourism research (Dunkley 2007), site selection is discussed.

The Normandy landscape of war has over 500 museums, bunkers, memorials, cemeteries, monuments and other war related sites (Holt & Holt 2010). This
brings forward the second issue of site selection: given the geographic immensity, which sites represent the events comprising the Battle of Normandy? Outside the context of guided tours, observation was conducted at a range of sites, from those regularly identified in guide books, to more remote locations such as St Lambert-sur-Dives, where in August, 1944, the heroic actions of Major David Currie of the South Alberta Regiment were recognized with the Victoria Cross, the highest medal for valour and the only one awarded in the Normandy campaign. Museums and interpretive sites were also visited as a means to assess their approach to the representation of war/battle. These are listed in Appendix C. Sites visited while on tour are listed in Appendices D and E.

The key relevant sites and sectors in this research are listed below, and reflected in Figure 17:

- **Canadian sites (green sector):** Juno Beach Centre, Juno Beach, Canada House at Bernieres sur Mer, Beny sur Mer Cemetery, Basly, Buron, Authie, Abbaye d'Ardenne, Caen;
- **British sites (red sectors):** Sword and Gold Beaches, Ranville and Bayeux Cemetery, Pegasus Memorial, the memorial park area and glider landing area, Arromanches;
- **American sites (yellow sector):** Omaha and Utah Beaches, Ste Mere Eglise and surrounding countryside that involved the airborne landings and particular battles, Angoville au Plain, Ste Marie du Mont, Carantan, specifically Dead Man’s Corner, Pointe du Hoc, and the Normandy American Cemetery at Colleville sur Mer;
These sites collectively represent nation-specific landscapes within the Normandy landscape of war. Other related sites, particularly those south of Caen such as Verrières Ridge, Carpiquet Airport and Falaise, were visited, but not extensively because of travel distance, time limitations and their relatively low visitor numbers. However, observations were carried out and these provided insight into and comparison with the sites listed above. One notable exception not included in this research is the Caen Peace Memorial Museum. This is because it does not focus on the Battle of Normandy, nor is the actual site associated with a battle.

Attendance at commemorations formed a key element of the observations in early June of each year. The booklet, *D-Day and Battle of Normandy Ceremonies and Festivities* (Normandie Mémoire 2008; 2009), is published annually and available through tourist information centres. Whereas the 60-page booklet covers ceremonies from May to the end of August, the majority take place between June 4th to June 8th each year. In 2009, there were approximately 150 communities, towns and cities organizing well over 200 commemorative events during this five-day period. Commemorations were selected that were both proximate to one another, and that provided an opportunity to observe different commemorative experiences. For 2008, the focus was on the Canadian and British sector, with the 2009 fieldwork focusing
on commemorations in the American sector. The list of commemorations observed is provided in Appendix F.

**Participant Observation of Conducted Bus Tours**

Seaton employed the guided bus tour ethnography for his research of tourism to Great War sites in France (2000). In a later article (2002), he notes that the ‘closed-field’ context of guided bus tours provides an opportunity to build trust with a group of individuals, allowing the researcher to become a ‘cultural peer’ with the other travelers, and facilitating greater inclusion in the group dynamic (p.312). However, as the guided tours observed in Normandy are only four to ten hours in duration, the danger of overfamiliarity was not a concern. For this research, both the visitor and guide performances were observed. Shared cultural characteristics such as language, an ‘allied’ history and an interest in the tour subject alleviated issues of ethnographic induction. This intensity of the tour schedule accelerated the depth of conversation, allowing the researcher to engage in meaningful discussion. A total of 13 tours were taken, selected from four different tour companies. To represent the array of guided tours available, generalist and specialist tours were observed. The closed-field setting in an eight-passenger bus also facilitated conversation both pre and post site visits. This facilitated conversation and the ability to observe the effect of the day’s experience on tour participants.

The observation of the guides focused on interpretive techniques and narrative, particularly with regard to reading the landscape of war. These moments and techniques were photographed and noted. As both a tourist and one able to observe, discuss and comment on the meaning of stories and places with other tourists during the tour, the researcher was able to gauge what places, interpretive approaches and stories had particular resonance with tourists. The meaning-making constructed by tourists is discussed in detail in Chapter 10.
Reflexivity

Van Maneen (1988) acknowledges the place of reflexivity stating, ‘the self is a key fieldwork tool’ (Van Maanen et al. 1989, p.5). Reflexivity is defined as:

…something that is accomplished through detachment, internal dialogue, and constant (and intensive) scrutiny of ‘what I know’ and ‘how I know it.’ To be reflexive is to have an ongoing conversation about experience while simultaneously living in the moment (Hertz 1997, p.vii-viii).

Reflexivity can be seen as a consciousness of self (Callaway 1992, p.33), whereby one’s positionality – shaped by gender, age, nationality, ethnicity and experience – shapes how the researcher experiences the world and interprets its meaning. The result is ‘reflexive knowledge: statements that provide insight on the workings of the social world and insight on how that knowledge came into existence’ (Hertz, 1997, p.viii). In terms of thanatourism, Dunkley (2007, p. 372) argues that emotional detachment by the researcher as problematic, arguing that the emotional elements of the experience lead to a deeper engagement in the thanatourism experience.

One may criticize reflexivity as self-indulgent (see Mykhalovskiy 1997), particularly as reflexive experiences with regard to war are typically the domain of the authoritative witnesses of war, the living memory (see Winter 2006). However, reflexivity is also employed by those attempting to understand their second-hand relationship to war, linked perhaps by a family member (see www.daughtersofdday.com), or one’s own curiosity with war history and the landscape of war (see O’Shea 1997). To not engage in reflexivity, particularly in the context of engaging with fellow tourists on guided bus tours is described by Hertz (1997, p.xii) as potentially creating ‘interactional problems’ with others observed and interviewed in the field. Nevertheless, knowledge generation cannot ignore that the researcher is implicated in constructing what is presented. In addition, the researcher as a reflexive insider – an international tourist visiting Normandy – is a strength in that it allows him to draw upon personal experiences to gain deeper insight.
Therefore, a reflexive approach, where experiences are captured in situ by digital recording, writing and photography is viewed as a valuable method. A multiple-voice approach is therefore employed in the writing of this thesis. Writing in the third person is the primary format in this research, with parts of the analysis written in the reflexive first person and noted with italics, in what Hertz describes as a ‘visible narrator and co-participant’ (p.xii).

The Use of Photographs as Visual Evidence

Following the arguments of Burns and Lester (2004), visual evidence in the form of photographs and, to a lesser extent, brochures, postcards and tourist maps are employed as data to support the narrative analysis. Zelizer (2002) views photography at sites such as Ground Zero as a means to ‘bear witness’ to the event, an object that assists in recollection in the future. Although tourist photography at thanatourist sites can be viewed as inappropriate, Sather Wagstaff (2008) argues that visitor photography contributes to the ‘social construction of these spaces, their acts forming a crucial part of the commemorative act and as informing cultural memory.’ Photography and other visual images are therefore used as a method in two complementary ways. First, a visual image can support the written narrative gained from the fieldwork. Second, as part of reflexivity, visual images, specifically photographs, are taken of what is intriguing and memorable, what is to be remembered as a means of mirroring the activities of tourists. Sather-Wagstaff (2008, p.361) advocates such an approach: from an ethnographic perspective, it is essential to engage in the same tourist practice in order for the researcher to experience and better understand the gaze of the tourist.

The Examination of Travel Guide Books

This section involves an analysis of various generalist and specialist guide books focusing on Normandy. The books selected are what Laderman (2009) describes as referential, providing guidance to tourists as to what is deemed worth seeing. A range of generalist and specialist tour guide books were examined (Table 7), many of them globally distributed. In addition, four authors
were interviewed, three specializing in battlefield tourism and the other in writing generalist guide books.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Travel Guide Book</th>
<th>Generalist (G) / Specialist (S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>D-Day beaches re-visited</em> (Boussel 1966)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brightly shone the dawn: some experiences of the invasion of Normandy</em> (Johnson &amp; Dunphie 1980)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Brittany &amp; Normandy: The rough guide</em> (Ward 1997)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The green guide: France</em> (Michelin 2000)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lonely Planet: France</em> (Oliver, Fallon, Hart, O’Carroll, Robinson &amp; Roddis 2003)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>The Canadian battlefields in Normandy: a visitor’s guide</em> (Copp &amp; Bechthold 2008)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rick Steves’ France 2008</em> (Steves and Smith 2008)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Major and Mrs Holt’s Battlefield guide to the Normandy landings beaches</em> (Holt &amp; Holt 2004)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>A traveler’s guide to D-Day and the battle of Normandy</em> (Shilleto &amp; Tolhurst 2004)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Battle Zone Normandy: Orne Bridgehead</em> (Clark 2004)</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thomas Cook drive around: Brittany and Normandy</em> (Rice &amp; Rice 2005)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lonely Planet France</em> (Williams, Berry, Fallon, Le Nevez, Robinson, Roddis 2007)</td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Guide books examined for this research.

The focus was on examining what sites and activities are deemed the principal attractions and how they are interpreted by the guide book, reflecting what Jack and Phipps (2003, p.283), citing Stagl (1980), describe as providing ‘rules useful for travel and observation.’ How these sites are viewed by the guide books may also reveal the way in which cultural memories of war are employed in the narrative text.
Online Survey Tool as Tourist Comment Repository

An online comment repository tool was developed in anticipation of people’s reluctance to speak of their experience, or if their schedule prevented a longer discussion. Rather than as a formal qualitative research method, the online comment repository augmented tour observation, visitor interviews and the reflexive experience by providing additional written comments.

![Business card](front and back) used to solicit participation online.

To implement this method, www.surveyconsole.com was used. A business card (Figure 18) that indicated the aim of the research, information on the researcher, a survey link along with an email address (ddayvisit@hotmail.com) for those preferring a phone interview, was presented to potential tourist respondents. Over 200 cards were distributed directly to tourists in Normandy. Eighty visited the survey site, with 42 completing the survey. Of this total, fourteen females self-identified themselves. Tables 8 and 9 indicate the range
of respondents by nationality and age respectively, representing a fairly broad representation in the audience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>British</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Canadian</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subtotals</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Online visitor responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>No. of responses</th>
<th>% of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 years old or less</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 years old</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 years old</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-68 years old</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69+ years old</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response to this question</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total (% rounded up)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>approx 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Age ranges of respondents.

Overall, the online comment repository tool provided a good source of additional visitor responses that assisted in crystallizing the voice of the visitor in expressing the meaning of their visit to Normandy. The next section focuses on the approach to interpretation of the findings.
Interpretation

Janesick (2000, p. 390) refers to the problem of methodolatry, what Richardson describes as the creative-disabling effect of ‘analysis paralysis’ (p.936) in employing certain analytical tools and approaches for interpretation. The various interpretive approaches listed here are not intended to be seen as unique and distinct. It is recognized that there is a considerable degree of overlap with the approaches and, as a form of bricolage, inclusion of the various methods empowers the researcher to interpret and make meaning from a number of subtle perspectives that collectively lead to insight and meaning-making.

With that said, Richardson (2000, p. 937) views ethnography as ‘humanly situated’, dependent on the perspective of the human researcher seeing and perceiving, constructed through research practices that lead to ‘enlarged understanding.’ The position of the researcher as sympathetic insider is adopted (Goldenberg 1992). This approach also takes into account symbolic interactionism as employed by Ryan (2007), an approach that accepts what the visitor says and interprets it as true, as they see it. For example, the historical account of D-Day, the perceived roles of nations as well as the moral rationale with regard to the war as interpreted by visitors is assumed true. As Stein (2006, p. 69) notes, this perspective acknowledges that the meaning of the visitor experience is of central focus, that the ‘participants are ‘expert’ as it is an appreciation of their experience, emotion and meanings that is necessary to [gain] a complete understanding.’

As part of this methodology, interpretive practices can be described as ‘the constellation of procedures, conditions, and resources through which reality is apprehended, understood, organized, and conveyed in everyday life’ (Gubrium & Holstein 2000, p.488). The interpretive constellation involves a number of interpretive approaches owing to the theoretical dimensions in this research. In this regard, these dimensions or levels of the research can be viewed as a ‘system of meanings’ (Schwandt 2000, p.191) that need to be understood or interpreted. But to understand an element of the tourism-remembrance
relationship, the research needs to consider the whole. Under the umbrella term of interpretivism (Jamal & Hollinshead 2001) various approaches are used to analyze multiple aspects of the tourism-remembrance relationship as explained below.

The interpretivist approach employed here is primarily founded upon the use of thick description (Geertz 2003): exemplars and thematic analysis to shed light on the tourist experience and its meaning. As Curtain (2010 154) explains, thick description ‘interprets and portrays the participants’ experience, incorporates the context, the cultural meaning and the [fieldworker’s] analysis’.

Another core element in the interpretivist foundation is writing as a form of inquiry. Richardson (2000) argues that the process of writing can act as a means to analyze qualitative data while at the same time forming the final writing product. He describes it as the creative analytic practices, or CAP ethnography, writing in this context is both creative and analytic, facilitating exploration and discovery, with the process and product intertwined (pp.929-930). The act of writing is one that is stymied at times with suppressing self expression, a view that, once acknowledged, allows the writer to write and revise, not necessarily ‘getting it right’, but ‘getting it’ (p.930-931, 936). Van Maanen (1990) also explains hermeneutic phenomenological reflection as trying to understand the essence or meaning of something by experiencing and reflecting upon it (p.77-78). This interpretive process involves identifying themes, coming from ‘the structures of experience’ (p.79) and engaging in thematic analysis in order to uncover the significance of phenomena, stated as: ‘what is its meaning, its point?’ (p.87).

Writing as means of inquiry typically involves writing passages and then by way of self-feedback, new questions are raised and the passage is re-written. What is deployed in this research is what Richardson describes as ‘evocative representation’, which involves writing ‘to re-create lived experience and evoke emotional responses’ (p.931). Complementing this is Van Maanen (1988) who describes various narrative approaches to writing an ethnography, one of which is referred to as ‘impressionist tales’ (p.101-124). This approach is used to
'evoke an open, participatory sense in the viewer’ (p.101), ‘to braid the knower with the known’(p.102), written in the first person and focusing on certain memorable experiences in the field. Such an approach can be viewed as incorporating phenomenological, symbolic and hermeneutic interpretations. This narrative style is employed in situations where it is difficult if not impossible to access other visitor voices, such as during commemorations. As such, it represents only a portion of the overall analysis, to capture certain reflexive moments that are often augmented by other research methods. For this research, braiding the knower with the known is attempted by narrating a series of stories and illustrating them with photographs that reconstruct and elaborate on details of the events.

As Coffey and Atkinson (1996, p. 108) argue, interpreting qualitative research is not ‘simply a matter of classifying, categorising, coding and collating data into forms of speech or regularities of action’ but ‘the representation or reconstruction of social phenomena’. Curtain (2010, p. 154),) explains that those engaged in field work develop narrative accounts of the social context and the actors involved, ultimately leading to a reconstruction of reality by way of thick description (Geertz 2003). An important characteristic of thick description is the use of quotations to give voice to the thoughts and feelings of individuals.

Thematic analysis of narratives gained through interviews and observation will be used in this research. As Willson and McIntosh (2007, p.76) argue, employing narrative allows for deeper insight into tourist experience, framed by the reflexive perspective of the tourist herself. The process adopted, informed by Duculman and Alan’s (1989) seven-stage hermeneutical process, was as follows:

- Conduct the interview and digitally record it
- Transcribe, and translate as needed, the audio recording
• An initial read of transcripts to gauge responses and to adapt questions for following interviews and to assess saturation point of responses

• Group the transcripts by voice (tour guides, site managers, tourists, etc). Read until familiar with each transcript. Then identify themes in the transcript, by identifying narratives and ideas related to themes in the literature and identified gaps

• Using a mind map schematic, collate themes for each group of transcripts, a page for each transcript

• Bundle the mind maps by site managers, tour guides, visitors and veterans, analyze the mind maps, and identify common content themes by bundle.

• Consider relationship of content themes across interviewee bundles, field notes, photographs and online responses

• Identify exemplars that represent themes

• Write analysis

• Revisit research aim and literature

• Continue/revise writing, as a means of working with and analyzing the meaning of the themes.

In carrying out the above, a range of themes emerged that were particularly instructive for understanding the tourism-remembrance relationship. For example, for visitors, their experience in the landscape was a particular set of themes, structured around national identity, social identity and death and war. For site management, understanding their mandate in terms of remembrance and the place of tourists resulted in another theme. In addition, attention was paid to differences, inconsistencies and contradictions. Presenting the research involved reflexive and deep narrative as well as organized tables of responses. The use of tables provides the reader with an overview of exemplars related to a certain theme and facilitates inclusion of a range of voices. The mix of rich description, reflexive narrative, photographs and tables of exemplars achieves what Jamal and Hollinshead (2001, p. 69) describe as ‘a new interpretive writing’ that embraces ‘dialogue, emotions, multiple points of
Trustworthiness

Guba and Lincoln (1985), argue that credible methodological inquiry ensures a foundation of trustworthiness. The four criteria, credibility (including triangulation), transferability and dependability and confirmability, as identified by these authors, are presented below.

Credibility in qualitative research is an issue because of the constructed nature of knowledge, which in essence fuses the inquirer with the subject of inquiry (Decrop 2004). Guba and Lincoln (1985), seen as the most comprehensive framework for credibility (see Jamal & Hollinshead 2001; Decrop 2004), suggest a range of techniques to ensure credible findings. Each is addressed below.

Prolonged engagement involves ensuring there is enough time in a culture or field setting in order to reach a point of saturation, experienced by achieving a level of repetition of themes and ideas. Of specific focus here is the duration of fieldwork. Traditional ethnography would demand at least a year in the field (see Wolcott 1999), and this would seem prudent if one were studying a local culture, learning its language and way of life. In the context of this research, fieldwork needs to be framed with regard to what needs to be observed (Creighton 2008). The following arguments support the seven weeks of fieldwork, over 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009 that, coupled with the range and depth of research activities, represent prolonged engagement in the context of this research:

- Positionality of the researcher, his experience in the military, as a battlefield guide and as a Canadian fluent in French, can assist in both habituating to the local culture as well as interpreting what is happening in the landscape of war;
Familiarity with the landscape of war and its history: visits in 1986, 1999 and 2004, and then by way of reconnaissance fieldwork (see Wolcott 1999) in 2006 and 2007;

Intensity of fieldwork: to maximize contact with visitors, guided bus tours, visiting museums and attending commemorations were employed, are all described in the literature as representing a more intensive experience;

Specific thematic focus of research: a focus on experience of Canadian, British and American tourists, representing a majority of the 'tourist society' (see Palmer 2010) allowed for a degree of positional familiarity with enclavic bus tour groups;

Specific temporal focus: attending annual commemorative events associated with the period around and including June 6 occurred in 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2009. This time of year is the most significant time in the commemorative calendar, attracting visitors specifically to participate in remembrance. Conducting field work at the same time in 2008 and 2009 allows for a comparison in experiences between 2008 as a 'standard' commemorative year, and 2009, that marked the 65th anniversary, resulting in an increase in tourists as well as involvement of heads of state in commemorative activities;

Separating what needs to be done in the field versus from home: following Marcus (2007, p.355), time in the field focused on participant observation of guided tours and tourists in the landscape of war. With regard to face to face interviews, emphasis was placed on management and guide interviews, with about half of the interviews taking place by phone upon return to Canada. Scheduling of the field work as a reconnaissance (2006, 2007) and then in earnest in 2008 and 2009 facilitated a formative assessment, noting gaps that could be addressed in the following years.

All of these techniques were used to streamline and maximize the information gathering in the fieldwork that ultimately led to information saturation.
Participant observation involves identifying the elements that are ‘most relevant’ to responding to the research aim, what Lincoln and Guba describe as ‘those things that really count’ (p.304). Salient ideas in response to understanding the tourism - remembrance relationship were first identified by reviewing the literature (Fussell 1976; Kelly 2000; Seaton 2000 2002; Scates 2006; Iles 2008; C. Winter 2009). Persistent observation was achieved through observing and participating in activities that mediated the tourist experience in the landscape of war: battlefield tours, commemorative events, visiting museums, landing beaches and other sites of memory frequented by tourists. The next section presents approaches and issues to triangulating the data.

**Triangulation**

Triangulation involves improving the credibility of data interpretation (Guba & Lincoln, p.305), attained by looking at the research aim from more than one source of data (Decrop 1999,p.158). Two elements of triangulation, sources and methods, (Denzin 1978) are addressed here, with methods already discussed in Chapter One.

- **Sources:** visitors, tour guides, site managers, veterans and the local voice were accessed. A core set of questions for each of these groups, allowing each to consider issues related to this research.
- **Methods:** the ethnographic approach involved participant observation of guided tours, semi structured interviews, reflexive experiences at commemorative events and in the landscape of war, along with an online comment repository

This criterion refers to the ability to verify the interpretation of raw data. Data is collected and stored in electronic form or in notebooks, with nearly every interview digitally recorded and then transcribed into English. As Wolcott (1999) recommends, note taking was reviewed and typed out in the evening while still fresh in the mind, triggering further ideas. In addition, digital photography was used to ‘capture’ scenes that could later be used as
supporting data for written notes, along with maps, brochures and other tourist literature.

Similar to external validity, transferability applies to naturalistic inquiry and is dependent upon thick description ‘to enable someone interested in making a transfer to reach a conclusion about whether transfer can be contemplated as a possibility’ (Guba & Lincoln, p.316). Thick description is achieved by way of the literature review and in the analysis by giving voice to those interviewed, providing excerpts from reflexive journals, using photography to illustrate various phenomena and to give a visual dimension to phenomena and places experienced.

Finally, confirmability, the criterion of trustworthiness concerned with verifying that the conclusions are supported by the data and the process of its analysis. This is available upon request and stored as a digital voice, digital photograph or word processing file, as well as field notes in notebook form. The methods of data reduction and analysis and synthesis are also available.

Ethical Issues

From the perspective of accessibility to observing visitors, site managers insisted that the integrity of the experience not be impacted. Written permission to engage in survey solicitation was denied by the American Battle Monuments Commission, responsible for the Normandy American Cemetery, as well as the Juno Beach Centre. An alternative, to provide assistance in distributing online comment repository business cards, was also not approved. However, unobtrusive observation was permitted in both the cemetery and museums. Ultimately, based on the adoption of observation and interaction with visitors on guided bus tours, interviews with visitors and the online comment repository, the challenge of not being able to speak to people on site was overcome. Taking photographs of those in the cemetery was conducted in a manner so as to maintain anonymity and privacy of individuals (see Padgitt 1985; Davidov 2004). Specifically, this involved taking pictures from behind the visitor as well as at a distance.
For the bus tours, a short announcement was made at the beginning of the tour that research was being conducted, inviting people to discuss their thoughts with the researcher over the course of the day if they wished. A rapport with various individuals typically evolved as the tour progressed, resulting in thoughtful discussion on the bus between stops as well as at sites. A more unobtrusive stance was taken at cemeteries and museums, opting to observe individuals from afar and then chatting with them upon returning to the bus. In presenting respondent views in the analysis, pseudonyms or just the first names were used to hide the identity of individuals. However, some site managers and guides permitted being recognized by name and title.

**Research Evaluation**

The ethnographic approach was employed involving observation of guided bus tours, visiting various sites of memory and museums as well as participating in commemorations. In addition, reflexive journaling, interviews with key informants, analysis of travel guide books and an online visitor response tool were also used. Fieldwork took place in the Normandy landscape of war over four years representing seven weeks of field experience targeted around the time of the June 6th commemoration. The time of year represented a high point in the annual commemorative calendar and for tourism, facilitating observation of not only tourists engaged in guided tours and visiting sites, but also participating in commemorative events.

Whereas the fieldwork involving the tourism aspect of this research ceased upon departing Normandy, acts of remembrance and engagement with the cultural memories of war continued in Canada through meeting with veterans, attending commemorative services and watching films and documentaries. In this context, the ethnographic notion of fieldwork was blurred, as the cultural phenomenon involving formal and informal acts of remembering continued beyond the field. Whereas the focus of this research does not entail considering this aspect of the research experience, it did provide both a constant reminder of what remembrance involves as well as to indicate how
remembrance through tourism provides a complementary yet more intense and resonating act of remembrance.

This does raise some thoughts regarding the meaning of fieldwork, particularly with regard to researching a cultural act such as remembrance. Remembrance is a ritual act that is shared by several countries. Whereas fieldwork is about exploring what is happening that is located in a certain setting, fieldwork that explores remembrance involves a place of the mind and spirit.

The research process was characterized as emergent, with ideas and directions becoming evident only as fieldwork commenced or upon conducting interviews. There are two challenges faced when researching visitor performance at a thanatourism site. First, sites such as cemeteries are typically toured in silence, as people contemplate what they are experiencing: intrusion during these moments would be unethical. Access was not granted at cemeteries or in museums to survey visitors, although observation was allowed. Second, there is a level of ontological insecurity (see Stone 2009) that results in experiencing sites associated with death, reflected in deeply personal and perhaps unconscious thoughts about death (see also Rosenblatt et al. 1989). The methodological challenge involves accessing what people are really thinking about a site. Thus, the challenge was to design a method that facilitated a more personal level of interaction with visitors that offered time for discussion.

Following Gatewood and Cameron (2004) and Yaguchi (2005) who conducted visitor surveys in the car parks of Gettysburg and Pearl Harbor, taking guided bus tours was viewed as a more appropriate method to gain insight into visitor reactions over a number of sites of memory. Rather than a single multi-day battlefield tour as experienced by Seaton (200; 2002) and Iles (2006; 2008), 13 single day trips were experienced involving various tour companies resulting in extended interaction with upwards of 100 visitors. This provided for a broader comparative set of data, allowing for empirical examination of conceptual
battlefield tourism models presented by Baldwin and Sharpley (2009), to explore questions about visitor motivations and why some sites were believed to have a more powerful sense of place than other sites. The drawback of the method is the cost, at 45 (half-day) to 80 (full-day) Euros a tour. The cost was rationalized in that it provided intensive exposure to visitors engaged in the performance of remembering, concentrating the fieldwork in a shorter amount of time.

Other methods involved post trip interviewing and an online commentary tool. Employing these three methods to collect commentary across time, - in the moment, immediately after and post trip meaning-making, allowed for a rich range of spontaneous thoughts, reflections and discussion. The ability to speak French facilitated additional interactions with site managers and locals. Engaging in field work with an understanding of French avoided some of the pitfalls of other researchers in Normandy, such as Diller and Scofidio (1994) and Torgovnick (2005): without the local language, their ability to understand the local perspective and the views of French management was not possible. Translation was a time consuming project, and involved the employment of a second translator to verify certain passages. Where there were doubts as to the nuance of meaning of a term, it was noted in the transcript and not employed in the research.

At times, the research represented a challenge in balancing ‘honest ethnography’ and local ‘micropolitics’ (Scheper-Hughes 2000, p. 117). This is particularly the case in the Canadian landscape of war. Whereas anonymity was maintained when requested, the community of tour operators and managers was small. On several occasions, interviewees would note, ‘I can tell you this because I have mentioned it to the Board [or] to [a certain person].’ Other individuals spoke their mind, often involving quite critical commentary. Providing multiple voices to describe a particular issue allowed the research to keep to the broad-based critique and not rest on the discontent of any one individual. What was also kept in mind was that the research focused on
understanding the tourism and remembrance relationship, as opposed to deconstructing local controversies regarding war memory.

Working with Canadian and British war memories resulted in some reflections regarding positionality as a first-generation Canadian. Henry (2003) raises this question when she discusses the challenge of responding to the question, ‘where are you really from?’

In my case, experiencing various sites of memory caused reflections as to my own parents’ experience living through the Blitz and the stories I learned in my early life related to the British cultural memory of war. The Canadian war experience is more of an adopted heritage, owing to my involvement in the Canadian military and by living in the Canadian milieu for most of my life. The result was feelings of kinship in the landscape of war with both British and Canadian war mythologies. Although the research was too expansive to allow for focus on this element of the field experience, it does demonstrate the intensely personal nature of both thanatourism research and of the reflections of identity evoked in a landscape of war.

Conclusion

This chapter has provided a detailed overview of the methodology and research design. The fieldwork focused on the Normandy landscape of war, observing guided bus tours and complemented by reflexivity. Interviews of the voices of the heritage force field, along with an online comment repository, were also employed. The limitations to the scope of the research were as follows:

- Comparisons between Canadian, British and American tourist perspectives can only be inferred, as most visitor respondents were either Canadian or American;
Interviewing veterans and visitors was a random sample often based on self-selection of the veteran and visitors. Their views may therefore not be representative of all visitors and Normandy veterans.

The research approach is informed by lessons learned from other than tourism related field research, and attempted to go beyond those approaches to ensure a broad theoretical perspective that incorporate multiple voices and dimensions in the tourism-remembrance relationship. As a result, the research provided a broader understanding on the subject. The following chapters provide an analysis of the research conducted.
CHAPTER 6. Exploring Context: Remembrance and Tourism in Normandy
Introduction

This chapter examines the contemporary context of Normandy as a remembrance tourism destination. This includes examination of the French legislative and organizational institutions that manage the memorialization of the landscape of war, their role as well as the relationship to tourism. By doing so, the examination contributes to knowledge by confirming and expanding upon the work of Edwards (2009) who examined the evolution of consumption and commemoration in Normandy from 1945-1994.

This chapter further provides a critical contextual dimension regarding remembrance and tourism by considering the role of the host nation in the management of collective remembrance in the region. This provides an opportunity to consider Seaton’s (2009a) concept of the management force field, as described in Chapter Three, to better understand how the existing management context informs the relationship between tourism and remembrance. As well, it acknowledges what Edensor notes (1998, p. 203) regarding the importance of understanding the context of how the landscape of war is ‘managed, regulated and bounded … within with groups and individuals manoeuvre.’ The opportunity here is to reveal another dimension involved in the tourism – remembrance relationship: its management as a destination of war memory.

The chapter is structured as follows. First, visitor statistics allow for comparison between international war-related sites. This examination provides perspective on the scale of tourism to Normandy’s landscape of war as a means to understand its significance as a site of remembrance. Second, post-war French legislation is examined to consider the relationship between commemoration, tourism and the involvement of the state. Third, the role of French agencies responsible for Normandy as a destination of war memory is examined.
Visitor Numbers and Tourism Management of the Normandy Landscape of War

In addition to battlefield tourism, Normandy’s main attractions are the heritage of William the Conqueror, who invaded England in 1066, and the sandy beaches which are a popular destination for summer family vacations. In 2007, Normandy was the eighth most visited region in France, and sixth in terms of excursions (Normandy 2008). The total number of visitors to Normandy, tourists and excursionists, is placed at around four million visitors annually, of which 25% are international (Normandy 2008). As Table 10 indicates, of the total number of paid entrance fees for all tourism attractions, 33% are dedicated to battlefield tourism related sites in what is known as the Espace Historique, or Historic Area of the Battle of Normandy, making it the top attraction theme in Normandy.

![Pie chart showing visitor numbers by attraction themes in Normandy 2006-2007](image)

Table 10: Visitor numbers by attraction themes in Normandy 2006-2007 (adapted from Normandy 2008 original in colour).

In Lower Normandy, there are over 500 memorials, museums, monuments and sites, more than in the World War I regions of the Somme and Ypres combined (Holt & Holt 2010). It is therefore the most memorialized landscape of World
War II, if not of the two world wars. The most visited site in Normandy’s landscape of war is the Normandy American Cemetery (NAC), receiving close to 1.5 million visitors in 2007, placing it in the top 10 most visited sites in France (Bayeux-Bassin statistics 2007).

While the Normandy landscape of war is significant in terms of visitor numbers within Normandy, it is also significant when compared to other war-related sites. Table 11 offers a comparison between major sites of war from the American Civil War, World War I and World War II. To represent Normandy’s landscape of war, data from the two most visited sites, the Normandy American Cemetery and the D-Day Museum at Arromanches, are used.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gettysburg National Historic Battlefield, US Civil War</th>
<th>Pearl Harbor National Historic Battlefield, WW II</th>
<th>Normandy American Cemetery, WW II</th>
<th>Hiroshima Peace Memorial Museum, WW II</th>
<th>Auschwitz-Berkenwald Memorial, WW II</th>
<th>D-Day Museum, Arromanches, WW II</th>
<th>Ypres War Museum, Flanders, WW II</th>
<th>Thiepval Interpretive Center, Somme, WW I</th>
<th>Historic de la grande guerre Peronne, Somme, WW I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1200000</td>
<td>1400000</td>
<td>1600000</td>
<td>1800000</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>2200000</td>
<td>2400000</td>
<td>2600000</td>
<td>2800000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1250000</td>
<td>1450000</td>
<td>1700000</td>
<td>1850000</td>
<td>2050000</td>
<td>2250000</td>
<td>2450000</td>
<td>2650000</td>
<td>2850000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1300000</td>
<td>1500000</td>
<td>1750000</td>
<td>1900000</td>
<td>2100000</td>
<td>2300000</td>
<td>2500000</td>
<td>2700000</td>
<td>2900000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1350000</td>
<td>1550000</td>
<td>1800000</td>
<td>1950000</td>
<td>2150000</td>
<td>2350000</td>
<td>2550000</td>
<td>2750000</td>
<td>2950000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1400000</td>
<td>1600000</td>
<td>1850000</td>
<td>2000000</td>
<td>2200000</td>
<td>2400000</td>
<td>2600000</td>
<td>2800000</td>
<td>3000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1450000</td>
<td>1650000</td>
<td>1900000</td>
<td>2050000</td>
<td>2250000</td>
<td>2450000</td>
<td>2650000</td>
<td>2850000</td>
<td>3050000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11: Visitor numbers to war-related sites 2004-2008 (see endnote for sources original in colour).

World War II sites – Auschwitz-Berkenwald concentration camp, the Hiroshima Peace Memorial, the Pearl Harbor National Historic Battlefield and the Normandy American Cemetery – all attract over a million visitors. The data
provides a sense of the popularity of these World War II sites, each representing a different war memory. In response to the claim by Valene Smith (1998) that tourism related to war is the largest attraction in tourism, the kind of information presented here provides some empirical evidence, but that particular question remains beyond the scope of this thesis.

What is emphasized here is to position Normandy relative to other sites of war memory in the world. Winter (2006) views Hiroshima and the Holocaust as the predominant memories of World War II, memories that are separate and distinct from the traditions of remembrance fostered and evolved from World War I. Based on visitor numbers, it is argued that D-Day is also prominent memory of World War II, distinct in that it represents collective effort against Naziism, the zenith of World War II era military planning in its sheer scale and technology employed. As well, D-Day represents the liberation of France and the beginning of the final chapter of war in Western Europe. It also is an event that took place before the Holocaust was publicly known and before the atomic age had dawned. Thus, the legend of D-Day is a popular and highly celebrated war memory, distinct in that it is a less traumatic narrative than the other two events.

Prominent World War I sites where collect data are collected: Ypres War Museum, Thiepval Interpretive Center in the Somme and the Historial de la grande guerre in Péronne, sites that are a major focus in the literature with regard to battlefield tourism and remembrance. All of the sites experience relatively the same level of visitors. Without statistics from the 1970s, the same duration after the Great War as 2010 is to 1944, it is difficult to conclude whether World War II sites will ultimately experience the same evolution in visitor numbers. However, the data from the Gettysburg National Historic Battlefield, with over 1.5 million visitors annually (National Parks Service 2009), indicates that there is more involved in maintaining remembrance than simply the passage of time. Perhaps the data indicates the evolving significance of Gettysburg as a contemporary site of memory, made relevant by 9-11 and the war on terror as Chronis (2008) suggests. What it does indicate is that time
does not necessarily lead to the inevitable and permanent decrease in visitors to preserved battlefields.

Whereas the data convey a sense of scale, they do not indicate the actual significance or meaning of each place. However, the comparison does expose an oversight in research into the Normandy landscape of war: it is a significant site of remembrance, yet there is little research that thoroughly examines what is happening there. Part of the reason for this is the sheer size and complexity of the landscape. Figure 19 presents a map of major sites of memory, specifically cemeteries, indicated by a cross, and museums and sites related to the battle, indicated by either a number or a cross. Some museums are quite small, dedicated to what Joly (2000) describes as the local micro narratives of the war. What this reflects is the historic relevance of the area for several nations as well as the local population, the scale of the battle and the countless stories and perspectives associated with 80 days that resulted in the liberation of France.

Figure 19: Sites, museums and cemeteries of the Battle of Normandy (Normandie Mémoire original in colour).
Table 12 presents the various museums and sites, including those relevant to this research.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>D-Day Museum, Arromanches</th>
<th>Arromanches 360 Cinema</th>
<th>Airborne Museum, Ste Mere Eglise</th>
<th>Mémorial Pegasus, Ranville</th>
<th>Omaha Beach Memorial Museum, ST Laurent sur Mer</th>
<th>Utah Beach Museum</th>
<th>Centre Juno Beach Center, Courseulles sur Mer</th>
<th>Dead Man’s Corner Museum, Saint Come du Mont</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12: Visitor numbers to D-Day-related museums 1993 1999-2009 (adapted from statistics provided by Normandie Mémoire 2010 original in colour).

The museums in Table 12 represent the main museums and the ones relevant to this research. In comparison with the 1.5 million who visit the American Cemetery, around 300,000 visit the Arromanches D-Day Museum, indicating that many visit the landscape of war without necessarily going to the museums. However, Normandie Mémoire indicate that tourists visit on average 2.5 museums during their stay, with the major hub museums being the Arromanches D-Day Museum, Ste Mere Eglise Airborne Museum and Pegasus Memorial Museum (Normandie Pass 2007). Aside from these sites that tell the
British and American stories of the battle, the Juno Beach Centre is the main hub site in the Canadian sector, and is therefore important to this research, although receiving significantly fewer visitors. Cinema 360 near Arromanches is also a popular site, and as a film, represents a different form of tourist attraction. Nevertheless, it is briefly examined in Chapter Nine.

As the oldest museum in the Normandy landscape of war, the D-Day Museum in Arromanches can be employed as a proxy to reveal the evolution of tourism since 1954 (Table 13).

![Graph showing visitor numbers to the D-Day Museum in Arromanches 1954-2009](image)


Aside from the decline experienced in the late 1960s, visitor numbers to the museum and the region as a whole have steadily increased over the years. The 40th, 50th and 60th anniversary commemorations are notable peaks, when many veterans were deciding to return with family and friends, along with international media attention (see National Broadcasting Commission 1984; Brinkley 2005). In an interview, the site manager predicts that the museum will remain ‘stable’ at 300,000 visitors a year, placing it in the top 20 cultural attractions in France. The museum owes its existence to post-war legislation that established a plan for its development, along with the other hub museums...
mentioned above. Given the role of the state in memorializing the landscape of war as well as in developing tourism, the following section examines the content and intent of national legislation that married tourism and remembrance.

Post-War French Legislation

The link between tourism, commemoration and remembrance is found in legislation as early as 1947. *Proposed Resolution No. 519 of February 1947*, by the representative from Bayeux, Mr. Triboulet, called on the national government to 'commemorate the landings of June 6 1944 and to upgrade the tourism facilities in the landing zone' (Assemblée Nationale 1947a, p. 1). In May, *The law for the conservation of remembrance of the allied D-Day landings* (Assemblée Nationale 1947b), established funding and priorities for infrastructure, both to memorialize and the landscape as well as to establish tourism as a function of remembrance. Six objectives were identified in the government order:

1. Clear war debris and to conserve sites, specifically mentioned are Arromanches and the artificial harbor, Omaha Beach and Utah Beach;
2. Provide coordination and regulation of private memorials in order to address the 'great disorder that reins.' (Assemblée Nationale 1947b, p. 4) As well, a series of official monuments would be established;
3. Construct the D-Day Museum at Arromanches;
4. Mark the D-Day landing route, later to become the Liberty Route (see Michelin 1948);
5. Launch a 'propagande du souvenir', effectively the marketing of Normandy in France and overseas as a 'place of pilgrimage' (p. 5); and;
6. Allocate financial resources for roadworks and to 'reconstruct as fast as possible all the hotels' (p. 5) 'to ensure the accommodation of pilgrims' (p. 152) while noting the need to avoid speculators looking
to make money. This ‘would be scandalous in an enterprise having as its goal an ethos of remembrance.’ (p. 5)

The law represents the establishment of an authorized heritage discourse (see Smith 2006), fuelled by political necessity to re-position French war memory. As Farmer’s (1999) work on the memorialization of Oradour-sur-Glane attests, the post-war government found itself needing to come to terms with the legacy of collaborators and the Vichy Government. Gordon (2001) argues that a heritage of resistance leading to liberation was promoted by the post-war French government. This messaging is exemplified in the image of the 1947 promotional poster for the national railway (SNCF) in Figure 20, for the French to experience its war heritage of liberation by visiting the landing beaches.

Figure 20: Image of a promotional poster of the landing beaches of Normandy 1947 (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).
Associated with this campaign was the construction of road markers (Figure 21), that formed the Voie de la liberté (Liberty Route) constructed through Normandy. Michelin also published a map called *The liberty route* (1947) that provided memorials and the allied line of advance at key moments during the 1944 campaign.

![Liberty Way marker ‘KM OO’ at Utah Beach](image)

**Figure 21:** Liberty Way marker ‘KM OO’ at Utah Beach (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The legislation also represents a detailed action aimed at both memorializing the Normandy landscape as well as establishing the infrastructure for tourism. Whereas there are clearly ideological undertones to the state’s involvement (Gordon 2001), it can also be argued that the French were already aware of the popularity of war pilgrimage in the 1920’s and 1930’s (see Lloyd 1998). Battlefields such as Verdun, the Somme all experienced state memorialization and construction. Edwards (2009) views the legislation as a fusing of commercialization with remembrance. However, it also reflects an awareness of and sensitivity to the conflict between commercialism and remembrance, with controls put into place to curtail the haphazard construction of memorials and other forms of development. In effect, the legislation reflects political, economic and social goals, the refashioning of French war memory, the rebuilding of post war Normandy and the need to remember in an appropriate
manner. Rather than a ‘refashioning’ of history and memory by tourists (see Holsey 2008), it was the state that aimed to actively play a role. However, its implementation was essentially left in the hands of local authorities, namely the D-Day Commemoration Committee and its off-shoot, Normandie Mémoire. Their roles are examined below.

The Committee of the D-Day Landings and Normandie Mémoire

The Comité du débarquement, translated as the Committee of the D-Day Landings, is officially made up of national, regional and local elected officials totaling about 300 members, reflective of the geographic scale of the battle as well as ownership of the memory. Since its inception in 1947, the Committee has initiated a range of activities to memorialize and commemorate D-Day, primarily in the form of memorial and museum construction and annual commemorations. Contributions from American and British government grants added to the funds accrued from the scrap metal from the artificial port at Omaha Beach partially funded the construction of the D-Day museum in Arromanches that opened in 1954. Three additional museums were constructed: the Utah Beach Memorial Museum (1962), the American Airborne Museum in Ste Mère Eglise (1964) and the Pegasus Memorial Museum, first in Benouville and then relocated to a new building 400 metres away in Ranville (1974, relocation in 2000). However, Joly (2000) notes that the state did not provide funding for war museums, owing to political sensitivities. The Committee of the D-Day Landings was therefore left on its own to raise funding, mostly from scrap metal of the artificial harbor and then later through museum revenue.

In 2002, Normandie Mémoire was created, responsible for coordinating the 80 days worth of commemorations to mark the Battle of Normandy. As Admiral Brac de la Perrière, Chairman of the Committee of the D-Day Landings and President of Normandie Mémoire explains in an interview: ‘I wanted people to celebrate not only the landing itself, but the Battle of Normandy as a whole, that went on for 80 days until August 24 1944…. So, to do all that, I created an association, Normandie Mémoire’ (translated interview).
He goes on to define its role as follows:

Normandie Mémoire looks after two things: the commemoration of the Battle of Normandy, the relations with the veterans, the civilian victims of the war, the resistors, the return of the people that were deported, everything that has to do with the memory of the Second World War in Lower Normandy. And another thing, we took charge of the federation of sites and museums, representing 31 sites.

Referring to the last point, the Historic Area (Figure 22) is a series of war heritage trails created in 1994, marked with totems (Figure 23). Similar to the Somme Heritage Trail, the Normandy routes incorporate key sites in the landscape of war – museums, memorials, relics of war, battlefields and cemeteries. As a means to generate tourism around the region, the three tourism departments of Lower Normandy hired a consultant to design and package the eight routes. Frederique Guerin, the Secretary-General of Normandie Mémoire explains, the intention was ‘to turn those places of pilgrimage into places for remembrance tourism’ (translated interview). In 2005, the entity called Historic Area of the Battle of Normandy was dissolved, with its mandate of partnering with museums and other war heritage sites absorbed into Normandie Mémoire.
Figure 22: Historic Area of the Battle of Normandy (Source: Courtesy of Normandie Mémoire original in colour).

More formally, the role of Normandie Mémoire is defined as follows:

… to conduct any action enhancing the Espace Historique… with the mission of enhancing the local operators to participate in the improvement and overall attractiveness of the sites and museums, to bring the resources to guarantee the historical truth/verity in all the interpretations of the Battle of Normandy, to promote the deepening of historical research and [museum related efforts] (translated from information brochure).
Figure 23: Historic Area totem with map noting roads and key sites in the landscape of war (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

Hence, Normandie Mémoire is a different kind of mediating agency. To paraphrase the definition of worldmaking as provided by Hollinshead (2007, p. 430) Normandie Mémoire is actively engaged in the process of making and representing the war memory of Normandy. Several examples are provided here that exemplify its role and the employment of tourism.

First, Prost (1998, p. 394) notes the necessity to organize commemoration once the living memory of the battle passes on, in effect, replacing ‘fervour with history.’ In addition to coordinating commemorations and promoting remembrance, Normandie Mémoire is embarking on the development of a museum quality assurance scheme, a reflection that remembrance is more dependent on the teachings of history and that there are some small museums that need assistance in the quality of their exhibits. In addition, extensive visitor data is collected annually to help museums plan and market.
Second, in 2008, Normandie Mémoire published a document entitled *The Good Conduct Charter for Collectors and Re-Enactors*. Given a range of unfortunate incidents in Norman towns where re-enactors dressed in Nazi uniforms insulted local townspeople and veterans, the code was created to ‘remind everyone… of the legal provisions and rules of dress and behavior….’ (Normandie Mémoire 2008, introduction). Its purpose is to ‘ensure respect for those who came to liberate Europe and the spirit of the places where that liberation took place’ (Normandie Mémoire). The document aims to control the ‘…uniforms and accoutrements likely to cause offence and breaches of the peace, due to the memories of historical events that such uniforms and accoutrements evoke, is generally prohibited’ (Normandie Mémoire, Article 5). The document conveys the tone of commemoration as espoused by The Committee and Normandie Mémoire:

> The celebration of these historic days must in no way be considered a glorification of war. The military deeds alone must never become the focus of events or displays. Respect for this memory is a vector of humanism, conveying a message of peace, of friendship between peoples, democracy and freedom in the name of the military and civilian victims who paid for these values with their blood. (2008, p. 2)

In this context, Normandie Mémoire is addressing the issue of auratic quality of the Normandy landscape of war, as it is impacted by visitor behavior. This represents another aspect of the heritage force field, whereby visitor behavior is regulated to maintain the auratic quality of the sites. As well, the action reflects a clear moral stance as to what is deemed appropriate with regard to what is remembered and how it is remembered (see Blustein 2008).

Whereas these initiatives may reflect the power of the state in directing remembrance, Normandie Mémoire must also promote remembrance to the state itself, evident in the planning for 65th D-Day commemorations in 2009. In applying for funding for extra staff, Ms. Guerin explains her proposal to local French authorities, where she ‘had to compete with the local Apple Festival’ (personal communication, 2009). Her frustration palatable, she notes that it was not until the Spring that the reticence of French officials to recognize the
popularity of the 65th D-Day commemorations was reversed, initiated by the sudden involvement of United States President Barak Obama and other heads-of-state. In this context, the awareness of the popularity of the commemoration and the anticipated increase in visitors to the area was argued by Normandie Mémoire, forcing government agencies to react and acknowledge its significance.

**Conclusion**

As of 2009, tourism to the Historic Area is a significant aspect of Normandy’s tourism attractions, and is one of the most visited landscapes of war in the world. It is also unique in its position as a war heritage site for several countries. The richness of war heritage is reflected in the number of sites and museums in the region. Certain larger hub museums are focal points for visitors to the landscape of war, but it is the Normandy American Cemetery and the adjacent Omaha Beach that are the principle draws for many visitors.

Winter (2009) argues that the predominant memories of World War II are Hiroshima and Auschwitz. The popularity of visiting the Normandy landscape of war calls for recognition of D-Day as a significant war memory. It is distinct from the other two in that it recalls the liberation of Europe and the collective action to defeat Nazism. Whereas D-Day is part of the larger history of the war, its memory is of an epic military campaign.

The research provided by Normandie Memoire indicates 1.5 million visitors to the Normandy American Cemetery, with just over 300,000 visiting the most popular museum, the D-Day Museum in Arromanches. This indicates that touring sites of memory such as the American Cemetery, Omaha Beach and Pointe-du-Hoc, are experienced more so than what is offered by museums. This suggests that it is the sense of place, and its perceived authenticity, that people wish to experience.

The historic role of the Committee of the Landing was established by the Government of France. It is clear from reading the laws that the state played
an active role in constructing sites of memory, both in conserving certain sites as well as funding memorials and museums. Tourism is enacted as a formal mechanism for remembrance in Normandy, with the funding of roadworks, hotels and a marketing campaign. Rather than a fusing of commercialism and commemoration as Edwards (2009) argues, the legislation outlines controls upon how remembrance and tourism are to be managed. The management of tourism is further illustrated by the work of Normandie Mémoire and the *Good Conduct Charter for Collectors and Re-Enactors that* established both guidelines and laws for appropriate visitor behaviour.

It is noted that the state and other levels of government are becoming more reactive than proactive to annual Battle of Normandy commemorations. Normandie Mémoire plays a role of a remembrance advocate, lobbying local government agencies for funding. This reflects the French state’s growing detachment with regard to World War II commemoration, leaving much of the commemorative planning and infrastructure to Normandie Mémoire. It is therefore ironic that, despite its funding coming from the French state, the organization plays such an important role in preserving the war memory of other nations involved in the battle.

The institutionalization of remembrance involves the alignment and collaboration of commemorative activities involving the various national memories of the war. In addition, Normandie Mémoire must combat forces which distort, silence or forget war memory. An example of this is re-enactors dressed in German military uniform who recreated the German occupation in Norman villages. The *Good Conduct Charter* is perhaps unique for a landscape of war, establishing what is deemed an appropriate and respectful tone to remembrance.

The concept of a heritage force is employed by Seaton (2009a) and Sharpley (2009a) to refer to a specific thanatourism site. The context in Normandy suggests the need to consider the forces of the heritage force field within the larger scope of the destination, with regard to various cultural memories of war,
as well as with regard to specific sites. Given their role, Normandie Mémoire is an important entity in the heritage force field, working with various levels of government, site management, international governments and visiting veterans’ groups.

In addition, Normandie Mémoire and the Committee of the Landing can be characterized as a significant element in worldmaking of Normandy’s war heritage. In effect, these related organizations ‘make’ the destination by way of legislation, organizing commemorations, marketing and lobbying in the interests of remembrance. The next chapter focuses on travel guide books and tour guides as mediating agencies.
CHAPTER 7. Mediating the Visitor Experience in the Landscape of War: Travel Guide Books and Tour Guides
Introduction

This chapter examines how cultural memories of war are represented in the landscape of war by tourism mediating agencies, in this case travel guide books and guided tours. This examination therefore focuses on responding to the context of what is remembered.

A range of generalist and specialist guide books are reviewed, reflecting various publication dates as well as perspectives. The examination reveals:

- The key themes emphasized in the guide book summaries and how these reflect cultural memories of war;
- Itineraries and recommendations as to what to see and do in the landscape of war.

Generalist and specialist guided tours are also examined. It is clear from Seaton (2000), Chronis & Hampton (2008), Iles (2008) and Caroline Winter (2010) that battlefield tour guides contribute to the tourism experience by providing historically accurate context, involving personal stories that are framed by visiting the landscape of war. The lacunae addressed here is with regard to how these mediating agencies contribute or conflict with remembrance. The discussion is divided into two parts:

- The tour theme, itinerary and content;
- The role, perceptions and techniques of specialist battlefield tour guides in interpreting the landscape of war.

Travel guide books represent an important mediator for tourists, yet they have their limitations, as discussed in the next section.
Representations of the Landscape of War and Cultural Memories in Travel Guide Books

Boussel (1966) wrote the first guidebook of the area, presenting a factual inventory of D-Day sites without prioritizing or recommending any particular sites over others. Since then, travel guide books have increased in both number as well as specialization. This section analyzes both generalist and specialist guide books as listed on page 150. What is important to note is how cultural memories are emphasized at the cost of others. Whereas the aim of The battlefields of Normandy: a visitor's guide (Copp and Bechthold 2008) is logically to focus on the Canadian war heritage, generalist guide books distort war memory to accommodate the interests of their reading audience.

For example, Rick Steves’ France (Steves and Smith 2008) offers a popular generalist account written primarily for an American audience, with some mention of sites of interest for a Canadian audience. Although focusing on all of Normandy, no mention is made of battles beyond June 6th. Rather, Steves and Smith (2008, p. 224-225) suggest 'one full day' for the D-Day area, with sites ‘listed … in the order of importance, with the most visit-worthy first.’ Their car tour recommends the following itinerary:

Begin on the cliffs above Arromanches and see the movie at the Arromanches 360 Theater to set your mood. Walk or drive…to the town and visit Port Winston and the D-Day Landing Museum, then continue west to Longues-sur-Mer. Spend your afternoon visiting the American Cemetery, walking on the beach at Vierville-sur-Mer [Omaha Beach], and seeing the Pointe-du-Hoc Ranger Monument. Make a quick stop at the German Military Cemetery on your way back.

The itinerary is typical of narratives found in Michelin (2000) and Let’s go France (O’Brien 2009). Through their writing, Steves and Smith mark the terrain in a manner that has relevance to a particular audience. As Smith (1986) notes, this form of tourism mapping has embedded within it certain values and beliefs, what he describes as ‘maps and moralities’ and a reflection of the nation’s moral outlook. An American perspective therefore emphasizes American sites, such as the Normandy American Cemetery and Omaha Beach,
receiving their highest ‘don’t miss’ rating (Steves & Smith 2008, p.231-232). Amidst the other sites listed in their narrative, the German cemetery is rated as ‘worthwhile if you can make it’, and the Canadian cemetery is ‘worth knowing about’ (p. 232).

_The Rough guide to Normandy and Brittany_ (Ward 1997) allows for consideration of a more internationally distributed guide book. Laderman (2009) notes the inherent biases of guide book narrative, the brevity of the text leading to oversimplified and blurred interpretations of history. For example, Ward notes ‘[t]hat the invasion happened here, and not nearer to Germany, was partly due to the failure of the Canadian raid on Dieppe in 1942. The ensuing Battle of Normandy killed thousands of civilians….’ (1997, p. 109-110). This narrative cannot only be construed as inferring Dieppe as a purely Canadian failure, but that the civilians killed could have been avoided had Dieppe been successful. The objectives of the raid on Dieppe are many, from demonstrating to the Soviets that the western allies were taking action to invade the continent, to testing out the German defenses of a port. Canadian authors note that the Dieppe raid was under British command, and point to their far-reaching ineptitude that led to the loss of so many Canadians (see Neillands 2005). From a Canadian perspective, Ward’s narrative aggravates a dark memory in Canada’s war memory.

The media can also represent what Hollinshead (2007, p. 430) describes as the false imaginative processes that unconsciously ‘privilege’ a certain representation of the past and place. For example, in some generalist guide books from Britain, Juno Beach is referred to as ‘a crucial British beachhead’ (Ward, p. 115), although it was a Canadian beach but under British command. For Canadians, battlefields such as Juno and Vimy Ridge in World War II represent national independence and free of colonial status under Great Britain. The commentary reflects how the media can be a negative force in the heritage force field by feeding discrepancies that are ingested into the cultural memories of war.
An example of privileging is how Ward emphasizes British sites, such as the Bayeux Cemetery, listing the beach towns dotted along Sword Beach. This is in contrast to the American perspective that views the British area as ‘overbuilt with resorts, making it harder to re-create the event of June 1944’ (Steves & Smith 2008, p. 224). Ward provides more of a critique of the sites than various Lonely Planet issues (Oliver et al. 2003; Williams et al. 2007) and Thomas Cook (Rice & Rice 2005). For example, he takes aim at the American cemetery as ‘endless rows of impersonal graves …no individual epitaphs, just gold lettering for a few exceptional warriors’ (1997, p.114). Whereas the Commonwealth War Graves are ‘understated and touching’ (Ward 1997, p. 121), he describes the American Cemetery as,

…so much like a balance sheet or corporate report, it seems something more than a mere difference of emphasis; the American cemetery is the only one where placards tell visitors where to walk, what to wear and how to behave’ (114).

This kind of perspective found in general guide books reflects what Laderman (2008) argues as a national or western bias of history and the semilogic interpretations of the landscape.

Another theme found in the guide books is the referencing to war films. For example, Rice and Rice (2005, p. 248) offer a typical narrative:

Casualties were heaviest on Omaha Beach, where US forces only won the day after displaying extraordinary tenacity and courage. (The full story is told graphically in Steven Spielberg’s film Saving Private Ryan). The beachheads at Sword, Juno and Gold, on the other hand, were secured with much less difficulty.…

In this context, the film represents the story of what happened on all the landing beaches and is employed by Rice and Rice as an historical account, rather than seen as an artistic license with history, as argued by Bodnar (2001). References to the other beaches as lesser sites are compounded by the mythic status of Omaha Beach. As one tour guide observed when interviewed: ‘When you read a potted guide [a generalist guide], the Brits and Canadians had it easy’ (Stuart).
Generalist guide books are used by visitors to provide an initial overview of what is important at a destination. Designed for a specific audience, the brief narrative often conveys certain biases as to the interpretation of history, the role of nations in the war. By categorizing or grading sites, generalist guide books prioritize what is to be remembered, typically emphasizing national perspective. Such an approach enforces national myths at the cost of understanding the larger context of the battle and its history. Specialized travel guide books allow for a more detailed analysis of the battlefield and its history and are assessed in the next section.

**Specialist Guide Books**

Specialist guides books are distinguished from generalist guide books not only in the amount of detail, but in how touring the area is recommended. In an interview, a specialist author explains the approach employed in his guide book, ‘The routes are chosen, to try and add to the tour experience. The route follows an advance for example … with various points along that route, such as monument and memorials and so on, particular scenes of action’ (Rennie)

This is an important difference between generalist and specialist guide books because, as Siegenthaler (2002) argues, guide books are mostly used to set an itinerary. Holt and Holt (2004), Clark (2004) and Shilleto and Tolhurst (2004) are examples of guide books offering a set of detailed itineraries of certain sectors of the Normandy landscape of war, geographically and thematically anchored by the landing beaches and landing zones and therefore by nationality. These guide books provide a greater amount of historical information by using contemporary and 1944 photographs, so-called ‘then and now’ images, along with military and tourist maps that serve to spatially and temporally situate the visitor in the landscape of war. For example, a typical specialist guide map identifies all of the museums, monuments, memorials and cemeteries, providing a sense of the density of memory in the landscape (Figure 24).
Often, authors argue that a better understanding of military history is gained only by visiting the landscape of war. For example, Hunter and Brown (1973) note the main reason for writing a book on D-Day is because ‘the story itself is still fascinating, while the battlefield can still be visited, and the one related to the other’ (p. 8). As Terry, a specialist author commented in an interview, ‘I can’t understand how you can write about the history of a battle without walking the landscape.’ However, with regard to emotional dimension of remembrance (White 2000), specialist guide books tend to avoid sentimentality. It is about getting there, identifying the marker, learning the history and moving on:

Continue along the D-514 and into Sallenelles. This is where the Belgian Piron Brigade first went into action. A memorial on a stone pillar, about thirty-five meters on the left after the crossroads, is
dedicated to the first Belgian soldier killed in Normandy. 450 meters beyond Sallenelles, as you continue toward….’ (Shilleto and Tolhurst, 2004, p. 38)

This typifies what one battlefield guide book author explained, ‘[y]ou can have a briefing on a guided tour, but with a guide book, you can tell them, but you can’t ease them into that frame of mind.’ This author is referring to the staging of a guided tour, where the guide is able to construct a certain ambiance through narrative, showing photographs and small objects and by playing music and video clips. This setting, referred to by Iles (2006) as mobile theatre, immerses the visitor in a form of sensory time travel that a guide book cannot achieve.

Johnson and Dunphie (1980, p.9) provide another perspective, one that reflects the enclavic perspective of the military, tinged with a nostalgia for war stories. Their book aims to expose ‘the reality of battle’, by way of veterans recounting their experiences ‘on the very ground where the action took place….’ (1980, p.9). However, like many military historians, the authors are quick to differentiate the seriousness of their mission: ‘(t)his was neither a holiday trip nor an exercise in nostalgia, but an essential part of the military education of young officers….’ (Johnson & Dunphie, p. 9) The gravity placed upon touring the battlefield is in contrast to the generalist narratives provided by authors such as Steves and Smith (2008) or Rice and Rice 2005. What this reflects is a variation and depth of meaning in the landscape that can be constructed by a mediating agency. This may in turn reflect the conceptual models of battlefield tourism as offered by Sharpley and Baldwin (2009), presented on pages 120-121. Generalist guides may be viewed as entry-level use for the curious tourist with little emotional attachment to World War II memory, whereas Johnson and Duthie (1980), with their attention to more detailed accounts, reflect a guide employed by a more connected visitor.
Holt and Holt (2004; 2010) provide the most extensive specialist guide, accompanied by a map of all memorials, plaques, museums and sites that marks the entire D-Day landing area. The authors note the evolution of memorialization in the area, a proliferation intensified by the major commemorations over the years. Also noted are the support and participation of local residents in remembrance, and the value of attending during the annual commemorative period, stating that:

Memorials are on the whole well maintained, ceremonies are well attended, by local people and Resistance workers and Free French standard bearers, often delightfully out of step, standards sometimes less than rigidly held, beret and Gauloise both at a jaunty angle, but with hearts in a very correct place. (Holt & Holt 2004, p.14)

Their book is one of the few that takes into account the local population, recognizing the role of local residents in maintaining the memory. Another approach is taken by Copp and Bechthold (2008) who represent a nation-specific specialist account of the battle, focusing on Canada. Their book is intended to,

…encourage Canadians to set out on their own journey to those places [in Normandy]; not just the landing beaches, memorials and museums, but the villages and fields where young Canadians fought with such bravery to liberate France from the yoke of Nazi tyranny. (Coop & Bechthold 2008, p.5)

Attention is placed on visiting sites marked by small memorials and belvederes, interpretive stands situated in the landscape that provide a geographic orientation, the history of a particular battle, and perhaps a human perspective in terms of a short story of an individual. At times, the narrative relies on orientating the reader/traveler by the use of aerial photos because there are no memorials or monuments to mark the landscape where an event occurred. This reflects a challenge for the person visiting Normandy: having enough time and a good enough map to orientate oneself in the landscape. This is one of several challenges to using a guide book as a mediating agency. As one visitor commented, ‘[t]he self-guided books are good, but you don’t get
all the richness and depths of the stories we’ve heard [on a guided tour]’ (Rick American)

Connecting with the battlefield is certainly a challenge for any guide book, owing to the fragmented way it is typically employed as well as its inability to contextualize the setting. Rennie, a guide book author, acknowledges, ‘…people rarely read guide books. They generally tend to choose bits and pieces. You don’t do that with a guided tour. You do that with a guide book.’ The fragmented use of the guide book reflects how touring the landscape is performed. While the specialist guide books attempt to employ the historical evolution of the battle to structure the tour itinerary, ‘GPS [geographic positioning system] is coming in now. A lot of people may just say, I will go to that and follow a GPS route, which means you don’t follow a route that has some connection with the battle (Rennie).’ Such an approach may lead to emphasizing what Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1988, p. 7) describes as high density tourism attractions, and forgetting the events that occurred at other sites.

To conclude, whereas guide books serve a referential purpose in orientating the visitor in the landscape, they are often limited in mediating the landscape in a number of ways. For example, generalist guide book itineraries typically follow national memories of war, validating only certain sites as ‘worth seeing’. What is remembered is prioritized, with silence and forgetting driven by the needs of guide book brevity and the target audience. Specialist guide books are valuable to orientating the visitor in the landscape of war, employing maps, war-time photographs as well as eye-witness accounts. Whereas generalist guide books can be critiqued for their bias and inaccuracies, specialist guide books are also limited in how they are able connect the visitor to the landscape in a deep and affective manner. Another means of experiencing the landscape of war involves taking a guided tour, discussed in the next section.

Tour Guides and Guided Tours

This section examines the representation of the Normandy landscape of war with regard to two types of tours: generalist sightseeing tours and specialist
battlefield tours. After examining the content and itinerary of day trip excursions of the battlefield, the role of the tour guide, specifically the specialist battlefield tour guide, their perceptions and interpretations are examined.

Several assumptions are typically made regarding these two forms of tours. Baldwin and Sharpley (2009) categorize battlefield tours by their content from generalist to specialist, the assumption is that the product and market are effectively matched. In other words, a generalist tour is taken by people with little knowledge and perhaps a general curiosity. During the fieldwork, the observed sightseeing tours included veterans, family members and serving military. Whereas their reasons for taking the tours may have been that the specialized tours were fully booked, others were determining their choice by limited time. For example, one serving American marine officer had flown in to Paris the night previously, taken a 4-hour train ride to Bayeux to arrive at 8 am, and joined the 3-hour tour. In her words, this was a ‘pilgrimage’, but with limited time, she selected the generalist tour. It was also observed that both sightseeing and battlefield tour companies shared a policy of offering free tours to veterans. Sightseeing tours are therefore viewed as reflecting a basic tour experience of the Normandy landscape of war, and are not a reflection of either a more commodified experience or one taken only by the curious.

**Itineraries and the Constructing a Sense of Place**

A review of the itineraries of generalist and specialist tour companies is provided in Appendix E. Generalist tours are noteworthy in that they focus on what are deemed to be the ‘highlight’ D-Day attractions in the area. What is left out is a measure of how tourism can frame the memory making experience. In reviewing tours of the Somme, Caroline Winter (2009) notes that markers, such as cemeteries, monuments or museums, and the scale of the site are key criteria for stops on a battlefield tour. This is true for a generalist tour, but several other selection criteria for itineraries can be added with regard to specialist tours: proximity of sites to one another, the utility of a site to symbolize an aspect of the storytelling, and the power of the narrative. For example, a specialist tour visits the site where Company Sergeant Major
Stanley Hollis of the British regiment, the Green Howards, was awarded the Victoria Cross for valor. On June 6th, Hollis took part in two attacks, first capturing an enemy position and taking 26 prisoners, and then destroying an artillery and machine gun battery single handed. The location of the second feat is in the backyard of a home on a residential street (Figure 25).

Figure 25: No marker: the site where Stanley Hollis won the Victoria Cross (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The Hollis site is unmarked, the German bunker now removed, leaving the visitor in Figure 25 to take a photograph of a backyard where Hollis charged. The guide narrative involves orientating the listener to the action rather than to a physical marker. This example points to the importance of the tour guide to interpret, employing perhaps a map and photographs, but more importantly in telling a story that can be visualized in the landscape. This situates a site of memory by constructing a memorialized sense of place. In Figure 25, there is nothing extraordinary about the physicality of the site. However, after hearing the story, one is able to imagine the attack.
As one element of the sensory experience, sound can illustrate the power of such places to transport the individual through time and space. As Tuan (1977, p. 119) argues, sound can serve to represent a space, ‘(yielding) an ambiance rather than a coordinated spatial system.’ The imagined chaos and noise of battle is juxtaposed by birdsong and the tranquility of a country garden. The visitor’s mind reflects on how this ambiance may have also been glimpsed by soldiers present on June 6th. In contrast, the visitor may also reflect on the aura of war and how it might sound when layered upon this landscape. Thus, in gaining a sense of place through sound or perhaps other senses, Tuan argues that space and vistas as pictured in Figure 25 can evoke the past. Being in the landscape and to hear the sounds is to therefore to share something of what happened in this place. As time and space ‘coexist, intermesh and define each other (Tuan, p. 130),’ the selection of stops on a tour represents various tourist moments to not only perform remembrance, but to engage in an imaginary time travel in the site of memory.

Guide techniques will be examined later in this chapter. Of focus here are spaces and places in the landscape of war, and the meanings communicated by guides. Table 14 (over three pages) presents a range of the more popular and a few lesser known stops included on tour itineraries. The table indicates the significant signs or markers found in the landscape, the general meaning associated with the site, and some of the narrative themes offered by the guide.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Significant signs</th>
<th>Meanings</th>
<th>Guide Narrative Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longues-sur-Mer</td>
<td>• Concrete structures</td>
<td>• France occupied</td>
<td>• Intro of tour;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gun Battery</td>
<td>• Guns</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Context of WW II leading up to invasion;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Surrounding countryside</td>
<td></td>
<td>• French life under the Germans; what happened at this spot; technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>information about the bunker and cannons; <em>Longest Day</em> scene.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arromanches</td>
<td>• Concrete and steel remains on beach and in the sea</td>
<td>• Innovation and Scale of the D-Day</td>
<td>• Planning for D-Day;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>: Mulberry Harbour</td>
<td>• Seascape</td>
<td>landing</td>
<td>• Mulberry Harbour story;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supplying the allied war effort; Dieppe, and importance of liberating a port;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• How it worked.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Beach Exit</td>
<td>• Naturescape: Sea, shoreline, beach, cliffs</td>
<td>• ‘Bloody Omaha’ and the near</td>
<td>• American landing;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog 1</td>
<td>• Bunker</td>
<td>disaster</td>
<td>• German defensive positions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memorial plaque to American National Guard</td>
<td>• American courage</td>
<td>• Approach to beach;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Road leading off beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Getting off the beach and scene from <em>Saving Private Ryan</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Number killed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ste Mere Eglise</td>
<td>• Church in town square with parachutist model hanging from</td>
<td>• Chaos of the American airborne</td>
<td>• Airborne scattered everywhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>steeple</td>
<td>drop</td>
<td>• Fire in the square, lighting up the sky: ‘imagine the white parachutes coming out of the darkness’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Town square</td>
<td>• Individual acts of bravery and</td>
<td>• ‘Cut those men down from those trees’ (Scene from <em>Longest Day</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Water pump used to fight fire</td>
<td>desperation</td>
<td>• Fighting in the streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Airborne Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Significant signs</td>
<td>Meanings</td>
<td>Guide Narrative Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cemetery</td>
<td>• 9,587 crosses and stars of David, American and French flags</td>
<td>• Hallowed ground for the United States of America</td>
<td>• Number killed in Normandy; Niland brothers who inspired Saving Private Ryan and the Niland Brothers who are buried at the cemetery and whose story inspired the movie, Management and design of site: American soil; repatriation option; statuary and lay-out. Often the conclusion of tour.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Statue: ‘Spirit of American Youth’, Chapel</td>
<td>• Defining national identity: sacrifice for freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Colonnade sheltering maps of allied advance in Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Naturescape: trees, grass, view over sea</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Soundscape: America the Beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth war graves</td>
<td>• White gravestones</td>
<td>• Hallowed ground for Britain / Canada</td>
<td>• Intimacy of valedictions, and age (not indicated on American crosses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sites (18 sites)</td>
<td>• Gardens</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Individual stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Plinth and Cross of Sacrifice</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Battle associated with war grave site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cemetery Register</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoville au Plain</td>
<td>• Small town and Norman church</td>
<td>• Individual acts of bravery &amp; compassion</td>
<td>• American first air station for three days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Bloody Pews’</td>
<td>• Another dimension of war</td>
<td>• Two American medics, 70 people in church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Memorial</td>
<td>• Americans saving lives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Silence, peace of church</td>
<td>• Sanctuary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site</td>
<td>Significant signs</td>
<td>Meanings</td>
<td>Guide Narrative Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecourt Manor</td>
<td>• Farmer’s field</td>
<td>• Military prowess, leadership</td>
<td>• Site of gun emplacement and the attack by Easy Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Line of trees</td>
<td>• Overcoming the odds</td>
<td>• Scene from <em>Band of Brothers</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Victory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td>• Landing beach</td>
<td>• ‘The Canadians also did their bit.’</td>
<td>• Dieppe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bunker</td>
<td>• ‘This place is about Canada.’</td>
<td>• Contribution by and significance to Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• War memorials</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Difficulties in some beach sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Interpretive center</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Most successful advance inland on Day One</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on Canada’s role in the war, and about Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe-du-Hoc</td>
<td>• Concrete bunkers and massive pieces of concrete strewn about</td>
<td>• Victory at all costs</td>
<td>• Perceived strategic significance; US Rangers scale cliffs, find no guns, attack lasted three days;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Pointe and the cliff face</td>
<td>• ‘The war happened here’</td>
<td>• Explosions and destruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Naturescape: seascape. warscape: craters .</td>
<td>• American courage</td>
<td>• Reagan speech on the 40th anniversary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• US Ranger memorial shaped like a dagger, Reagan monument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial / Museum</td>
<td>• Memorialized landscape where battle occurred, the canal</td>
<td>• Pluck and daring of the British</td>
<td>• Glider landings near the bridge at midnight;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The original bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td>• ‘Hold until relieved’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Replica ‘Horsa’ glider</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Relieved by late morning by Lord Lovat and his 40 Commando, along with Piper Millan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Museum with artifacts</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Nearby Merville Battery, various other bridges destroyed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Café Gondree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Symbolic meanings of ‘highlight’ sites in the Normandy landscape of war.
Places such as the Normandy American Cemetery and Omaha Beach reflect what Anthony Cohen (1985, p. 102) describes as a condensation site, where complex stories are reduced to a simplified digestible narrative and supported by the place. However, whereas military cemeteries are filled with symbols and signs, Omaha Beach, like so many battlefields, has little in the way of physical markers. The landings beaches are nevertheless powerful sites of memory, dependent on their natural settings and sensory scapes. For example, Baldacchino (2010, p. 763) argues that sand can be a “powerful, visual, emotive and experiential component’ that is culturally determined. Bastable (2004) is quoted in Chapter Four drawing meaning from the sand of the landing beaches, exemplifying what Baldacchino notes as the power of sand to evoke ‘time, impermanence… [and] a place of solace (p. 767).’ The sand (Figure 26) is therefore significant a nature’s relic of war, conveying the memory of D-Day and the aura of battle.
Smells are also an important sensory element at sites, where certain smells associate a site with a time and place. Dann and Jacobsen (2003) describe different smellscapes associated with the countryside and towns, and how aroma is a powerful aspect of defining space. This is illustrated when a guided tour stops at the 11th century church at Angoville, near St Mere Eglise. It has a musty damp smell to it, evoking its age but also acting as a common sensory experience to what it was like in 1944 when the room was filled with wounded soldiers. Walking across the field at Brecourt Manor involves the fresh scent of a farm and wet grass. This is where the 101st Airborne attacked a German gun emplacement, an event depicted in the television series Band of Brothers (Spielberg and Hanks 2001). Unlike the account by Ambrose (1992) and the television series, smelling the site provides an additional sensory gravitas to the story.
Whereas individual sites have their own unique sense of place, guided tours involve experiencing a number of sites, offering various perspectives to the battle. Generalist tours often employ sites as a symbolic backdrop, providing both the story of the site but also what Togorvnick (2005) describes as a synecdoche to represent a larger story of the battle and the war. In examining itineraries of generalist tours and what generalist guide books recommend visiting, five synecdoche sites can be identified in the Normandy landscape of war:

- The planning and scale of the invasion (Arromanches artificial harbor);
- The Atlantic Wall and the occupation of France (Longues sur Mer)
- A landing beach (Omaha Beach);
- A physically scarred battlefield (Pointe du Hoc), and;
- A cemetery (American Cemetery).

This collection of sites forms the basic elements of the Legend of D-Day, and for some generalist mediating agencies this is often deemed enough for visitors to get a general understanding of what happened. Sites inland from the D-Day area where the battle raged during July and August do not generate the same level of tourist demand. Whereas the Battle of Normandy continued for another 80 days after June 6th, the beaches are marked, with a range of markers in close proximity in contrast to the fields south of Bayeux and Caen.

Specialist tours go beyond general synecdoche sites in two ways. First, in visiting a site such as Pointe du Hoc, a richer historical narrative is offered than in a generalist tour. Second, other lesser known sites are visited that expose a deeper significance and meaning in the landscape of war. This is often dependent upon how the guide is able to interpret the landscape. The next section focuses on the role, perceptions and techniques of the specialist battlefield tour guide. The concept of social activists of remembrance is offered by Winter (2006) to describe family, friends and veterans who work together in
a fictive kinship to commemorate and maintain the memory of the fallen. It is argued here that battlefield tour guides represent another form of social activist, what is described as a guardian of memory.

**Self Perceptions of the Battlefield Guide: Their Role and Perspective on Visitors**

Battlefield tour guides provide a unique perspective in that they have an expertise in military history, the local landscape and guide interpretation. Their approach results in a substantially deeper and more detailed experience of the landscape of war, as exemplified by one visitor interviewed: ‘[The battlefield tour guide] gave us alternate perspectives of what transpired, that differed from the usual 'Hollywood' legends. And that was just fine with us.’ In contrast, generalist tours as Stuart, a battlefield tour guide explained, ‘…they hire students as guides and train them up. I have seen them at Omaha and they are doing their best, but they will spend five minutes explaining and that is it.’

Interviewing and observing battlefield tour guides provide a valuable means to consider the critique of guides as a negative, distorting force in presenting war history, as in the poem, *High Wood*, described in page 22. First, there is a sincerity and seriousness in the approach taken to their role as guides, reflecting what Ang (1990), cited by Christie and Mason (2003, p. 3), describes as the ‘commitment, enthusiasm and integrity’ of guides. For example, Dillan offers his philosophy of guiding, explaining, ‘a guiding theme would be that I would like to educate and inform and pass history on in such a way that people would never forget their day … to remember the experience…thereby giving the inspiration to find out more about the event.’

Second, guides have an extensive level of knowledge about the history of the battle, leading Wynn (2005, p. 400) to describe professional guides as unconventional intellectuals. As Terry, a Canadian part-time guide and professor expressed, ‘[w]e are not boys with toys. We are interested in events
that shaped the world in which Canada played a major role….’ (Interview with Terry). Jules reflects this in terms of the challenge of planning the tour itinerary. As he explains, ‘[t]he timing is a killer. There is so much that can be said about Ste Mere Eglise, for example, but I am limited to an hour and a half there. There are so many great stories.’

Finally, there is also an emotional conviction to the subject matter and the vocation. One illustration of this is how several British guides have moved to Normandy, choosing to live in areas where battles occurred, as if to continuously experience the sense of history. This is also conveyed by Sean when he reflects, ‘I think about what kept them going through it all. I really don’t feel I can complain.’ (Sean British guide based in France). In discussing the reaction of visitors on his tour, John provides a sense of conviction to the vocation when he notes, ‘I have come to realize that there is what I call ‘the moment’. It’s this huge wave of emotion. I get some reward out of … whatever my small part in getting someone from here to there.’ Collectively, the sincerity, knowledge and emotional conviction of battlefield tour guides reflect a kinship with the past, as embodied in the landscape, objects, places and veterans.

As the last quote indicates, guides are also in a position to observe visitors and their reactions to the battlefield tourism experience. This is useful in this research, as it provides another perspective of visitor meaning-making. Some tourists may have read history books or seen documentaries on the battle, leading them to feel that they know more than the guide. As Olivier explains, ‘It is crazy that they think they know everything because they saw Band of Brothers.’ However, the guides tend to find that visitor knowledge is limited to the Legend of D-Day. There were several occasions when a guide’s interpretation is questioned, particularly when elements of the D-Day legend come into question. As Iles (2006) contends, guides have considerable influence on visitors and their perspectives of the battle. In the context of the tourist experience in Normandy, opinions on historian Stephen Ambrose, the
historical value of war films, tactics employed in the battle are all open to interpretation by the guide.

There was a perception that, when a male and a female came on a tour, it was the male who came with some historical knowledge, but at the end of the day, it was the female who had the more resonating experience. Several guides note how gender is not a clear indicator of motivation or interest. For example, Stuart explains what he often sees when wives and husbands are on tour:

’It is the usual: ‘come with me today, and we’ll go shopping tomorrow.’ But what I find is that at the end [of the tour] the wives are saying ’you showed me something that has got me thinking.’ That is something I like.’

This perhaps helps to refute the assumption of battlefield tours being the domain of males and of war mongering as Buffton (2005) and Torgovnick (2005) suggest. However, Jules notes that there are those who do not visibly show an interest, leading him to wonder, ‘honestly, I don’t know why some of them come.’ The comment reflects the seriousness of battlefield tour guides. In Chapter Ten, the perspectives of visitors are presented.

Another observation amongst many guides was a concern with the emphasis placed on the American sector and its history which overshadows to the point of forgetting the British and Canadian sectors. The American profile is often explained as owing to the popularity of books written by Stephen Ambrose, but primarily due to films and the miniseries Band of Brothers. As Paul, a British tour operator based in France explains:

One of the biggest things we have to contend with is, partly the Americanization of World War II history, and that is tied up in the Stephen Ambrosification of World War II history. And I think that the media that people use to study World War II – the internet and Wikipedia and those sorts of things – I think it is simplifying everything and the danger of individual actions … is being entirely forgotten.
Of the tours observed, the American tours were typically full, with several buses allocated to the same tour: the British and Canadian tours typically were nowhere near as busy. Dillan, a tour operator, notes when he was considering setting up his company, he ‘realized that the commercial opportunities would lie at the American end’ of the Normandy landscape of war, and therefore only provides tours in the American sector. Paul, another tour operator living in Normandy, offers a range of sector-specific tours, but finds ‘across the board – Denmark, South Africa, Germany, Holland – they [the tourists] think that our standard tour is the American Highlights Tour. They think that the tour will cover all the D-Day sites.’ Paul goes on to explain his concern with, for example, Canadian visitors who choose to take the American tour rather than learning about the Canadian story, noting ‘I think that is quite sad.’ Sean, a British guide living in France, reasons the hegemony of the American story over the British involvement as follows:

America has Omaha, Canada has Vimy and Juno and the British, theirs is the Somme. That is the one in the British mentality. We also have places like Waterloo, the Crimea, the Zulu War, Agincourt, Hastings. So, the D-Day battlefield for the British is one of many that are toured.

This point seems to be reflected in the battlefield tourism literature, with the majority of analysis focusing on the Great War battlefields. Another point of clarity is illustrated by Torgovnick (2005) who notes that the number killed on Omaha Beach is far fewer than other events in World War II and other wars, yet the site is so prominent in the cultural memory. Speaking of Omaha Beach, Paul explains,

…when you say there was 700 killed on June 6th, and they say, ‘oh well, that was alright then.’ Then, they fail to realize that there was another 500 the next day, another 300 the next day and within four weeks it was 25,000. And somehow, this perception that D-Day is the beginning and the end of the battle….

Dillan also makes this point, arguing ‘lot of people don’t really understand D-Day and they think everything went along smoothly and it didn’t. A lot of people don’t understand the strategy of it, and have a lot of trouble with the tactics.’
Clearly, visitors represent a range of knowledge, opinions and interest regarding D-Day and World War II. From the perspective of guide perceptions of their role and of visitors, battlefield guides can be viewed as committed guardians of memory, expressing concern with visitors’ lack of awareness while at the same time possessing a passionate commitment to guiding and interpretation of the landscape of war. These examples also point to the potential role of battlefield tour guides in redirecting perceptions of the cultural memories of war, and re-educating individuals by offering context of the battle within the history of the war, and giving meaning to, for example, the number killed. As guardians of memory then, they are the brokers between visitors and remembrance. This role is examined in the next section by exploring how guides employ various techniques to interpret the landscape, and in Chapter 11 to assess the mediated experience from the visitor perspective.

Guides and Memory Work: Interpretive Techniques

Many guides collect relics of the war, and also conduct extensive research. However, what separates battlefield tour guides, specifically those living in Normandy, is their frequent interaction with returning veterans, learning their stories and finding sites where certain events occurred. As a result of gathering stories from veterans, researching the history, finding photographs and locating sites associated with veterans’ stories, guides are able to not only resuscitate forgotten events, but transmit those stories to visitors. This unique knowledge and expertise of the landscape is what has maintained certain lesser known war memories. This is exemplified in the book, *In the footsteps of the band of brothers*, where Alexander (2010) employs a Normandy-based battlefield tour guide to accompany Easy Company veteran Forrest Guth to locate sites and offer historical accounts. This example illustrates how a battlefield tour guide, as a guardian of memory, plays two roles. First, the guide is able to hear the stories of the veterans, orientated in the site where particular events occurred. Second, the guide is able to triangulate veterans’ accounts with their historical research and knowledge of the terrain. For
example, in Alexander (2010, p. 89-90), the guide clarifies where various paratroopers landed. Third, the guide is able to re-count the story to visitors.

Battlefield tour guides exemplify responses to the challenge of what Iles (2006, p.163) refers to as ‘decoding to understand hidden narratives’ in the landscape of war. To interpret the battle, guides employ a number of techniques to mediate the meaning of the landscape of war. Whereas Tilley (2006) notes the subjectivity of the landscape, the guide nevertheless has a central role in what Chronis and Hampton (2008) refer to as the co-construction of meaning. Various examples of techniques employed to interpret or construct a sense of place are now examined.

Wynn (2005) refers to the employment of storytelling tricks to reproduce history in a landscape. The focus here is on interpretive techniques that represent best practices in storytelling the landscape of war, often employed concomitantly:

- Use of interpretive principles and universal concepts to link tourists to the story: Use of weather conditions, tide, smell, imagination, etc (see Tilden 1977);
- Use of photographs of a) soldier ‘then and now’ photographs, and b) situated to capture the same viewscape from 1944 in the contemporary context;
- Employment of maps orientated to the landscape;
- The use of news broadcasts from the era, played in the landscape they were recorded;
- Historical accuracy and depth of information;
- Use of war films to support a mental visual representation or general storyline that is refashioned for historical accuracy;
- Time for visitors to reflect on their surroundings.
All of these techniques reflect intent to orientate and link the tourist to history in the setting offered by the landscape of war. The following narratives are illustrative of guide interpretation:

[Guide comment on Juno Beach] ‘What we do is try and hit the beach when the tide is roughly as it was on the morning of June 6th to get a clear and dramatic sense of the distance between the water line and the seawall…’ (Terry, Canadian guide and professor)

[Driving through Caen on tour bus] ‘It looks like we are going to have some rain this morning, but it’s only right that you should feel some discomfort. But yours is only for 9 hours.’ (Sean British Guide in France)

[Guide comment on managing 14-18 year olds on tour] ‘When I bring them here to the American Cemetery and I put them in front of a grave, that makes them quiet.’ (Jeanne, French guide)

‘I am always moved … [standing] on the cliffs of Arromanches, getting the full picture, with the American sector to the west and the British sector to the right, and imagine what happened sixty odd years ago. Our first [tour] stop is usually up there.’ (Steve, American generalist guide and guide book author)

The comments exemplify the guide’s position in mediating what Morgan and Pritchard (2006) call the multisensory nature of the experience, the soundscape (waves, wind, silence), touchscape (gravestone) and smellscape (imagining the smell of smoke). In effect, the guides are involved in choreographing remembrance, positioning the visitor in order to engage with the sense of place in a manner than uncovers the war memory.

Another good example of orientating the visitor is illustrated by Jules performing with an unmarked landscape. He stops the tour bus beside a field, and starts his story by applying a universal concept, as Larsen (2003) suggests, ‘[t]here are certain times in life when you say ‘oh, for God’s sake, I’ll do it myself. This is one of those situations.’ He introduces the story of Sergeant Frank Peregory, an American who was awarded the Medal of Honor for bravery.
Jules continues by employing a mental image drawn from the cultural memory and provided by *Saving Private Ryan*: ‘Do you remember the scene in *Saving Private Ryan* when they are deciding whether to take the radar station or to bypass it? This is the true story of that event.’ This reflects what Crouch, Jackson and Thompson (2005) discuss regarding how media imagery can feed into the tourist imagination. The film is employed by Jules to provide a point of departure for the historical account, an image that is refashioned by historical narrative. He is also able to provide a photograph of Sergeant Peregory, this time to elicit what Chronis and Hampton (2008) refer to as perceived contextual authenticity in the story. Pointing to a distant unmarked ridgeline (Figure 27) Jules then explains how Peregory charged a German gun emplacement single handed, a moving story of bravery. He concludes by noting ‘[o]therwise, this is just an ordinary field in Normandy.’

![Figure 27: A guide interprets the ridgeline and the story of Sergeant Peregory (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).](image)

From the perspective of the battlefield tour guide, Jules has provided a complex set of interlocking pieces in his interpretation, involving personal perspective, a
cultural memory of the war in the form of a film, detailed historical narrative as well as a layering of the meaning of the story across several sites. Using this viewscape and layered with a historical narrative, he is able to focus visitors, and their imagination, on what is an ordinary, unmarked field. Jules has also personalized history and memory by viewing battle from the actions of one individual. The final act of the story involves visiting the Normandy American Cemetery where, among the 9,387 graves, visitors are able to know the story of at least one soldier, Frank Perepory (Figure 28). This exemplifies what White (2000) refers to as emotional remembering. Whereas White employs the term in reference to veterans who tell their personal stories, Jules is acting as a guardian of memory in the landscape of war, not only recounting a personal narrative but situating it in an open field that results in constructing a sense of place.
Figure 28: Grave marker of Frank Peregory, Normandy American Cemetery (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

**Choreographing and Performing Photography as War Remembrance**

Another powerful technique employed by guides is the positioning of photographs taken in 1944, alongside the present day location to create a ‘then’ and ‘now’ experience. A military magazine called ‘Then and Now’ popularized this technique in the 1970’s, along with guide books such as Coombs (1990), what Roesch (2009, p. 136) describes as guided sight directing. Figure 29 is one example of this: the guide situates the audience from the perspective of the photographer, aligning landmarks with the photograph.
Mark, a Canadian tourist, particularly enjoys how guides employ the technique of ‘marrying the old photos with the exact spot.’ He explains,

> I enjoy the intimacy of being in the spot where some incident exactly happened. You have an idea of what or where or it happened, and it turns out to be wrong. Your impressions of what the photograph captures is different than what it ends up actually being.

This comment exemplifies the power of tourism, as represented here through guide interpretation, in creating an intense intimacy between the visitor, history and the landscape. Tourists are often inspired to re-capture both the contemporary image with the 1944 photograph, what Philippe, a French guide, refers to as time travel (Figure 30). In effect, the guides are, as Huff (2008, p.20) describes, defining how a landscape is conceived, refashioning the contemporary setting to 1944. However, what is also happening is that tourists are collaborators in choreographing the gaze through their photography, as Larsen (2006) argues. In this context, photography is being performed as an act of remembrance that involves capturing two dimensions of the past for future recollection: remembering the visit to Normandy and the memory of the war. In effect, the tourist becomes a part of the fictive kinship of war.
remembrance, traveling back in time to an intersection of two dimensions in time and space: 2008 and 1944. With this photograph, war remembrance and the visitor experience are fused together by way of the camera.

Figure 30: a tourist performs time travel: capturing time and place, 1944 and 2008 in Bretteville Orgeuilleuse (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The Battlefield Tour Guide as a Guardian of Memory: Recounting Veterans’ Stories

Another interpretive technique employed by guides is one bestowed upon them by the veterans who have returned and who have passed their stories on to the guides. Table 15 provides commentaries that exemplify how guides, as guardians of memory, transmit the stories passed on to them by veterans.

[On Juno Beach] ‘A vet told me about his uniform. The wool uniform, soaked
from the salt water, taking days to dry out. The first time he had a chance to take a shower was three weeks after the landing. He had to peel off his uniform and his body was covered in sores....That is what I think about sometimes: the sheer discomfort of it all.’ (Stuart British guide based in France)

[Standing in a laneway near the site of the airborne charge across a mine field, talking about General Otway.] ‘He was troubled by losing his men, particularly on the mine field charge. This is where Otway’s commander found him. Otway was holding his head, like this.’ (Sean British guide based in France)

[At church in Angoville au Plain] ‘As we walk along here [passing the pews], there are men are either side of us. Smoke rising from the clothes, they are sitting and smoking. Can you imagine? Now you can see this - see the stains on the wood, and the stains from drops of blood on the floor. This is where [name of soldier] died.’

Table 15: Guide narrations: putting the visitor in the footsteps of the soldier.

By including detailed accounts or anecdotes of a personal nature, such as the discomfort of a wet uniform, visitors are invited to think of the war on a personal level. This points to what Edensor (1998) and Ryan (2007) say about the crucial role of the guide in the tourist performance and in mediating meaning-making. It also points to the power of the guide not only as a guardian of memory in receiving veterans’ accounts, but what Winter (2006) describes as a social activist of war memory, transmitting history and war memories. In the next section, the ways in which war films inform the design and narrative of guided tours are examined.

Film in the Landscape of War

Several of the above examples point to how film is inaccurate in its depiction of history, yet nevertheless orientates visitors by way of imagery and context. Guides mediate the relevance of war films by either referring to a scene to provide a visual reference for the imagination, or by negating its value as a point of historical reference. In this sense, they employ films as an imaginary gateway, orientating the visitor’s imagination in terms of a particular scene or
site. For example, Olivier stops the tour bus in St Marie du Mont, ‘Do you remember the scene in Band of Brothers when they are in the square? There is the statue.’ Another guide choreographs a group photo that re-creates both the original photograph and the scene from the film (Figure 31).

![Guided tour group re-creating photograph of Easy Company, from the Band of Brothers (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).](image)

Roesch (2009, p. 160) describes this form of posing to re-enact a scene from a film as representing two forms of experience: proof of having been there, and place insiderness. The latter experience achieves a deeper level of imaginary engagement whereby the visitor immerses herself in mental visions informed by the film.

Some battlefield tour companies offer a Band of Brothers Tour, focusing on the first three episodes dedicated to D-Day and the few two weeks of fighting. The nine-hour tour visits sites offering historical corrections and expanding upon
certain aspects of history raised in the television series. The tour presents an opportunity for place insiderness, facilitating mental simulations that fuse both place and film. However, unlike the fictional movie examples provided by Roesch, the *Band of Brothers* tour draws upon factual accounts, employing war-time and contemporary photographs and veteran’s stories.

Figure 32 represents a series of moments in guide interpretation of the story of Private McClung, a paratrooper in the 101st Airborne Division who is portrayed in the *Band of Brothers*. An historical account of McClung’s story is published in Brotherton (2010, p. 103):

> As I came down, there were two Germans running down a walkway toward me, shooting at my parachute. It was no contest. I always jumped with my rifle in my hands, ready to go. The church was behind them, and I could see their silhouettes against the church, but they couldn’t see me. I was only five feet from them when I shot them.

What is of relevance here is how the guide narrative and interpretation triangulates history, with the living memory of a participant and a film. Each photograph is explained below.
Figure 32: A guide triangulating place, witness testimony and cultural memory (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).

- Photo 1: guide positions visitors in front of the wash basin indicating where McClung landed;
- Photo 2: guide provides photographs of McClung in 1944 and 2006, from a recent visit
- Photo 3: from what he was told by McClung, the guide re-enacts the attack by German soldiers
- Photo 4: a photo of McClung with the guide, along with a photo of the actor in Band of Brothers
Citing Dovey (2000), Paget and Lidkin (2009) argue that *Band of Brothers* triangulates war memory by including first-person witness in the series, a script based on testimony and the audience bearing witness as an act of memorialization. Whereas the docudrama does not actually depict this scene, McClung is a character in the series, thus enabling the visitor to associate general scenes to the McClung story, such as the uniform and the image of parachuting into St Mere Eglise. On the tour, the guide recounts the story to visitors at the site of memory. The story is further validated by what Chronis and Hampton (2006) describe as an authentic personage, McClung. The story gains further meaning and resonance by including the relationship to the film and correcting elements of the docudrama. The visitor, as a witness, gains proximity to the story by standing where McClung stood and through the interpretation by the guide. The result is a powerful experience for the visitors, providing a place insiderness that is triggered by the triangulation of images, narrative and what Roesch (2009, p. 144) describes as mental simulation. This illustrates the worldmaking role of guides with regard to staging powerful acts of remembrance.

Rather than a reiteration of history in certain places, the guide conveys a story informed by his selection of information and ordering of events, representing an “idiosyncratic expression of the narrator’s poetic aptitude” (Chronis 2008, p.7). In this regard, the landscape of war, with its sites, monuments and museums, along with other resources such as photographs and tape recorders, and cultural memories of war are interpreted to illustrate, colour and authenticate the history of the Battle of Normandy. However, one of the challenges is how that message conflicts with myths and legends held by visitors. Below are a range of examples involving the tempering of the guide’s narrative.

**Tempering the War Memory Narrative**

Guides face a dual role: as historian and as a guide paid by visitors who want to have a memorable experience. This can be construed as the politics of remembrance, the interpretation of war in a manner that does not insult or
detract from what people believe happened. It also reflects the role of guides in negotiating what is remembered, forgotten and silenced. Dale explains the practical challenges of a guide:

> We live off our tips. So, you don’t get into too controversial stories about, say, the Americans. For example, you don’t start talking about the 30,000 deserters sitting in Paris at the end of the war, and the raping and pillaging that went on.

Despite the comment by Dale that exemplifies Winter’s (2010) concept of silencing controversial aspects of the war, there are those guides that attempt to explore such stories. For example, Rick, an American tour operator and guide, notes that ‘[o]ur guides have the right to bring up interesting issues, that there are good wars and those that aren’t so good. So, we have these conversations with anyone who wants to. It’s casual, not forced.’ In this case, Rick leaves it to the visitors themselves to figure out the boundaries of remembrance.

Other guides approach potentially controversial narratives that may be inferred as criticism with diplomacy. This is illustrated by Oliver, a French guide, when he explains some of the American errors with landing troops at Omaha Beach to a predominantly American tour group: ‘I am sorry, perhaps because of little experience. This was your second mistake, launching the boats 10 miles out.’ However, attempts to tactfully frame sensitive issues can backfire, as Stuart recounts:

> I told the story of Canadian troops getting executed in an emotive and perhaps naïve way, and the group of British veterans I was touring around didn’t take it kindly. A vet pulled me and said, ‘don’t judge. You weren’t there. There are at least 10 men here including myself that killed German prisoners.’ You try to look at it from both sides but in the end it’s murder. (Stuart Guide based in France)

Stuart explains that, ‘[i]f the veterans want it told a certain way, then we must respect that.’ These comments reflect the dynamic element of war memory and history, whereby moral judgments shift over time. It also reflects the significance of the guide’s role as both a guardian of memory and as a
worldmaking agent as defined by Hollinshead (2007). As was discussed in Chapter Two, a Canadian documentary that accused Canadians of executing prisoners in response to the German acts was ultimately banned. The execution of Canadian soldiers is further discussed is explored further in Chapter Nine.

In the context of battlefield tourism, there are many stories that weigh issues of morality in war, as the above examples illustrate. Such controversy aligns with Orams (1994) who notes the benefits of employing cognitive dissonance in interpretation. Christie and Mason (2003, p. 5) refer to this as ‘knocking tourists off balance’, to challenge the attitudes of the audience in an attempt to modify people’s behavior. However, these authors are speaking about nature-based tourism interpretation. In the context of battlefield tourism, whereas guides are involved in educating visitors, there is a heuristic challenge in terms of presenting dissonant war memory or by defining what is morally correct. For example, Olivier, a French guide, makes a point of indicating his own family’s wartime history, showing a photograph of his father as a fighter pilot during the war. He explains, ‘It is very difficult to talk about the French experience, even to this day. I was, I was, I was…everyone was with the resistance.’ His comments reflect his reticence to engage in too much discussion with the tour group, not necessarily owing to the sensitivity, but more to do with his own personal cognitive dissonance with the issue. As the cognitive crossroads for the contested nature of cultural memories of war and a focal point for different cultures to interact and discuss the war, battlefield tour guides are often placed in a predicament with regard to either narrating or critiquing the authorized heritage discourse (L. Smith 2006). The guides are effectively on the frontlines of the heritage force field in the landscape of war, engaging in discourse on the dissonant elements of heritage from day to day, interacting with veterans and various nationalities in the interpretation of one of the most dramatic moments in the 20th century.
Conclusion

This chapter focused on the guided tours and the role of battlefield tour guides. Several conclusions are offered here:

- Sites in the landscape of war can have a range of material markers, but often it is the natural setting and the sensoryscapes that are then constructed by the guide to evoke their sense of place;
- Generalist tour itineraries represent a set of synecdoche sites that allow for generalized interpretation of the landscape of war;
- Specialist battlefield tours provide for a richer interpretation of the landscape of war, involving the employment of a range of guide techniques that evoke a sense of place as a site of memory;
- Guides enable visitors to choreograph photographs that capture two dimensions of memory that intersect at a certain location. This empowers visitors as agents of remembrance, and illustrates the role of a guide as a social agent of remembrance;
- The employment of film can lead to place insiderness, enlisted by the guide to illustrate what happened in a particular place, and by visitors to mentally simulate what happened in a particular location.
- Battlefield tour guides can be seen as guardians of memory, based on their interactions with veterans and locals resulting in the collection of their war memories, coupled with their knowledge of the landscape and of history. They are also faced with the challenge of dissonant heritage, stories of war that are counter to the official heritage discourse, making them an important and active player in the heritage force field.

As living memory of the war fades and the role of education evolves as the primary means of perpetuating war memory, battlefield tour guides will play an increasingly important role as guardians of memory. Guides find themselves in the frontline of negotiating what is remembered, forgotten and silenced in war memory and history. Thus, as guardians of memory, battlefield tour guides...
symbolize a crossroads in the discourse of remembrance, ultimately becoming the ‘authority’ on what happened in the landscape. As social agents in remembrance, guides uncode the landscape and transmit stories that they have researched and have had recounted to them by veterans. Different in their role from travel guide books, tour guides are not only able to interact with visitors, but they are emotionally committed to the subject manner. This is illustrated by guides moving to Normandy and their commitment to the role as a career, as well as through their passion of their interpretation. This mix of expertise and commitment make them unique as mediators of war memory in the landscape.

The silencing of controversial memories is not unique to guiding, as was discussed in Chapters 2, with regard to cultural memories of war, and Chapter 3, with regard to museums. In time, with their passing of veteran generation, the silenced controversies and interpretations may become a part of the guide narrative and of the war memory. In this context, guides can be viewed as presenting cultural memories of war, including the myths and the legend of D-Day. At the same time, they are able to clarify, re-direct and augment the visitor’s understanding of what happened. Battlefield tour guides are therefore a significant agent in the tourism-remembrance relationship. Guide books are less of an mediator of place insiderness. Generalist books align with certain cultural memories of war based on their audience, limiting the scope and understanding of history and the landscape. Specialist guide books can also align with certain war memories, but they provide a greater amount of detail that can lead the visitor to a more informed and intimate level of experience in the landscape. The next chapter considers two other elements of the tourism-remembrance relationship: museums and commemorations.
CHAPTER 8. Museums and Commemorations
Introduction

This chapter examines three sites of memory: Pegasus Bridge and the adjacent area; Arromanches, including the D-Day museum during the June 6th commemorations, and; the Canadian sector of battle, including Juno Beach Centre and two commemorative events at Basly and Abbaye d’Ardenne. The sites illustrate how cultural memories of war are memorialized and read through tourism. Each section of this chapter exposes the complexity of issues and politics involved in remembrance while at the same time illustrating the clustering of war memories and meanings experienced when touring and remembering in the landscape of war.

Section I: Pegasus Memorial Museum

The Pegasus Memorial Museum marks the site where, just after midnight on June 6th, a British glider-based attack took place to secure two bridges over the Orne Canal and Orne River. Securing the bridges was essential to protect the eastern flank of the invasion, to take place later that morning. The museum also memorializes the other actions at Merville Battery and at sites east of the landing beaches involving the British Airborne Division. What is of focus here is the memorialization and commemoration of the attack on Pegasus Bridge (Figure 33), as represented in the exhibits of objects and relics at and adjacent to the museum as well as the memorials of the glider landing area.
Figure 33: the original Pegasus Bridge enshrined in the Memorial Park (Photo source: the author 2006 original in colour).

It is argued here that through the clustering of sites and objects, the story of the attack on Pegasus Bridge is richly memorialized, resulting in a uniquely touristic and resonating act of remembrance. This accumulation of symbols, typically accrued by a visitor taking a tour of the British sector, represents the power of tourism to engage in deep and meaningful memory work, one that can be described as intensive remembering, or as Horne (1992) describes, a sight experienced rather than simply sight seen.

The attack on Pegasus Bridge over the Orne Canal involved three gliders totalling 60 men. The *coup de main*, an attack largely dependent on surprise, involved landing the gliders as close as possible to the bridge. The soldiers then rushed the bridge, knocking out the German positions and defending their position throughout the night until they were relieved toward noon on June 6th. The story of Pegasus was one of the main stories dramatized in the film, *The Longest Day* (Zanuck 1962) that further elevated Pegasus Bridge as hallowed
ground. The following reflexive narrative conveys the significance of the site based on an interview and what was observed during the June commemorations.

June 8, 2008  Pegasus Bridge

I meet a retired senior British officer visiting Pegasus Bridge and he accepts my request for an interview over lunch. I ask him to explain why this site is significant. He explains, ‘Well, it was the first time that the British forces got it completely right and everything went basically according to plan.’ He talks about the significance of defending the eastern flank of the invasion, of men versus tanks, the courage and skill required to land the glider and then to capture and hold the bridge as well as the sheer audacity and heroics involved. There is also the wonderful luck of the attack, such as the successful landing of the gliders, the German tanks waiting for orders from Hitler who was asleep. The interview takes place in a café overlooking the Orne Canal. Within a five-minute walk, a range of monuments, sites and relics of war can be viewed, including a replica of the iconic Horsa glider (Figure 34). The concentration of objects gives it the crammed feel of a film set. Yet, this is it where it all happened. The shrill of a bag piper interrupts our conversation as scores of re-enactors dressed as British paratroopers pose by the bridge. With the cafés filled with visitors, it is a festive atmosphere.

The scene observed is somewhat chaotic, with its crowds, memorial markers and bag piping. As the British officer notes, the battle for Pegasus Bridge was temendously successful, an important element that led to the success of the D-Day landings. The battle resulted in two men killed and 14 wounded (Ambrose 1984, p. 123), giving it the feel similar to Arromanches: free of the blood and carnage associated with other sites of war. This enables the visitor to have a drink at Café Gondrée, reputed to be the first café liberated in France, as a ritual symbol of commemoration. Without any mention of the German troops killed in the attack, this is a uniquely British shrine that symbolizes a daring and audacious operation. It is also a vivid story that reflects and informs the British
cultural memory of World War II. Various elements of this site of memory are examined, specifically material culture and its meaning.

Figure 34: British school group touring the replica Horsa Glider. (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The Pegasus Memorial Museum possesses an extensive collection of objects exhibited in as well as adjacent to the museum. Of interest to this research is the memorialization of Major John Howard, the officer in charge of the gliderborne ‘D’ Company, Oxfordshire and Buckinghamshire Light Infantry (nicknamed the Ox and Bucks). Howard’s legend is augmented by the portrayal in the movie, the *Longest Day* (Zanuck 1962). Part of his uniform is on display at the museum (Figure 35). The exhibit includes Howard’s map, compass, log book, helmet, beret, along with his war medals. Pearce (1994) investigated the meaning associated with a museum exhibit of a British uniform from the Battle of Waterloo. She notes the multiplicity of meanings, based on the epistemological relationship between the object and viewer and how that evolved over time. As with Pearce’s example, Major Howard’s uniform offers an intimacy with history, the personal objects framing the context and actions of an individual and summing up the events at the bridge. The collection can be also viewed as representative of the factors in the British
success. As Ambrose (1984, p. 141-142) argues, it was Howard who established and trained ‘D’ Company, as well as planned and executed the operation. Pearce (1994) also notes the ‘emotional potency’ of objects, based on the virtual or dynamic nature of the text associated with the objects. In this context, it is the surrounding landscape that gives potency to this exhibit, through the presence of material culture that is associated by directing with the man and the mission itself. This aspect of the field work is informed by Miller (1998) and Palmer (2003) who both point to the insights that can be gained by examining material culture. Such an approach enables, as Palmer (2003, p. 431) argues, an appreciation of ‘what it feels like to belong to a culture.’ In the context of the culture of Pegasus Bridge, the material culture allows the visitor to imagine the battle by way of the objects that were used in battle, and a more intimate knowledge of the individuals involved.

Figure 35: Major John Howard exhibit, Pegasus Memorial (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).
A five-minute walk from the museum, there is a marker indicating the location where Howard’s glider landed alongside a bust looking toward the bridge (Figure 36). It is from here that Major Howard, wearing a helmet as displayed in the museum, launched his attack. The photograph is taken from behind and looking toward the bridge to illustrate how close the first glider landed. This feat establishes the pilot Jim Wallwork as one of the heroes of the raid. His account of the landing is provided on page 70. A visit in 2009 allowed the researcher a reflexive observation.

Figure 36: Monument to Major John Howard looking toward the bridge, along a marker situating the first glider landing. (Photo source: the author 2007 original in colour).

June 5, 2009: Pegasus Bridge

A lone Dakota aircraft, as was used in 1944, flies toward a drop zone nearby. The drone of its engines offers a muted sense of what it must have been like the night when hundreds of aircraft filled the sky. Standing by the point of attack marked by the two monuments (Figure 36), I look toward the bridge and
then refocus on the distant horizon and imagine the glider’s approach from the north. I think of Jim Wallwork’s words, the sound of a stopwatch, the whistle of the wind and the turn on command. I am aided by the landscape, the replica Horsa glider and the range of objects in the museum. They collate in mind, along with an image of Wallwork at the controls.

The materiality of memorials, sounds of old aircraft and the bridge, recently constructed but still the general silhouette of the original, all stand as ritual symbols. Each has its own meaning and story, and all inform the dominant symbol of commemorating the attack. The cultural memory of war is informed by the veteran Jim Wallwork, that redefines meaning of the place and the battle in a more personal and powerful manner.

At midnight of June 5-6 each year, the next of kin of Major Howard, along with surviving veterans of the attack, their families as well as a large crowd of locals and tourists gather to listen to the recorded narration of Howard recounting the attack. Champagne is uncorked and a toast made: ‘to ham and jam!’ These were the codewords to indicate the taking of both ends of the bridge, part of the language of the Pegasus legend. Fireworks along with drinking at the nearby cafés, re-enactors in British airborne uniform and the playing of bag pipes all add to the festive atmosphere (Figure 37). The commemoration marks what is the beginning of an 80-day battle, but the battle at Pegasus Bridge is celebrated as its own distinct victory.
Figure 37: Celebrations at the Café Gondrée at midnight, June 6th, 2008 (Photo source: the author original in colour).

The exhibit, the monument and commemoration can be associated with site sacralization (MacCannell 1976), whereby the symbols and meaning of the site are elevated as sacred and meaningful. But the symbols also suggest the physical nature of memorializing objects, both in the museum and in the immediate area, and how they provide a connection between the past and present. Palmer (2003, p. 441) refers to this connection as operating by way of three realms of influence: imagination, memory and emotion. However, it is the physicality of being there that triggers the imagination and emotions, providing a resonating and deeply memorable experience.

This clustering of objects and commemorations at the site of memory involve what Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998) describes as authentic elements of the past that are staged and performed to create a destination. In this context, the destination is a site of British war mythology. As a site of memory, there is a
range of markers and objects that provide a cohesive and complete narrative: authentic objects, markers in the landscape, stories narrated by guides and augmented with videos and taped narrations from veterans. As a performance of remembering, there is a layering of the narrative, reinforced and expanded upon with each element. Pegasus Bridge represents another ‘condensation site’ (Cohen 1985, p. 102): it is one battle within D-Day but in many ways, it has come to represent one the principle war memories of the British effort on D-Day.

However, there is a complexity to the site and its story, briefly cited here:

- The owners of the Café Gondrée, the daughters who were children at the time of D-Day, choose not to speak with the museum officials, as the two entities have gone to court over the ownership of certain regimental artifacts;
- Each year, a son of a veteran sets up a table at the museum entrance to sell books, raising money for another memorial, this time to the non commissioned soldiers who stormed Pegasus. One of the managers of the museum comments, ‘I don’t support the idea. The bridge is the memorial. Isn’t that enough?’
- Annually, pipers visit to cross the bridge while playing to reenact Piper Millen on June 6th. The manager explains, ‘[t]hat was in the movie, but they’ve got it wrong. He didn’t play when he crossed the bridge. He told me that there was too much shooting going on, that he ran across the bridge.’ This is also noted by Ambrose (1984, p. 136) in his oral history of the attack.
- A Canadian insists on providing his own interpretation in the museum, feeling that the Pegasus guides are ‘too pushy’ with their interpretation: he prefers to focus more on the Canadian aspect of the airborne landings.
These dissonant phenomena represent various voices claiming ownership over a part of the war memory. They range in significance, from a litigation to the mis-representation of history through film, and a desire to emphasize another nation’s war memory. Such issues and initiatives can be seen as typical of a site of memory, demonstrating the dynamic nature of cultural memory (see Sturken 1997).

The Pegasus Memorial Museum and the immediate area is an example of a constructed destination of war memory, involving the memorialization of the battlefield, along with preservation and sacralization of various relics and objects of war. The materiality of the site enables the visitor to imagine what happened, employing realms of imagination and emotion. Despite the succinct nature of the legend of Pegasus Bridge, it nevertheless is encumbered in a range of major and minor issues, reflecting the dynamic nature of cultural memory as well as the politics of remembrance.

Section II: Arromanches

This section focuses on what Edensor (1998, p.200) refers to as progressive sense of place, as embodied in Arromanches, defined as ‘places … continually reconstituted by the activities that centre upon them.’ As in the study of the Taj Mahal, where ‘a range of diverse practices which are organized locally, nationally and globally’ (Edensor 1998, p. 200), Arromanches is a hub of tourist and commemorative activity. To reveal the practices and experiences of Arromanches, three perspectives are offered here:

- Interviews with the museum manager and the town Mayor;
- Observations of living in Arromanches and of experiencing the sense of place, and,
- Observations of the June 6th commemorations.

The town of Arromanches, population 609 in 2008, is at the halfway point between the American and British landing sectors and is a 20-minute drive from
Bayeux and the major autoroute. Looking out to sea, remnants of the Mulberry Harbor dominate the viewscape, (Figure 38), representing one of the most iconic images of the Normandy landscape of war. It is perhaps for these reasons, geographic centrality, accessibility and that it marked the delineation between the American and British sectors, that Arromanches was deemed the most appropriate site to construct the first D-Day museum in 1954.

Figure 38: the community of Arromanches, with Mulberry Harbor offshore (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

There is also another benefit with the selection of Arromanches: unlike other towns that witnessed death and carnage, Arromanches survived relatively unscathed, avoiding the horror and carnage associated with the other beaches. This frames the war memory of Arromanches as somewhat free of the bloody side of war heritage, a seaside town with an interesting piece of technical history on its seafront, rather than a place directly affiliated with the dead. Consequently, the local aura is notably less solemn in comparison with the military cemeteries or the towns such as Courseulles-sur-Mer, adjacent to a
landing beach. It is nevertheless what Lowenthal (1985) describes as a ‘landscape of commemoration’, with its intensive cluster of memorials, monuments, relics of war and D-Day museum. Figure 39 provides an illustration of Arromanches as a site of memory, with each dot marking a memorializing marker for a particular event or regiment. It is in this setting that the researcher conducted his fieldwork, as described in the next section.

Figure 39: Arromanches as a landscape of commemoration (Map source: Courtesy of Holt & Holt 2004, www.guide-books.co.uk original in colour)

7 am, May 31 2008: Arromanches

For my time in Normandy, I am based in Arromanches, living in a rented flat. I jog the beach on certain mornings when the tide is out and there is no one around. I am aware of the juxtaposition from a once busy port that supported the liberation of Europe to what is now a tranquil and beautiful beachscape. The aura of 1944 is still palatable here. A pontoon sits askew, forever stranded on the Arromanches waterfront (Figure 40) echoing the epic effort of the invasion. Thousands of men, trucks and tanks travelled over it, on to shore and into the war. And here it is to touch. My jog continues up to the cliff to take in
the viewscape: with caissons in the foreground, the Channel extends beyond like a stage from which these actors of war came forth.

Figure 40: Coming into contact with a relic of war: a remnant of the artificial harbour at Arromanches (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

In essence, Arromanches has what Mels (2004) describes as a geography of rhythms, with the soundscape of the waves and wind, the taste of the sea air. Similar to how Virilio (1975) interprets the profile and meaning of the concrete bunkers as symbolizing the German occupation, the remaining pontoons and caissons of the artificial harbor are symbolic of the liberation of France. Gazing out to sea, the landscape of war continues as far as the horizon, and in the imagination, beyond, a point described by Virilio (1975) when he writes, ‘(s)eeing the oceanic horizon … is in fact an event in consciousness of underestimated consequences’ (2009, p. 9)). In this context, what is experienced as the Normandy landscape of war involves the seascape to beyond the horizon, as it is from there that the liberating armies came.

Another perspective of what is happening in Arromanches is offered by Edwards (2009), when he argues that there is a commercial element to
remembrance along the Normandy coastline. Arromanches is perhaps the best representation of a seaside town, complete with souvenir shops with sand pales and shovels, ice cream stands, a carousel and a tourist train. It is, as it was before the war, a seaside town that lives by tourism. In his guide book, Fenn (2002, p. 33), describes both the commercialism and the cliff vantage point mentioned earlier:

One cannot reprove Arromanches from profiting from its wartime fame and the part that the people of the town played in the landings. They are rightly enormously proud of their role and in 1994 gave the veterans a huge welcome. Now the tourists invade the little town, climb to the points d’orientation, and are strangely silent as it begins to dawn on them how it must have been.

The following journal excerpt explores the interaction with a local café owner in Arromanches, as one representation of the local perspective.

**May 30, 2008: Arromanches**

*During my stay, I regularly visit a local café for a morning coffee, becoming acquainted with the owner, Pierre. He has lived here all his life. He is the face of local tourism, typical of other seaside cafés along the Normandy coast. Pictures of smiling veterans with Pierre, drinks in hand, festoon the café wall. This is a comfortable place, most notably emphasized by a cat sitting comfortably atop the bar, evoking what the director of the museum described as a ‘second home’ for the British veterans who come here. Pierre tells me to come on June 6th…. I am aware of the importance of the day for him. He speaks of veteran acquaintances that have not returned, ‘it’s sad’ he says.*

This scene is a personalization of remembrance, where locals interact with veterans, honoring them by making them feel welcome. He profits from tourists and it supports his livelihood, but he is also engaged in an ongoing relationship with these veterans. From Edwards’ (2009) perspective, Pierre represents the fusing of commemoration and commercialism whereby there is profit to be
gained. Another perspective is that Pierre offers a friendly gathering place for veterans, locals and tourists, facilitating interaction and friendships. It is here that one element of tourism as a force in the social agency approach to remembrance can be seen. Before discussing what occurs during the June 6th commemorations in Arromanches, the issue of commercialism is examined in terms of another mediating agency of the landscape of war, the D-Day Museum in Arromanches.
The D-Day Museum at Arromanches

Figure 41: The D-Day museum in Arromanches (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The D-Day museum (Figure 41) was constructed in 1954. It operates as a non-profit organization, formally under the management of the Committee of the Landing and was recently turned over to the town of Arromanches as part of the original agreement. The mandate of the museum is to provide a general overview of the landings, focusing primarily on the technology involved in the construction of the Mulberry Harbour. This theme conveniently avoids any challenges associated with representing the French war memory (see Joly 2000). However, as Joly (2000, p. 47) notes, the D-Day Museum benefits from tourists visiting the landscape of war, rather than as the primary attraction. Part of the museum includes a guided interpretation of the viewscape that employs maps, photographs and a harbor diorama adjacent to a wall of windows (Figure 42).
After the American Cemetery, the D-Day museum is the most popular war heritage attraction in Normandy with over 300,000 visitors a year, generating a significant flow of visitors to the community (Arromanches 2008). Another museum director refers to the Arromanches D-Day Museum as a ‘factory’, given the incredible number of visitors for such a relatively small museum. As the Mayor of Arromanches explains, ‘Arromanches is a function of tourism’ and ‘commerce knows well it cannot live unless the museum functions.’ Unlike other seaside towns that have a summer tourist season, Arromanches is open practically throughout the year owing to French and English school groups who regularly visit. To accommodate the several buses that may descend upon the town at any given hour during the summertime, the town’s traffic circulation has been revised, leaving the town centre more accessible to pedestrians.

The extent to which Arromanches profits from its war heritage illustrates Winter’s concern with the relationship between tourism and remembrance. Hurley and Trimarco (2004) position commercialism and sacred spaces as a
paradox, but in their case they are talking of the 9-11 site, the brutality of the death still raw in the minds of the people: Arromanches is removed from the aura with battle and death, both spatially and temporally. Furthermore, revenue generated by the museum is used ‘only for the duty of memory’ (translation by author), notes Mr Sommier, the Director of the Museum. This is explained as including the operation of the museum, future expansion plans, and the June 6th commemorations and related municipal maintenance. Nearby, cafés, restaurants, hotels and shops benefit from the regular arrival of busloads of museum visitors.

Edwards (2009) argues that towns such as Arromanches represent the fusing of commemoration and commercialism as one entity. However, interviewing the Mayor of Arromanches, and the Director, both indicate concern with this perception. As the Mayor explains, many developers have considered constructing a hotel on the cliff overlooking Arromanches:

Commercially, it is interesting. But from the point of view of memory, to be aware of the damage caused if we had a hotel on the cliff overhang, of someone in the hotel who is profiting, it is an inadmissible. Therefore, it must be [left] in its undeveloped state….

What falls beyond the jurisdiction of the town is Arromanches Cinema 360, located just outside of town and operated by the Regional Council. There are plans to augment the commercial aspect of the cinema. The Mayor disagrees:

That is the problem. The day we begin to reflect on the tools of remembrance as serving commerce, as a commercial function, to preserve and continue to exist, we have entered in a way of doing that will not get us too far.

The Mayor perceives that Arromanches is ‘in balance’ between remembrance and commercialism. Cinema 360, is in contrast to this ‘peaceful’ setting of the beach and the materiality of the port remnants. However, it is clear that the authorities are aware of the perception of commercialism. Asked of his future
plans for the museum, Mr. Sommier responds, ‘I hope to get rid of the boutique, because I’m a little bothered by the monetary aspect of it in the museum.’

As Seaton (2009a, p. 87) notes, it is difficult to sustain the argument that such sites of memory should be free, given that most goods ‘including water, food, energy and land’ are associated with a financial value. As locals and management, the café owner, Mayor and Director all demonstrate sincerity toward the war memory and the role that Arromanches plays. In effect, the debate on commercialism is typically leveled by outsiders, academics that observe that context and come to their conclusions without interacting with the locals or site managers. Whereas one can argue that each of these individuals hold a stake in the existing form that remembrance takes, they are nevertheless part of the heritage force field. Therefore, taking the perspective of Seaton (2009a) and Sharpley (2009), the perspective of remembrance held by locals and managers is important to take into account and must be placed in balance with the views of veterans and visitors. The visitor experience at Arromanches during the June 6th commemorations is examined next.

**Commemoration at Arromanches**

3:30 pm, June 6. Arromanches

*Arromanches is abuzz with people and a celebratory atmosphere. A pipe band plays as beer-drinking veterans and visitors spill out of the cafés. The veterans generate attention of tourists and locals alike, often asked for autographs, a handshake or a photograph. I make my way to the town square, noting how many people are wearing World War II uniforms. I hear French and English voices as I pass by a group dressed as American GIs. What catches my eye are shoulder flashes on a Canadian uniform: Lincoln and Welland Regiment, from Southern Ontario. I make eye contact with the fellows. I ask why they are wearing Canadian uniforms? They turn out to be Dutch, explaining their town was liberated by this regiment in October 1944. They wear Canadian uniforms ‘out of respect and to honour the veterans’. I tell them that I am Canadian,*
resulting in warm handshakes and smiles. As fellow tourists, we share a cultural memory about the war, that Canadians liberated a large part of Holland. We exchange pleasantries, take a photo (Figure 43) and promise to keep in touch.

Figure 43: Dutch re-enactors wearing Canadian military uniforms, Arromanches, June 6 2008 (Photo source: the author original in colour).

The interaction with the Dutch represents the life-affirming symbolism of the commemoration at Arromanches. The short discussion was heartfelt, reflecting a shared heritage but also putting a face to each nation. The tourist interaction reflects an act of remembering shaped by a shared war memory.

Wearing uniforms can be seen as a tourist performance in remembering. The Dutch group reflect what Bagnall (2003, p. 87) refers to as an ‘emotional and imaginary relationship' with heritage, in this case with the Dutch war memory as well as the legend of D-Day. Gazed upon, they may be viewed as reenactors,
caught up in the nostalgia of an era and the commodification of war, but their reasons are more complex than that, and much more personal. They have an emotional tie to Canada, as embodied in the uniforms of the Lincoln and Welland Regiment, as a liberator.

4:00 pm, June 6. Arromanches

_The veterans’ parade and service is an informal affair. First, a brief march past by veterans, followed by a parade of military vehicles. Speeches are made and ‘Last Post’ played followed by a moment of silence. French reenactors in British uniforms stand by their jeeps chatting during the service, and motorbikes and cars rolled by during the moment of silence. The language barrier and a poor sound system limit any sense of order. It all seems perfectly acceptable, the mixing of remembrance and the French Fete de la victoire. Hats are replaced; the formalities of remembrance are over. The Master of Ceremonies invites the audience to come in front of the grandstand, to join hands and sing Auld Lang Syne. French, British, Dutch and other nationalities start stepping forward to form a circle. It is a sudden and collective outpouring of friendship and joy, strangers hand in hand, sharing song and a uncommon and spontaneous bond. The circle, maybe 500 strong sways in unison (Figure 44).

The universality of Old Lang Syne connects all the nationalities in a collective act of remembrance. It is unlike any other commemoration, quite separate from the sensory solemnity that Marshall (2004) identifies. Rather, the commemoration represents a form of commemorative heritage as spectacle from two perspectives. First, it evokes a sense of survival, both in the sense of those who lived through the war as well as symbolized in the town of Arromanches itself. Second, it reflects, as Abercrombie and Longhurst (1998) note, when ‘the distance between audiences and performers has diminished’ (Bagnall (2003, p. 87). As a result, there is a fictive kinship, a bond shared by an act of remembrance that is shaped by the place.
Figure 44: Collective remembrance through song: Auld Lang Syne sing-along, Arromanches, June 6 2008 (Photo source: the author original in colour).

4:30 June 6. Arromanches

Amidst the cheering, I meet a German fellow. He has a German flag sewn to his coat and he stands like an island in the crowd. He has a backpack on, and has stripped off his camouflaged jacket and wrapped it around his waist. By the regimental markings on the pack, I suspect he had served in the German army in recent times. We make eye contact and I walk over to him. We shake hands. Amidst the energy of the ceremony and the celebratory crowds, the contact is enough to create a mix of emotions to well up in me. Here is a German standing in a British celebration, and, quite different from meeting the Dutch, I feel a distance.

German: ‘I am from Germany. Where are you from?’

Bird: ‘Canada.’
German: ‘I think I am the only German here.’

Bird: ‘Well it is good to have you here. Did your father fight here?’

German: ‘Yes. He was with the Panzer Leyer. He fought against the British near Caen and then against the Americans near St Lo. He passed away two years ago. They often were alongside the 12th SS, the Hitler Youth, who he said were fanatical.’

Bird: ‘Panzer Leyer fought against the Canadians too. I was at Le Mesnil Patry last night, and will be going to Abbaye d’Ardenne tomorrow where the Canadians were executed by the SS.’

He does not respond: he simply looks ahead: a bit of a conversation stopper on my part.

The excerpt reflects the experience of two dissonant cultural memories of war, represented by a Canadian and a German, coming into contact with one another. They engage in memory work of their own, and then feel the contested narratives of war in a short but stilted exchange. Prince (2009) writes of the German war memory in contemporary consciousness, of how generations over time try to come to terms with their family or their nation’s role, and the ongoing dissonance is reflected in this personally powerful, unfortunately brief, yet typical of a tourist encounter. For Bagnall (2003, p. 87), this type of performative interaction among tourists reflects the ‘the key role of memory, life histories, and personal and family narrative in enabling visitors to relate the consumption experience to a range of experienced and imagined worlds.’ The personal interaction with various individuals, exemplified here by observations of a Dutch group, British veterans and a German demonstrates the reflexive and emotional aspects of the tourist performance of remembering in the landscape of war.
With killing and death not immediately present in the story of the artificial harbor and logistics and supply of the armies, Arromanches acts as a respite from imagining the horrors of war. Commemorations in Arromanches take on a decidedly celebratory tone in contrast to the ones that occur on the landing beaches or more infamous sites such as Abbaye d’Ardenne. As Mr. Sommier explains,

‘The English come for the same reason as the Americans going to the American Cemetery. The English are at home here. Everything is done for the veterans to make them feel at home. A veteran who comes here is welcome. It is his home. We want to conserve that. It is normal.’

As Winter (2006, p. 6) explains, ‘in virtually all acts of remembrance, history and memory are braided together in the public domain, jointly informing our shifting and contested understandings of the past.’ The mythic status of Arromanches is owing to the relics of war left on the beach and by its foreshore, but it has also become the main hub for British commemorations on June 6th, where cultural memories of war coalesce and interact in a site of memory. As a result, Arromanches is able to maintain an auratic quality of war remembrance and a unique celebratory spirit that also involves visitors revisiting their own cultural memories of the war. These forces overshadow concerns of commercialism: remembrance occurs in a deep and meaningful way. The next section examines Canadian national war memory, as represented in various sites and commemorations.

**Section III: The Canadian Sector: Juno Beach Centre, Basly and Abbaye d’Ardenne**

This section provides three vignettes of how Canada’s war effort is remembered in the Normandy landscape of war. The three vignettes represent different perspectives on how this war memory is represented, maintained and commemorated through sites of memory, as well as through commemorations experienced by Canadian visitors. Highlighted here are:
• the politics of remembrance associated with the Juno Beach Centre;
• commemorative services at Basly and Abbaye d’Ardenne.

The focus in this section is on the contested nature of the heritage force field of Canadian war remembrance, and the emotional power of locating representations of war within the contextual setting provided by the landscape of war.

The Juno Beach Centre

The quotes below represent a range of reactions to the Juno Beach Centre (JBC) (Figure 45), each embodying different perspectives and expectations of the Canadian interpretive centre that opened in 2003:

The Juno Beach Centre, someone needs to get a horrible grip on that. (Interview with Raymond, Canadian tour guide)

The Juno Beach Memorial Centre - is fantastic - has so much information and really made me proud to be a Canadian. (Online comment repository response from a Canadian 14-18 year old, responding to ‘best place you visited in the D-Day area’).

When you asked me what I do here, they gave me a baby, and after five years it is walking, it evolves, it progresses well but it was that everything had to be created here. Everything. (Site manager 2 interview translated 2008)
With no government funding at the start, the initiative to establish an interpretive center on Juno Beach was led by veterans who turned to the general public to help fund the project. The surge of popular support ultimately embarrassed the government to participate (see Granatstein 2004, p.A20), notable in that the state was not attuned to the significance of the site. As this site is often read as Canadian hallowed ground (Granatstein 1989, 1995; Barris 2004; Goddard 2005), there was much attention and expectation brought to bear on the JBC.

Controversies that arose reflect the contested nature of heritage as described by Tunbridge and Ashworth (1995), and driven by the heritage force field (Seaton 2009a; Sharpley 2009) made up of the following stakeholders:

- The controllers are the Board of Directors based in Canada, made up of next of kin and veterans;
- The management of the JBC;
• The host community is represented by an advisory committee;
• The subject is Canadian war memory and represented by the veterans, specifically Mr. Garth Webb, who is board chair and the driving force behind the creation of the JBC;
• Finally, there are visitor groups, a mix of nationalities, the majority being the French population.

Although not formally part of the force field are the battlefield tour guides. The Canadian government does not actively play a role in managing the site, but provided funding for five years of operation. As Webb explains, the Juno Beach Centre ‘is privately operated’, with Canadian elected officials opted to provide funding rather than to have the Veterans Affairs Canada operate the site, as it operates the World War I memorial sites.

There are several interrelated aspects of dissonance that entwine representation and the heritage force field. First, the mandate given to the centre is to tell the story of Canada’s involvement in World War II, not only of D-Day. Webb (Figure 46) clarifies the mandate of the Centre saying, ‘this is not a D-Day memorial. This is dedicated to Canadians of World War II to tell their story.’ He explains that D-Day veterans, ‘got more credit because it was the start of the major offensive. We have always felt that the guys in the Italian campaign saw more war than we did.’
Despite the well-intended meaning of representing all Canadian veterans, this broader mandate raises challenges in its implementation, as the following example illustrates. In May 2008, a temporary exhibit opened at the JBC focusing on Canada’s role in the Italian Campaign. Site Manager 2 explains the challenge she faces with such an exhibit, ‘It is completely… you have to realize, I can tell you because I already said to the committee. For me, it is very difficult to sell an exhibit on Italy in Normandy.’

Site manager 2 is respectful of the intent of the mandate yet struggles with its practicality in attracting visitors, as she describes,

That is to say … we must in a place that is linked to Canada in the Second World War, pay homage to others not just those who landed here. But for me, who must get the visitors to the museum, it has to be understood that I am in something that is not logical, not pertinent, but it
is not a problem because it has to be seen… that there will not be 80,000 visitors.

However, the manager points out, …(t)hey have given the means to carry out their ambitions, but the ambitions are not necessarily logical. It is a small enterprise here, all the same, there is no marketing logic. But they [the Board] can do it, because they have the support from the [Canadian] government to do these things…the larger message, the commemoration of the Second World War.

The challenge facing management is what Joly (2000, p. 50) describes as typical when veterans take the lead role in the development of a museum. Joly points to the success of the conseil scientifique, or expert steering committee, that was created for the design of the First World War Museum in Péronne, an initiative that ‘revolutionized thinking’ (Joly, p. 50) by providing academic input from the three main warring parties. This is difficult in the context of World War II, given that veterans are still alive. Joly describes the prevalence of micro memories that dominate museum portrayals of World War museums, presenting localized narratives. In the case of the JBC, the micro memory is not to a localized narrative, but a shallow and broad memory, one lacking deep narrative linked to the immediate landscape of war, yet presenting the entire Canadian war effort. The result is described by a Canadian historian and guide:

One of my problems with the Juno Beach Center is that [visitors] read kind of basic stuff about the war but the beaches are only one part of the story and I’m not sure the people are understanding that only one of our three divisions that fought in Normandy was involved on the D-Day beaches. For the other division that area south of Caen is what matters and the biggest Canadian cemetery in Europe is in Bretteville-sur-Dives….
This controversy spills over into criticisms over the lack of objects on exhibit in the Centre, relying more on interpretive boards and video clips. As John, a Canadian guide reflects,

Something is missing. I don’t know what it is. Is it to have more ‘hands-on’ stuff, or to have some different kinds of artifacts in there? It doesn’t capture what I am feeling. But maybe my expectations are too high.

A Canadian newspaper editorial criticized the Centre as being ‘artifact-light and text-heavy’, ‘bleak’, ‘uninspired’ and at times inaccurate in its narrative of Canada before the war (Granatstein 2004, p. 20). Another dimension to this issue is that there is a French battlefield tour guide who has one of the most comprehensive collections of Canadian war materiel in Normandy. He was once employed by JBC, and organized a successful exhibit of Canadian uniforms for the 2004 commemorations. Unfortunately, the management and Jean are no longer speaking to one another owing to disagreements. As a result, boxes of Canadian artifacts are stored away in his farm, with nowhere to exhibit them (Figure 47). This is an example of how social agents in commemoration can come into conflict. From one perspective, it also reflects the power of an institution mandated to present the authorized narrative to essentially ignore stakeholders even though individuals such as Jean with his collection of artifacts can augment the mandate of JBC. From another perspective, it may point to the challenge faced by JBC to pursue a certain mandate, and the limitations of collaborating with various private individuals with divergent interests and perspectives.
Figure 47: Canadian World War II artifacts stored in a farmer’s loft (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

A larger issue is the minimal link that the JBC, located on the Canadian landing beach, has with the beachscape. Guided tours by young Canadians provide some integration between the Centre and the surrounding landscape, but the tour is limited. In addition, memorials are being constructed at JBC, and a nearby bunker has been dug out. However, Manager 2 realizes,

Canadians who come from Canada want a little more about Juno Beach than Italy or Holland. But Garth, he does not want a film about D-Day. He [Garth Webb] said, no, we are not here to speak about Juno Beach. He is very convinced about that.

Ed, a Canadian guide and honorary Colonel of a regiment that landed at Normandy, has a different perspective, one shared by a number of others with an interest or involvement in Canadian remembrance.

The trouble is that Garth is so much in control. You can understand why, after what he went through [the trouble to get funding], but it would be so much better handled by Veterans Affairs. They do the Vimy experience
Vimy is properly organized and the guides know what they’re doing and there’s no political agenda.

Another prominent Canadian guide and history professor adds,

I think all of us have accepted that Garth, who remains a friend of mine, I have expressed all of these concerns to Garth and it’s not anything – I’m not speaking behind anyone’s back. Garth has won. His stubbornness and grit and determination and tactics that have led to raising money to build the center and then raising money to subsidize it: you can’t quarrel with success at some point you have to live with it.

Their resignation echoes the view that JBC will experience two eras: the ‘Garth era’, meaning fulfillment of Mr. Webb’s vision for the centre, and the ‘post-Garth era’, a time when the post-war generation, rather than just the veterans, will have an influence on the mandate and operation of the JBC.

This represents another perspective of fictive kinship (Winter 2006), where a national war memory is dominated by a board made up of veterans and next of kin. Management, government and the visitor voice are weakened if not absent, and the voice of battlefield tour guides is non-existent. This fragmentation of Canadian history falls along a fault line that separates World War II as a Canadian mythic narrative, as presented by the JBC, and the demand by various stakeholders for a more detailed historical representation of the Canadian military involvement in D-Day and the Normandy campaign. The next vignette explores commemorations that take place around the time of the June 6th period, the most significant time in the commemorative calendar. It also explores the interaction between various cultural memories of war.

6:30pm, June 6th, Commemoration at Basly Village

The service at Basly (Figure 48), a small village a few miles from Juno Beach, is to commemorate its liberation by Canadians. I overhear the accents of a couple from Quebec. I turn and say ‘Salut!’ and we begin to chat. It is interesting how feelings of connectedness between Quebecois and English Canadians are manifested here in Normandy. Speaking French here provides a chance to participate in this heritage: it makes me feel more Canadian.
Figure 48: Flags and anthems: Local commemoration on June 6th 2008 at Basly (Photo source: the author original in colour).

The traffic is brought to a halt and the service starts. The stone monument cut in the shape of a maple leaf stands festooned with flowers and wreaths, surrounded by about 100 locals. The Chair of the local Board of the Juno Beach Centre, strides up to the microphone. ‘Thousands of Canadians were killed in order that we could be free.’ He speaks of how far they came, as volunteers, to fight in a war far away from those they loved. I think about some of the veterans I know, and the places they came from: the prairies, small towns on the west coast of Canada, so far removed from this culture.

The speech is for the French, not only in its message but as it is only offered in French. I feel a sense of solemn earnestness here. School children are called upon to recite poetry. They are part of the Westlake Brothers Association, a local organization named after Canadian brothers who were killed in Normandy.
As if emotionally primed by the steady flow of speeches and poetry about the war dead, about freedom won, about foreigners coming from the other side of the world to fight, the crowd is unleashed on Le Marseilles. Voices raised, the anthem fills the town square. Aux armes, citoyens! To arms, citizens! Voices quiver, those around me do not hold back, and I am stirred by the emotion and imagery evoked by the anthem. Marchons! Marchons! Let’s March! Let’s March! The historical concept of occupation, of oppression, fear and then liberation, takes on a different emotional charge here. The Canadian national anthem is played, and the few Canadians present do our best to have our voices heard. Afterward, a Frenchman shakes my hand. A woman steps toward me and explains that she visited the family of a Canadian bomber pilot killed near her town south of Caen. She travelled to Prince Albert, a small community in Northern Saskatchewan. We laugh in the shared knowledge that Prince Albert is in the middle of nowhere, a far cry from Normandy. At the same time, she speaks of her love for the people, of her ongoing connection with the Canadian family, and how she hosted them in Normandy. I am invited to the local hall for a vin d’honneur. I glance to the west with misty eyes, the sun setting on French and Canadian flags as they roll in the summer breeze. It is a powerful moment, one tinged with patriotism as well as a sense of personal attachment toward this community.

A range of themes can be discussed with regard to what was observed: the commemorative narrative as ‘a story told and reflected on’ (Connerton 1989, p. 58) or what Farmer (1999, p. 208) notes as ‘organization of silences’ in French commemoration that do not speak of collaboration and Vichy. However, the Norman memory of the war, such as what was experienced in Basly, is perhaps more attuned to commemoration because it represents local heritage. As a tourist, the researcher feels a connection to the place through the ritual narrative of the commemoration and the interaction with local and Canadian people. Taken from the perspective offered by Cary (2004, p. 73), this represents a tourist moment, whereby the sense of being a tourist is erased, and that the narrative and experience in this site of memory creates a sense of belonging. Rather than standing as passive consumer, as Bagnall (2003, p.
95) describes, the French-speaking Canadian researcher gains a different insight and connection about the meaning of war remembrance. Interestingly, Footitt (2004) also notes the language as a theme in the allied narrative of fighting in Normandy. He argues that the locals were placed as a backdrop to events, unable to interact and converse with the common soldier. In a contemporary setting, non French-speaking tourists can miss the chance to interact with the French, muting the French war memory.

The next example provides another example of what Park (2010) aptly entitles ‘emotional journeys into nationhood’ but one that is more conflicted than the experience at Basly. Whereas the ritual elements are similar to other commemorations attended throughout Normandy, each commemoration has its own tone of remembrance, framed by the war experiences of that landscape. From a thanatourism perspective, the tourist more readily experiences the aural quality of the Other of Death at Abbaye d'Ardenne, the site where Canadians were executed.

Figure 49: Commemoration at Abbaye d'Ardenne, June, 2009 (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).
June 7, 2009, Abbaye d’Ardenne

A crowd of Canadians and French gather in a small clearing adjacent to the Abbey (Figure 49). It is a solemn affair, with the events of June 8th recalled, and the reciting of 16 names of those executed. The moment of silence is filled with the rustle of leaves overhead, as a stand of trees sways to a gentle wind. The juxtaposition of the beauty of Nature adds to the emotion for me, as I think it might have been the last sound these guys heard before being shot. It is a familiar sound, like a forest of maple trees that would be found in their native Nova Scotia. The faces stare out (Figure 50), reminding me of their youth and innocence. There is no sense to what happened here, and there is no feeling of closure: there is a hauntedness to this place. A bagpipe breaks the silence with a lament.

A French woman requests a chance to speak. She asks that the local French Resistance Movement be recognized for its efforts in a memorial of some kind. Her speech is met with an uncomfortable silence.
This place is what Mayerfeld Bell (1997, p.813) describes as a ‘landscape of ghosts’, with a haunted sense of place that narrative, ritual, memorials and the naturescape enshrine in the site. Winter (2009, p. 62, 70) describes the search for meaning in World War II commemoration is ‘infinitely more complex’, a comment that holds veracity when considering the memory of what occurred at the Abbaye d’Ardenne.

Abbaye d’Ardenne provokes thoughts of what Seaton (2009a) describes as the Other of Death (Seaton 2009a). For the researcher, it is uncomfortable, as there is no happy ending, no heroism to deflect the story of murder, no way to rationalize the loss without stepping away from the details and thinking about the larger victory. However, being in this place requires reflection that in turn leads to a search for meaning. This complexity reflects what Geertz (1973, p. 30) describes as being ‘in search of all-too-deep-lying turtles,’ resulting in losing ‘touch with the hard surfaces of life.’ In the end, it is one part of the Canadian story of Normandy, unsettling and a sobering contrast to the festive victorious mood of Arromanches and Pegasus Bridge.

The request by the French woman exemplifies the potential dissonance of remembrance by unveiling the silences associated with the memory of resistance and collaboration. The discomfort felt was both in raising a controversial topic as well as intervening in the ritual of commemoration that was about the Canadian war experience. But this illustrates the multiple layers of war heritage in Normandy and how sites can evoke a range of remembrances, as Winter and Sivan (1999) and Seaton (2009a) argue. By raising the contested French war memory at a Canadian memorial associated with senseless act of war, the complexity and irreconcilability of certain war memories was amplified.

Figure 50: Abbaye d'Ardenne, site of Canadian executions (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).
The Canadian tourist performance at Abbaye d’Ardenne involves leaving objects and mementos behind (Figure 51). Bachelor (2004) describes such rituals at cemeteries as establishing a relationship between those remembering and the remembered. The act also reflects what Park (2010, p. 117) describes as the ‘socio-psychological dimensions of heritage’ and how ‘personal perceptions…subjective sentiments and collective social memories contribute to the long-term tourism appeal’ of heritage sites. In this light, it is the power of being there that instills a shared sense of collective remembrance. The sense of place is enabled by the sensory element: the familiar and peaceful sound of wind rustling the trees. Like the physicality of a place as a site of memory, sound acts as an intersection in time and space, a bond shared between those awaiting execution in June, 1944 and those who come to bear witness and to remember in a contemporary setting.

Figure 51: Flags, poppies and crosses left behind at the Abbaye d’Ardenne (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).
The Canadian sector represents a landscape of national war heritage within the larger Normandy landscape of war. Whereas the hub site of memory is purported to be the Juno Beach Centre, it lacks a strong force field of support in this mandate. The criticisms reflect the opposite to what is working in the Pegasus Museum setting, whereby the museum links locally relevant stories with objects and the adjacent landscape. The JBC represents an agency that is struggling with the interests of various stakeholders which mark the dissonance of Canadian war memory. In contrast, local commemorations represent an opportunity for Canadian tourists to remember in a deep and meaningful way. The connection is with the landscape and the local people, providing an avenue of deep reflection with regard to war remembrance and national identity.

**Conclusion**

This chapter examines three sites: Pegasus Bridge, Arromanches and three sites in the Canadian Sector. Pegasus Bridge is a British site of memory, memorializing the legendary glider-borne coup-de-main. The concentrated materiality of the site provides an intense connection between the past and present, traversed by imagination, cultural memories of war and emotion. Arromanches is similar to Pegasus Bridge in that it is a British site of memory and also relatively free of associations with the carnage of battle. This characteristic positions them as life-affirming sites of memory, exemplified in the festive atmosphere associated with commemorations at these sites.

As a seaside town, it may be argued that Arromanches also illustrates the uneasy mix of commercialism and remembrance as argued by Winter (2006; 2009) and Edwards (2009). What this research demonstrates is the importance of listening to all the voices involved in remembrance. The dynamic nature of war memory is exemplified in Arromanches where locals, the museum management and the visitors interact. The war memory and the livelihood of this town are undoubtedly linked, and there is a sense of responsibility to the integrity of the war memory among the locals, such as the
museum manager, the Mayor and others observed. Criticisms of
commercialism are off base, as they need to take into account the local voice
as well as the complexity of memories that are negotiated in these places.

The June 6th commemoration was a festive occasion that generated a sense of
fictive kinship with, for example, a group of Dutch visitors, through brief
discussions, as well as through holding hands with strangers and singing Auld
Lang Syne. Meeting a German was in contrast to the festive setting, involving
an uncomfortable silence about his father’s time in the military and references
to the battle in Normandy. In the context of a commemoration in Arromanches,
British, Canadian, American, French, Dutch and German cultural memories of
war are negotiated as part of the tourism performance of remembering.

Examining three sites in the Canadian sector provided an opportunity to
uncover the politics of remembrance, with regard to the Juno Beach Centre, as
well as the sensory power of the visitor experience. The contested nature of
the Canadian war memory involves a complex balance in the heritage force
field that places the veterans’ voice as predominant, as noted by Joly (2000).
The transition from the veteran to the post veteran era will inevitably alter the
representation of Canadian war heritage at Juno Beach. In this context, the
Canadian war memory can be viewed as a passionate debate as to how the
national war story should be told, reflecting a sense of ownership on all sides of
the discussion including tourism stakeholders - visitors, locals, site managers
and guides. From another perspective, it raises questions as to the awareness
of the Board of the heritage force field and their approach to including various
voices. This is a topic for future research.

Two other experiences in the Canadian sector illustrated the range of
commemorative experiences in the Normandy landscape of war. In Basly, a
town liberated by the Canadians, the researcher had what could be described
as a spiritually uplifting encounter during the local commemoration. It did not
reflect the disquiet of the Sorrow and the Pity (Ophuls 1972), regarding the
silences of French war memory, but rather a sense of familial remembrance about foreigners who came and liberated their town.

The commemoration of Abbaye d’Ardenne evoked the pain and suffering of war, the lack of closure on wartime atrocities. The stark reality of what happened provoked thoughts about the Other of Death. Taken in light of other more festive commemorations at Arromanches and Pegasus Bridge, sites of death are an important balance in the visitor performance of remembering. They provide a depth and breadth of sensory, imaginative and emotional elements that go beyond the legend of D-Day as a nostalgic war memory. The layers of French and Canadian war heritage were also evident, an indication of the complexity of meanings associated with sites of memory.

Within a landscape of war, there can be other scapes that reflect specific war memories: a national war mythscape, a landscape of ghosts and war film scapes. These scapes are socially constructed by visitors as well as by site managers. The performance of remembering involves spectacles such as dressing up, dancing, singing and leaving objects behind that reflect the significance and power of commemorating in the landscape of war. As well, the interaction of visitors of various nationalities, representing various war memories that travel to a specific site and commemorate together is another powerful phenomenon. The visitor experience represents an important dynamic to furthering understanding of war and its meaning to people and societies.

In addition to commemorations and museums, war cemeteries are important sites of memory. The next chapter explores the interpretive approaches taken by war cemetery management. American, Commonwealth and German cemeteries are examined in terms of their approach to mediating the experience of the contemporary visitor.
Introduction

Sivan and Winter (1999) argue that a major challenge facing war remembrance is maintaining the relevance of the memory after the veteran generation is no longer present. Military cemeteries are sites at the heart of remembrance, where the fallen are buried and visitors come face to face with an outcome of war. This chapter focuses on site management in the context of remembrance and the next generation of visitors, and how cemetery management has approached representing and interpreting the cemetery and the fallen. The main focus is on the American Cemetery, given that it is the most visited site in the Normandy landscape of war and that it has taken a proactive approach to planning that recognizes the potential benefits of tourism to remembrance. The Commonwealth War Graves Commission and the German War Cemetery at La Cambe, managed by the Volksbund Deutscher Kriegsgräberfürsorge (VDK), provide an opportunity for comparative analysis.

The Normandy American Cemetery: Auratic Quality, Interpretation and the Transition to the Post-Veteran Generation

With approximately 1.5 million visitors a year, the Normandy American Cemetery is the most visited site in Normandy and the seventh most visited site in France (Bayeux-Bessin 2008). The symmetrical rows of crosses and stars of David positioned across a manicured lawn exemplify architectural characteristics embodied in the Cult of the Fallen (Mosse 1990) is in stark contrast to the horror of the landing on the adjacent Omaha Beach. Speaking to the setting of the cemetery, the Superintendent, Mr. Neese, acknowledges that the cemetery has ‘a special aura’. He compares the Normandy cemetery to other military cemeteries with their ‘beautiful chapels.’ He suggests,

... here, we don’t really focus on that chapel. We do not have to make a grand structure in here, as it would detract from the entire aura because the aura of Omaha is the beach. You know, everything else is tied into that.
Ms. Bauer, Deputy Director of Visitor Services describes the cemetery as embodying ‘American values’. Similar to other battlefields overseas that have a significant meaning to nationhood (see Slade 2003; Gough 2007) there is a solemn power of place, evoked by its design and location, as well as by the commemorative speeches of President Reagan in 1984 (McManus 2004) and President Clinton in 1994 (see Kahl 2006), and finally in film. Mr. Neese remembers the sudden profile with the post-war generation: ‘…Private Ryan comes out and ‘Boom!’ [It] explodes and revitalizes everybody’s interest. People were saying, ‘holy smoke we forgot all about this stuff’…’

The cemetery gained further public prominence by way of the opening and closing scenes of Saving Private Ryan. However, with the rise in the number of visitors, several of the ABMC management interviewed pointed out that visitors did not have enough knowledge about the cemetery. Mr. Neese describes visitors asking, ‘are there really soldiers buried in your cemetery? Aren’t these just symbolic crosses?’ This growing challenge effectively marked the functional evolution of the site from being specifically a military cemetery to one needing to provide an education to the next generation.
Figure 52: The original 'Visitor Services' building, Normandy American Cemetery (Photo source: the author 2007 original in colour).

As part of the World War II memory boom experienced in the United States (see Doss 2008) the ABMC embarked on a new direction, what Mr. Conley, Director of Public Relations, describes as ‘the (need) to rejig the role of these sites.’ Facilities and services to receive visitors at the cemetery were characterized as ‘more of a funeral parlor’: accompanying next of kin and providing information and condolences on behalf of the government (Figure 52). Now, the focus is described as being ‘educational’, of ‘making a connection’ between visitors and the place. As Mr. Neese explains, ‘we now have to think about future generations who want to experience the cemetery and understand why this is an important chapter in American history and their history.’

The ABMC turned to the United States Parks Service, the agency responsible for sites such as Gettysburg and Pearl Harbor. Parks Staff were hired and investment committed to infrastructure development. Normandy cemetery is described as the ‘laboratory’, with $40 million US spent on the interpretive center (Figure 53).
Mr. James Woolsey, formerly a guide and manager in the US Parks Service, is the Director of Visitor Services at the Normandy American Cemetery. His time in this position is short-lived, having just been given the position as Director of Visitor Services for all American cemeteries in Europe. He notes the researcher’s surprise at the existence of such a position, explaining that it is ‘because the agency [ABMC] realizes … where things are going.’

As a reflection of where things are going, Conley explains the agency’s efforts to promote military cemeteries to the American public as sites to visit when touring overseas. In comparison with the Commonwealth War Graves Commission and the Volksbund Deutscher Kriegsgräberfürsorge, the ABMC has the most aggressive plan to provide interpretive services to visitors as well as to promote visiting war cemeteries. Although Prost (1998) notes the evolution of remembering and tourism with the Verdun site, what makes the ABMC effort different is the extent of the investment and the fact that the cemeteries in other countries. In effect, the American government agency is promoting overseas travel to experience American heritage.

Another indication of changing direction for ABMC is the focus on interpretation and how remembrance becomes more resonant by mediating the experience. In responding to a question regarding the role of the interpretive centre with regard to remembrance, Ms. Bauer explains,

I think it really deepens the experience and for some, gives them something to remember. What I mean by that is, I think you have so many people, particularly young people that unless they had some kind of family connection and hear people talking about it at the dinner table … to me, there is a difference between learning. Remembering is something more personal.

This perspective echoes what Winter and Sivan (2000) describe as a characteristic of collective remembrance, the independent reflection by
individuals giving their own positionality to war memory. In addition, the approach reflects concepts the mediated connection of the visitor to the place and memory (see Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1998; Suvantola 2002; Palmer 2003). For example, Bauer goes on to talk about the role of the centre to ‘put things into context’, responding to historical questions about, for example, the soldier’s equipment and the battle itself. She continues to differentiate between memory and history, explaining,

I think of [memory] as something that puts a face on it, makes it more personal and can make it more about a real person… it becomes remembered, it becomes more of an actual connection.

Here, Bauer is acknowledging the need to mediate meaning through interpretation and of making a personal connection. Schooled in the interpretive principles of Tilden (1977) and Larsen (2003), the Parks Service focuses on presenting universal concepts, defined as points of discussion or ideas that will engage the audience. Neese echoes this challenge when he explains,

For years, basically we superintendents were all facts: 9387 [buried in the cemetery], 172.5 acres, you know. These are people that are here. These are not headstones, these are people, this is their resting place but it’s just not a headstone.

To put a face on those buried at the cemetery as well as to achieve what Bauer describes as a ‘deeper experience’, the visitor is introduced to three interpretive themes, what the National Parks Service describes as universal concepts (Larsen 2003): competence, courage and sacrifice (Figure 54). Two films are screened, one of which focuses on five men that are buried in the cemetery, the lives they had before the war, what each did during the war, and how their families remember them. Another room offers a chronology of the war and multimedia presentations on the preparation for D-Day and the day’s events.
A fourth universal concept, honor, is experienced in a room leading to the cemetery. There is a 10-metre hallway with blank walls. A voice reads the names of the dead. At the end of the hall, a translucent glass encases a rifle with bayonet into the ground and a helmet placed on top. The scene, to mark the burial of a soldier, is lit by natural light through a glass roof, creating a spiritual aura. The visitor then leaves the center and walks on the bluff overlooking Omaha Beach to enter the cemetery. The interpretive centre, like Pegasus, links individual stories and historical context with the immediate landscape, both the beach and the cemetery.

One may argue that such state involvement will lead to propagandizing the message of war, as Buffton (2005) and Doss (2009) argue. Both authors posit that the state’s involvement in memorialization can be employed to validate war in the contemporary context, effectively giving new life to Mosse’s Myth of the War Experience (1990). An example of state propaganda is noted by Kelly (2000) who describes the controversy at the Pearl Harbor Memorial when the Parks Service moved away from politically-charged interpretive messages reflecting the Cold War policies prevalent in the 1950’s and 1960’s. In the
context of the Normandy American Cemetery, universal concepts such as honor and sacrifice may be viewed as embracing war in a romantic or mythic manner. Another perspective is to view the ABMC as fulfilling its mandate in maintaining the memory of those killed in the war. In this context, the interpretive center represents what Winter (2009, p. 71) refers to an essential element in sustaining remembrance over generations: the transformation as an active site of memory. However, the Normandy American Cemetery contests Winter's view of tourism as an undermining force to remembrance. Instead, the ABMC is promoting remembrance by way of embracing tourism and by providing the necessary educational facilities to carry out this connection in a meaningful way. The visitor perspective of the cemetery is examined in Chapter Ten. The next part will first examine management practices at the German Military Cemetery at LaCambe followed by consideration of the approach taken by the Commonwealth War Graves Commission, with its 18 cemeteries in Normandy.

The German Cemetery at La Cambe

The German military cemetery at La Cambe is located just off the motorway running from Caen to Cherbourg, making it easily accessed by travelers. This is one of two cemeteries in Normandy, with over 21,000 German soldiers buried. Responsibility for the two million war dead and 836 cemeteries located in 44 nations rests with the Volksbund Deutscher Kriegsgraeberfuersorge. In contrast to the large staff at the American cemetery, Mr. Tisseraud, the Director of the cemetery, works alone, managing a modest interpretive center (Figure 55), coordinating commemorative events, managing the gardeners as well as liaising with the local authorities. From time to time, a German body is unearthed, requiring Mr. Tisseraud to process identification and its burial. On occasion, he provides interpretation of the site. Although there are approximately 180,000 visitors a year, representing a range of nationalities, there is no formal interpretive program.
Prince (2009, p. 44) notes that the mandate of the VDK is much broader than their American and Commonwealth counterparts, as it formally takes on the role of promoting peace and cross-cultural understanding. The mission is reflected in the comments of Tisseraud:

Remembrance is about showing to today’s generation what happened, that there were people who behaved in an inhuman way. There are neo- Nazis everywhere, all over the world…. (Translated interview)

He goes on to explain that the mandate of the VDK is ‘reconciliation with the graves,’ a message that is reflected in the peace and anti war messages which cover the centre wall in three languages (Figure 56). Asking what he would like people to gain from visiting the cemetery, he replies,

I want them to realize that the war has neither a victor nor vanquished. It is only the military and the politicians that speak like that. Everybody…has lost something. The sole victory is the fact that we
succeeded in getting rid of Nazism. There was a German who was here for a ceremony and he said, it wasn’t only France that was liberated.

His comment reflects the philosophy of the VDK, ‘to promote the development of a European culture of memory and commemoration’ (Prince, p. 45). Aside from the beautifully manicured lawns and gardens, the VDK cemetery stands in contrast to the materiality of the American and Commonwealth cemeteries. Black headstones are placed flat on the ground, indicating only the name of the soldier and his date of birth and death (Figure 57). Military symbols, such as rank or regiment are absent to avoid idolatry. Mr Tisseraud notes that ‘people [visiting the cemetery] tell me repeatedly that they feel something, they don’t know what it is: if it is the architecture, the black crosses, the trees, they feel something special.’
Other symbols He points to the doorway to the cemetery (Figure 58), explaining,

… it symbolizes the difficult passage from life to death and everyone is all alone in the face of his destiny. Therefore, only one person can pass through the door. We have life on the exterior, and death represented inside. That has to make an impression on people.

This comment points to both the utility of cemetery architecture and design to evoke reflection upon death, as well as universality of the symbolism.
The Commonwealth War Graves Commission

Peter Francis, the Public Relations Officer for the Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) was interviewed at the head office in Maidenhead, UK. The CWGC runs the largest operation of the three agencies, with over 2300 cemeteries located in 150 countries. It does not operate interpretive centers, nor does it provide staff on site, other than gardeners. Francis explains that maintaining the cemeteries is the core function of the Commission. However, he also notes that ‘if you are going to stay relevant… you are going to have to engage with them [the public], and particularly with the younger people.’ In addition to its website that provides information on cemeteries and burial records for use by tourists and school groups, the Commission annually organizes a few field trips for British school children to France, although this is not solely a function of the Commission. Nevertheless, Francis argues that the Commission is not getting into the construction and staffing of interpretive centers because ‘our member governments are doing it already’ and ‘that it really wasn’t our job to build visitor centres, to staff them, to resource them.’

Figure 58: Doorway to the LaCambe Cemetery  (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).
Part of the challenge for the Commission is the direction taken when the Imperial War Graves Commission was first established during World War I. As a matter of practicality and later policy (see Kenyon 1918), fallen soldiers were buried close to where they fell, not collected into massive cemeteries as the Americans chose to do. As one of the ABMC managers commented about the Commonwealth war grave at Beny sur Mer,

It’s a lovely site. It’s beautiful. But it is out in the middle of a field. It is on a good road, it is not like people can’t get to it. But I bet if that cemetery was right in the town, right on the beach, it would have visitation like this place [Normandy American Cemetery].

This points to the geographic clustering of various sites of memory and how guide books and some tours will prioritize sites based not only on materiality (see Caroline Winter 2010), but on proximity to other sites. As McGeer (2008) notes, this is also the power of such sites, tranquil and often situated in quiet rural settings. However, owing to the remoteness of such sites, they are not as visited as more central and larger cemeteries.

The actual cemetery has only rudimentary resources for the visitor: the cemetery register that lists the names of those buried in the cemetery and often a stainless steel panel that explains the battle that occurred in the area. However, it is an issue of historical accuracy versus an interpretive medium aimed at establishing a connection between the site and the visitor. As Francis notes, the panels are ‘very well-written, but I would suggest that perhaps a modern audience is less interested about the 15th Battalion Infantry rose up on the left flank.’ Despite the acknowledgement, no changes are in the works for the CWGC, certainly not to the extent of the American effort.

**Conclusion**

The American Battle Monuments Commission has come to terms with the notion that tourists are key agents in the perpetuation of war memory and are involved in acts of remembrance. To prepare remembering in the post-war
generation period, expertise has been enlisted in the form of the US National Parks Service to ensure the implementation of interpretation that is meaningful and puts a face to the fallen. This is a reflection of the significance of the Normandy site in the American cultural memory, and of mediation to make meaning of a place. Interpretive themes herald the heroism and sacrifice of the soldiers, aligning with the American war memory that mythologizes the landscape, the event and the American soldier.

The German Cemetery has a more modest interpretive program, but focuses on conveying messages of world peace and cultural understanding as opposed to ‘putting faces to the graves’, as American Commission described. In contrast to the triumphal colonnades and rows of white crosses and gravestones at the American and British cemeteries, the German cemetery employs symbols that emphasize the finality and equality of death and the futility of war: a single doorway and gravestones without rank or regiment. It reflects a challenge of remembering the fallen who were the enemy, and a refashioning of that memory into one of reconciliation. In this context, the cemetery represents a counterpoint to the allied cultural memories of the war, one that warrants future research.

The Commonwealth War Graves Commission stands alone in that there are no plans to develop visitor centres, rather it is left to each nation to support and manage such sites. This is also a reflection on the number and geography of graves sites. There are 18 cemeteries in Normandy alone, making it difficult to fund and manage interpretation at every site. Rather than their ubiquity positioning them as frequently visited sites, they are typically tucked out of the way in more remote locations, leaving only the larger and more accessible cemeteries at Bayeux, Beny sur Mer and Ranville visited. With limited interpretive information at cemeteries, the CWGC leaves interpretation to the tourists, guide books and tour guides. Nevertheless, all of the cemeteries possess a powerful auratic quality for visitors. The next chapter focuses on the reactions and meaning-making of visitors to the landscape of war, providing a
sense of how cemeteries, museums, the landing beaches and other sites of memory as well as the mediating role of tourism, affect visitors.
CHAPTER 10. Meaning-Making and the Visitor Experience
Introduction

In this chapter, visitor interviews, participant observation of guided bus tours, and online visitor feedback are reviewed. There are three aspects of interest here:

- The motivations to visit a landscape of war;
- The reactions to sites and the sense of place, and;
- The outcome of their experience.

These three interrelated dimensions help to frame the role of tourism and the ways in which visitors perform in the landscape of war. This aspect of the research contributes to knowledge by addressing some of Seaton’s (2009a) identified concerns regarding the lack of research into visitor meaning-making in thanatourism, specifically with regard to motivations, memorable moments and general reflections evoked while touring the landscape of war.

Following Winter’s recognition of differences in remembrance between next of kin and those with no familial association with the war, the chapter categorizes responses along these two perspectives. After examining the experience of next of kin visiting the landscape of war, the three identified meaning lenses, as reviewed and identified in Chapter 4, are employed to analyze the visitor meaning-making.
In His Foot Steps: Kinship Remembrance in the Landscape of War

Presented below are comments that exemplify the reactions of next of kin (Table 16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations to visit</th>
<th>Memorable moments in the landscape</th>
<th>Reflection on touring the landscape of war</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I had eight siblings, two of which fought in World War II. I wanted to come once in my life.’ (Tour Gay American female 70)</td>
<td>‘All these Americans … kept on coming up and shaking Dad’s hand.’ (Tour Jackie British)</td>
<td>‘He only started telling some of the stories when we came over.’ (Tour Jackie female British)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘We wished to see the memorial plaque [to their uncle] and pay our own personal respects’ (Online 945).</td>
<td>‘I have a picture of my father and he’s standing on one of the huge gun turrets facing the beach… we could clearly identify where my father was. (Interview Ilene American female)</td>
<td>‘My grandpa died in France and my Mom cannot remember him. We have many pictures, so it made me cry to think of him dying there all alone’ (Online 387).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I was interested [to go to Normandy], but then I’m interested in the Galapagos as well. The fact that my father had been there made it more interesting, the fact that I realized there was a piece that I was not getting, the emotional content of it, what happened there, what happened to these men there, and how did they change. It became like a larger thing for me … and then it was like the nail in the coffin – I had to get there. (Interview Ilene American female)</td>
<td>‘Seeing the field where my grandfather’s glider was supposed to land - it made what he experienced very real to me’ (Online 083).</td>
<td>‘For me, it was like passing on the historical knowledge within the family.’ (Interview Mark, male Canadian interview)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Comments relating to kinship and meaning-making.
Comments regarding the motivation to visit and memorable moments in the landscape reflect a desire to either gain a better understanding of what happened to their kin, or out of a sense of duty, to come and visit the landscape. Another theme is that of walking in their footsteps, of gaining perspective on their kinship’s war time experience. These comments evoke a uniquely private and socially constructed meaning to the visitor experience. They also illustrate familial ties of kinship that are accessed by way of the imagination, emotion and cultural memories of war, triggered by the physicality of the landscape (see Palmer 2003). Cosgrove (1988) characterizes this phenomenon as employing the landscape as a means to situate memory which is then passed on the next generation. In this context, as Winter and Sivan (2000) note, kinship ties serve as the primary driver in remembering. As a tourist performance, the narrative remembered is motivated and framed by familial ties.

In addition to what people say, their performance of remembering can also indicate an attempt to better understand their father’s wartime experiences. Ilene, an American, offers her reflection of visiting Normandy:

There was absolutely no one there the day that I went there [to Omaha Beach]. I had images in my brain…those Capa photographs with the guy coming out of - what do you call them, Higgin’s boats – the images of the people, the men sitting in the water around the barbed wire and … of course that was reinforced by Spielberg’s movie and seeing the water red. And you’re seeing things, what my father meant, and understanding what he saw [crying] and understanding about, that there’s no way a person could see that and not be changed inexorably. And to understand that my dad saw it, I felt that God, how come I didn’t know, how come I didn’t understand? (Ilene American female interview)

This quote exemplifies the emotional and intellectual complexity of meanings associated with remembrance and grieving. Evident is what Baldwin and Sharpley (2009) describe as battlefield tourism with high emotional intensity owing to the familial act of remembrance. As well, Ilene recognizes that her imagination of D-Day is informed by several vectors of cultural memory - the legend of D-Day, war films, her father’s stories - that inform her imagination as
to what her father experienced. Being in the landscape, with thoughts of her father, generates another form of what Casey (1987) refers to as intensive remembering, the meditative moment when a range of thoughts and ideas come together. In this context, being on Omaha Beach plays a key role in triggering a transformative moment in her life.

What is also of note is that Ilene is reflecting upon her experience of a trip that occurred a year or two earlier. The moment of standing in the battlefield in her father’s footsteps is an emotionally charged memory and stands as a turning point in understanding her father. This reflects what Sather-Wagstaff (2008) and Sturken (2007) describe as an important aspect of understanding tourism to sites of memory: the tourist performance of remembering involves attempting to understand and gain a sense of balance and closure. An example of this is Gail (Figure 59) who attempts to trace her father’s wartime route in Normandy using his original map. Gail calls her father by cell phone to clarify stories and place names. The phone conversations are long, resulting in more questions for the guide and references to the map. There is a sense of urgency, of capturing as much information as possible about the landscape and what happened as if to reveal greater understanding and insight about her father.
Figure 59: A daughter orientates herself in Carantan using her father’s wartime map (Photo source: the author 2009 original in colour).

The experience of families visiting with their veteran fathers represents the passing on of the family history. In other words, touring the landscape of war represents the succession of family war remembrance to the next generation. For example, Cullis, a Canadian veteran, took a trip with his daughter and grandchildren. With his 1944 photographs taken from the landing craft he piloted, he is able to locate the spot where he landed and pass his story on to his daughter (Figure 60). The triangulation of veteran and father narrative, landscape and imagery generates a strong family connection, anchoring the memory of the past in a tourist performance in the present, achieving what his son Mark describes as a ‘passing on family history.’
Figure 60: Situating familial war memory in the landscape (Photo source: Lancaster 2009 original in colour).

This is exemplified when the family visits a military cemetery, as Cullis explains, …we were at the Canadian cemetery and I got quite tearful. I realized I was so lucky, I was there with my grandchildren and showing them around, and all these other guys their date of death was June 1944.

The veteran father visits the cemetery to engage in what Bachelor (2004) describes as maintaining an emotional bond with the dead and to seek solace from emotions of grief. The meaning of the visit for Cullis’ son Mark, can be captured in Bachelor’s description of a perceived duty of respect, ‘an inexplicable innate compulsion to visit’ (p. 97). The sense of obligation forms a central part of the continuance of war memory beyond the veteran generation and exemplifies the notion of next of kin as social agents of remembrance (Winter 2006).

In summary, much of the commentary in this section confirms what Winter (2006; 2009) argues with regard to the social agency of memory and how
familial kinship plays an important role in preserving the individual memories of war. Part of this legacy involves visiting the landscape of war and recounting wartime events, thereby anchoring family memory in a place. This next section provides some insight into the reactions of veterans to memorialized and interpreted sites.

**Veteran Reactions at Sites of Memory**

Veterans touring the landscape of war can involve comparing their war memory with how interpretive centers and other sites of memory represent the war. Therefore, another theme in the performance of remembering by those associated with the war memory is the dissonance in how war is represented, as experienced by veterans. Two examples are offered here.

May 25, 2008  Near Arromanches and Gold Beach on a guided tour

Jackie and Donna, two British women, brought their father Bill to Normandy, a veteran of the Royal Engineers who landed late on June 6\(^{th}\) (Pictured in Figure 61). Visiting the landscape provokes memories of the war for Bill, some of which are not welcome. Our guided tour stops at the Arromanches 360 cinema, a circular cinema that marries war time and present-day images of the landscape along with the sounds of war. Within the first five minutes, Bill is visibly overcome with emotion, his daughters offering to take him out of the cinema. Back on the bus, Bill explains, ‘[The tour] was great until seeing that film. I have too many bad memories.’ Bill is more content when he gets to Gold Beach, observing wind sail carts zooming along the beach. ‘Now that’s more like it! Just as it should be!’ As part of the tour, the rest of the group enthusiastically listens to Bill’s story. The experience with the film and on the beach reflects what Bill wants to remember and what he wishes to forget.
As a witness and participant to war, Bill represents what Winter (2006) views as a central figure in conveying its memory. Cinema 360 represents what Belhassen, Caton and Stewart (2008, p. 672) refer to as a manipulation of the meaning of the landscape. Other veterans interviewed, such as Webb, have noted that Cinema 360 is ‘a dud’ and were not ‘impressed with it.’ The Mayor of Arromanches also notes his concern with the commercialized effort bordering his town. However, in their guide book, Steves and Smith (2008) recommend beginning with Cinema 360 in order to ‘set your mood’ of a tour of the D-Day area (p. 224-225). Collectively, these voices represent the contested nature of war remembrance and how it is represented. Other more sanctified sites of commemoration such as a cemetery can also evoke dissonance by veterans, as the following example illustrates.
June 6, 2008: Normandy American Cemetery

I move toward the cliff that overlooks Omaha Beach to listen to an American veteran telling his story to a small group of visitors (Figure 62). He stands by the belvedere depicting the assault on Omaha Beach, with its sweeping arrows to indicate the attack. The veteran explains,

Our first night here we put in just beyond the cemetery. The stories I hear are not sufficient. I didn’t see it that way. I was standing on the landing craft and the guy standing to my left, no further than you, was killed. Another guy stepped out of the landing craft and was immediately hit in the ankle. He got hit another six times that day. His story is not told. When I got on the beach, someone ran right past me and then blew up when he stepped on a mine, not six yards in front of me. There are so many things.

Figure 62: American veteran tells his story overlooking Omaha Beach (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

The narrative demonstrates the power of the memorialized landscape in defining what is remembered and forgotten. Rowlands (1999) argues that memorialization establishes a certain tone and narrative for remembering war in a manner that enables the blood and horror to be forgotten. The veteran
describes the horror of war that is not represented in the symbols and narrative of the Normandy American Cemetery. Despite veterans gaining voice through oral histories, such as Ambrose (1994) and Brinkley and Drez (2004) and in influencing the state with regard to memorialization, the nature of the cultural war memory is that it tends toward the mythic narrative, a view echoed by Wood (2006), a veteran who argues that America worships certain war mythologies. In effect, the peace, serenity and beauty of the cemetery belies what Wood describes as the ‘animal nature of combat, the combat numbness that so destroys moral choice’ to which the veteran visiting the cemetery infers (Wood 2006, p. 78).

The veteran’s perspective on the interpretation of the landscape reflects the conflict in cultural memories, how legend and myth can readily clash with the experiences of veterans. Whereas mediated experiences and memorialized place can lead to conflicted meaning-making for veterans, the power of place in evoking memory is not questioned. The next section examines the meaning-making of tourists without a familial link to the landscape of war. Employed to examine the data is the meaning lenses of national identity, social identity/nostalgia and war/death.

**National Identity as a Theme of Meaning-Making**

Examining meaning-making from the perspective of national identity involves taking into account national war memories and other cultural memories of war. Table 17 represents commentary that references national identity in some way. The comments represent a range of themes with regard to the relationship of tourism and remembrance.

From the perspective of motivations to visit the Normandy landscape of war, comments indicate that it is perceived as a national sacred site by Americans, Canadians and British visitors, for various reasons and to varying degrees. The purpose here is not to compare reactions between nationals of particular nations but rather to reveal the relative value placed on Normandy as a national
site of memory. What is of interest in this research is to reveal what meanings of national identity are evoked by this landscape, to better understand the role of tourism. This research confirms what authors such as Linenthal (1991), Palmer (2003) and Park (2010) say about the power of a heritage site such as battlefield to trigger a sense of national identity, experienced through tourism. In this research, the linkages to national identity are inferred by what some believe is a sense of duty to visit, and what a teacher sees as the best way to teach the state curriculum. Others describe their motivation owing to their association with a particular regiment, another form of fictive kinship with roots in the nationalist perspective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations to visit</th>
<th>Memorable moments in the landscape</th>
<th>Reflection on touring the landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I am very patriotic. I wanted to see this place.’ (Tour Jean female British)</td>
<td>[Pegasus Bridge] ‘Perhaps I am biased because it was about the British. But there was also hard material there. The rest is down to your imagination.’ (Tour Brit male 40)</td>
<td>[At Pointe du Hoc] I am proud that we are willing to die for the country. I am impressed. I have always said that I would die for God and my country.’ (Tour Gay American female 70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I think it is my duty to come.’ (Tour American female New York)</td>
<td>[looking at artificial harbor] ‘We needed those …so we could unload.’ (Tour Jean female British) ‘Seeing Omaha Beach and learning negatives/problems…amazing that we overcame these’ (Online 827). ‘Visiting the Juno Beach Centre…made me proud to be a Canadian’ (Online 945). ‘Point du Hoc: I was an Army Ranger’ (Online 809). ‘… how many Canadian flags there are and the sense of, especially around Juno Beach…genuine gratitude is so profound … I was taken aback ….’ (Interview Julia Canadian interview) [Tour bus passes Canadian war cemetery] ‘Canadians deserve more attention.’ (Tour Tim American)</td>
<td>‘It represents a great moment in US history. We have lost that. We are no beacon anymore. The world doesn’t like us.’ (Tour Tim American male) [Angoville village party for WWII veteran] ‘I am looking around this room, and these French are still grateful for what America did. We were never welcomed home.’ (Observed American male Vietnam veteran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘All British, Canadian and American citizens should try and visit at least once ….’ (Online 402). ‘I wanted [the students] to understand and… this doesn’t come across well in a textbook. (Interview Mary Canadian teacher) ‘Historical significance: I served in the 101st Airborne Division in Vietnam’ (Online 005) ‘Son currently in the Army 85th [Regiment]’ (Online 951)</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘We are soft really. England’s changed. It is not what it used to be. It is no longer polite.’ (Tour Jean British) ‘I can see the link with heritage and national identity and all that. But we don’t learn from history. 1914-1918 was supposed to be the last war.’ (Tour British male 40+) ‘Visiting here allows you to make your own reference. I have an overall appreciation of the Allies and what they have done here.’ (Tour American daughter)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: National identity as a theme in visitor meaning-making in the landscape of war.
The experiences mentioned in Table 17 regarding reactions to flags and of employing third person in speech – ‘We needed those so we could unload’ - convey an emotional rendering of the commemorative experience, as described by White (2000). In his study of Pearl Harbor Historic site, he identifies how certain discourses, such as third person use, reflect an ownership over the war narrative, not only reflecting national identity but also an emotional engagement. Another example of this is explained by a Canadian teacher who recalled, ‘when the kids saw them raising the Canadian flag, they spontaneously broke into singing ‘O’Canada [national anthem].’

Reflecting on the experience of touring the landscape of war resulted in a range of remarks that were influenced by contemporary issues or personal experiences related to national identity, and framed within cultural memories of war. For example, in Table 17, whereas Gay indicates her pride and willingness to fight for her country, Tim considers World War II nostalgically as a great time for the United States, dissimilar in his view to the contemporary context. An English woman reacts by lamenting how England has 'changed’ from the war era. These comments support Seaton’s argument on the polysemic nature of meaning in the thanatourism experience: even though there is agreement that the war is a significant aspect of a nation’s heritage and national identity, there is a range of ideological perspectives as to its contemporary relevance. That is to say, to experience national identity through tourism in Normandy can result in contested meanings, as both Edensor (1998) and Palmer (2005) argue.

Wood (2006) describes the war myth, ‘we won World War II largely on our own’ as a particularly prominent theme in the American war memory. However, the visitor experience not only involved remembering one’s own national war memory, but many people, particularly Americans, also commented on learning about the allied cause. The research indicates that Americans not only experience their own national identity, but are exposed to the broader context
of the battle as an allied effort, perhaps a by-product of the layering of several national cultural memories in Normandy. The extent to which this debunks Wood’s war myth is unclear, nevertheless it does point to the educational element involved in war remembrance and tourism. This observation will be revisited in the concluding chapter.

What is unique about Normandy is that it represents hallowed ground for a number of nationalities. There are a range of sites within this landscape of war that evoke national identity, as indicated in Table 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Memorable sites evoking national identity mentioned in responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>Pointe du Hoc; Omaha Beach; American Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>Pegasus Bridge and Memorial Museum; Arromanches artificial harbor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>Juno Beach and Juno Beach Centre, Beny sur Mer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Sites of national identity in the Normandy landscape of war.

People found those particular sites memorable because what occurred at the site is seen to evoke the national character, what Bell (2002) describes as mythscapes, sites of memory that confirm nationhood. For example, the attack on Pointe du Hoc involved US Rangers climbing a cliff to reach a gun battery. It is a powerful story of audacity, heroism and bravery that took place on a dramatic cliff overlooking the Channel. The taking of Pegasus Bridge can be viewed as the main British story of bravery, involving an equally amazing feat of landing gliders beside a bridge at night. These sites are incorporated in the legend of D-Day, as McManus (2006) explains with regard to Pointe du Hoc, and Crookenden (1976), Ambrose (1984) and Shilleto (1999) explain with regard to Pegasus Bridge.
Nationalist nostalgia for the era and how it represents the best of the national character is an important part of national war mythology (see Noakes 1998). Scates (2006) touches on this theme in his account of Gallipoli as a site emblematic of all that is good about being Australian. For Torgovnick (2005, p.2), this kind of nostalgia is troublesome it ‘masks the shock of death but seems too good to be true’. What follows is an examination of social identity.

Social identity

Aside from national identity, social identity involves how individuals associate with something or someone else. In the context of the visitor performance of remembering, social identity is reflected in the comments of visitors as they interact with the memorialized landscape of war. Table 19 lists various comments that reflect some component of social identity, such as for example, gender, religion, or personal trait. What is of interest is to consider the ways in which visitors reflect upon the battlefield tourism experience from their own positionality. Visitor comments demonstrate a desire to define their experience in relation to who they are, associating or disassociating with certain stories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations to visit</th>
<th>Memorable moments in the landscape</th>
<th>Reflection on touring the landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I wanted to come and see for myself.’ (Tour Jean British)</td>
<td>[Visiting the American Cemetry]: Very moving. Women are smarter than men. But when it comes to bravery – how do they do it? Why do they do it? How brave men are!’ (Tour Jean female British)</td>
<td>‘I am looking forward to coming back. In retrospect, I feel enriched now that I have come here.’ (Tour Male British 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘People come here to capture something.’ (Tour Carmilla American)</td>
<td>[Three British men at Pegasus Bridge standing where the first glider landed] ‘They must have been shitting themselves. I know I would have been.’ (Tour Male British 31)</td>
<td>[American Cemetery] There is something macho about it in a way. But what else to do? The Nazis had to be stopped.’ (Tour American female NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Perhaps parents should be bringing their kids. Keep the pot boiling so to speak.’ (Tour Male British 40)</td>
<td>[Looking at a gravestone in American cemetery] ‘There is a [Jewish family name] where I am from.’ (Tour American female Jewish NY)</td>
<td>‘I wasn’t there in ’44, but I’m a mother and it breaks my heart.’ (Interview Mary Canadian teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[In Ste Mere Eglise] ‘My first boss when I was 18 jumped here during the war, and since then I have always wanted to come. It is a bit of a shrine for me.’ (Observed Male American civilian parachutist)</td>
<td>‘Feel the sand under foot. Just feel the contact. Look up and see the German placements. Try to time it that the tide is out, you see the distance to sprint.’ (Interview Ian male Canadian 30)</td>
<td>It was sobering and awe-inspiring. I see the courage of these guys.’ (Tour American female marine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Running up the beach as the soldiers would have’ (Online 209)</td>
<td>‘It was a moving experience to stand in the exact spot and beside an existing object on the beach where many soldiers on D-Day sought refuge. I tried to imagine what they were thinking and going through emotionally at those moments.’ (Online 402)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Visitor comments relating to social identity as a theme in meaning-making.
Motivations related to social identity are not as clear as nationalist motivations. Some comments reflect a sense of duty to visit, overlapping with national identity, whereas Jean British conveys that she wants to make up her own mind about the importance of Normandy and its history. A male British visitor reflected that he found the experience ‘enriching’, conveying a nostalgic sense of association with the era and the landscape.

With regard to memorable moments in the landscape, comments reflect attempts to imagine the soldier’s perspective, such as the fear of landing at Pegasus, the distance to sprint across a landing beach or ‘feeling the sand underfoot.’ Mary Canadian reflects upon the tragedy of war from the perspective of a mother, providing her with a certain authority in her visitor experience. In general, the comments demonstrate an emotional connection with the landscape at a more intimate level of meaning. In this sense, meanings related to social identity reflect what Moscardo (2010, p. 50) describes as total immersion in the experience. They also illustrate the personal and dynamic nature of war remembrance, as described by Winter and Sivan (1999) and whereby people reflect upon war and death as a reference to their own sense of who they are. White (2000) identifies the significance of emotionality in the process of identifying with a war memory. This is relevant to this research because it shows the range of cognitive and emotional thoughts that are part of the tourist performance and the unique power, or resonance, experienced in a landscape of war. Other examples of meaning and social identity are found later in this chapter. The theme of death and its meaning as experienced through the landscape of war is discussed below.

**Death and War**

A central element of war remembrance is reflecting upon the memory of those killed in the war. The comments in Table 20 are of people without any immediate family or friends and are of the post-war generation. Memorable
moments associated with thoughts of death occurred at cemeteries as well as where fighting occurred. Some of the comments reflect a comparison between Commonwealth and American gravestones, and how much more individualized and arguably more uniquely profound each Commonwealth marker is by itself. In addition, other perspectives involve thinking about the meaning of death through war. Thoughts of the death of young men evoke heroism but also the tragedy of death through war. Cemeteries, despite the beautiful gardens and trees that symbolize the natural circle of life and death and white marble and stone that convey a purity of their memory (see Mosse 1990, p. 34-50), can still be sites of dissonance for visitors, raising questions about the utility of war despite World War II being consistently viewed as a just war. As mindful tourists, their comments reflect a contestation of the official narrative, reflecting in part a dynamic trait in the tourist performance of remembering (Edensor 1998). This juxtaposition of views may also reflect the concept of ontological insecurity, as Stone (2009) argues, generated by thanatourism sites. Stone (2009) argues that visiting thanatourism sites may result in people searching for meaning to rationalize it, in an attempt to maintain their ontological security. Becker (1973) and Rosenblatt, Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski and Lyon (1989) also explore this concept from a social psychological perspective, arguing that exposure to thoughts of death result in a questioning of one’s worldviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Memorable moments in the landscape</th>
<th>Reflection on touring the landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Ranville Cemetery] This I feel is powerful [because of] the age and poetry at the bottom of the tombstone. The American cemetery doesn’t have that.’ (Interview Tim American)</td>
<td>I went to the British Cemetery in Bayeux. Sad but beautiful. I felt shock, sadness and then awe.’ (Tour American female California)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Ranville Cemetery] ‘The last one I looked at was 18 years old. Very moving.’ (Tour Carmilla American)</td>
<td>‘I pay my respects to those who gave their lives. It just shows the stupidity of war.’ (Tour American female NY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[After visiting American Cemetery] ‘When I visit a cemetery, I feel sadness. War doesn’t stop anything. Out of the war come other problems.’ (Tour Jean British)</td>
<td>[Beny sur Mer Commonwealth Cemetery] ‘One image that will always stick with me…[crying] sorry. Watching the soldiers enter the graveyard for the first time to see their fellow buddies who didn’t come back and feeling huge guilt for that and seeing how important it is for them to remember those men….’ (Tour Julia female Canadian interview)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Upon arriving at American Cemetery] ‘Oh my god.’ (Tour Jewish American)</td>
<td>‘I think about the tragedy of wars, the lives cut short and the families that waited in vain for their beloved ones. I find the experience very sobering’ (Online 125)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[At Commonwealth Cemetery] ‘Emotions are difficult to vocalize.’ (Tour Female British 40)</td>
<td>‘I see all this stuff on the memorial about how they gave their lives. They didn’t give their lives. Their lives were taken away from them.’ (Observed American male Vietnam veteran)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[upon hearing the story of the amphibious tanks that sank whilst standing on Omaha Beach] ‘That would be the worst way to go for me: drowning like that.’ (Tour American female marine)</td>
<td>‘I kept thinking that where we were walking was where someone had died. I can’t wrap my head around the magnitude of people who died.’ (Tour Detroit American teacher)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Omaha Beach - My mind couldn’t help but picture that beach filled with fallen men’ (Online 464).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Normandy American Cemetery] ‘There’s one from Montana, Dan.’ (Tour American female Montana)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Visitor comments relating to death
Seaton (2009b) dismisses Stone’s argument by arguing that society is more open about death and dying by way of the media. However, it is the scale of military cemeteries, the linkage with age, place of residence, name or other association offered by grave markers that spurs deep emotional feelings. It was clear that individuals approached the cemetery in a different way than other tour bus stops such as a museum or memorial. As one visitor said to the researcher mid-conversation once the tour bus arrived at the Ranville Commonwealth Cemetery, ‘I would like to hear more about that, Geoff, but I am going to walk around first,’ inferring that he planned to enter the cemetery alone and in silence. Upon leaving the cemetery, discussion often turned to more light-hearted banter. In this context, it would seem that ontological security was maintained by not wanting to dwell on thoughts of death beyond the cemetery, or perhaps individuals choosing to keep their thoughts to themselves. As Chronis (2005) points out, stories of human suffering and death still evoke strong emotional reactions when experienced through tourism, reflecting what Seaton (2000) views as the person-centred and compassionate perspective constructed through the battlefield tourism experience. Below, how war films inform the visitor experience is briefly examined.
The War Film as a Gateway to Meaning

Examples of visitor comments related to war films are presented in Table 21.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivations to visit</th>
<th>Memorable moments in the landscape</th>
<th>Reflection on touring the landscape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘I watched this show by Steven Spielberg and Tom Hanks called ‘Band of Brothers’ and I was hooked. I bought the book and my kids bought me the DVDs.’ (Tour Jeanie American)</td>
<td>[standing at the Longues sur Mer observation bunker] ‘I remember a film where the German was looking out to sea and saw the little black dots. He couldn’t believe it.’ [Scene is from the film <em>The Longest Day</em>] (Tour Jean British)</td>
<td>‘Films or documentaries will never replace our visit. [Visiting the battlefields] engages all our senses.’ (Tour Brit woman 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I am very patriotic. And I have seen documentaries about it and I always get upset when I see the American cemetery.’ (Tour Gay American female 70)</td>
<td>[Standing in the cemetery looking at photos of the Niland brothers, whose story inspired Saving Private Ryan] ‘They are so good looking.’ [on Pointe du Hoc] ‘…it’s like going to Fenway Park. You kind of feel you have already been there because you have seen it … in so many movies.’ Interview with American (Interview American Vietnam vet living in Paris)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘You watch the shows, then you come here and then you go home and watch them again.’ (Tour Female American Texan)</td>
<td></td>
<td>‘I always think about the last scene in <em>Saving Private Ryan</em> when he says, ‘earn it’. I try to live my life that way.’ (Tour American female 31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Band of Brothers I watched at 15, then I read the book. I am all about the American Airborne.’ (Canadian male 20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Visitor comments relating to war films as a gateway to meaning-making
The three films were referenced by visitors in two ways: as a source of motivation to visit Normandy, and; as one frame of reference for what happened in the war. This perspective aligns with Winter (2006) when he argues that film mediates memory by pushing people to think about war in different ways. This is reflected in the comment regarding the Niland brothers, one of several sets of brothers buried in the American Cemetery. Owing to *Saving Private Ryan*, it is their story that is often told, and their graves often visited. The film, *The Longest Day* is also evoked by visiting the observation post at Longues sur Mer, as another comment suggests. In this case, the film provides a frame of reference to help the visitor imagine the invading fleet on the morning of D-Day.

What is useful here is to understand how tourists utilize war films in different ways. Their interaction with the landscape indicates that they are useful at introducing warfare to viewers and providing a common association for the imagination. Touring the landscape of war provides a segue from film toward a deeper understanding of history and memory by way of a range of other meanings and ideas constructed in the landscape of war. Building upon this, the next section examines reactions to the concept of sense of place.

**Sense of Place**

Whilst the meaning lenses indicate a number of landscapes that evoke a sense of place, this section provides a further examination of the phenomenon as a way to better understand the kind of meanings generated through touring the landscape of war. Memorable experiences at sites of memory are described in Table 22. Below are comments that draw upon the natural environment.
‘Omaha Beach - the tide was out and, after walking to the Channel's edge, I stood humbled by the vista before me and could only imagine the carnage incurred by both sides’ (Online 695).

‘One afternoon I was caught in the middle of a thunderstorm while visiting the memorial wood on Hill 112 near Baron, the scene of intense fighting during Operation Epsom. Alone and far from my vehicle, I had to ride the storm out in the woods that still bear scars from the fighting. The darkness and thunder from the storm combined with my isolation led to a somewhat eerie and haunting feeling as I continued to explore that section of the battlefield’ (Online 402)

‘I think there is something that’s visceral about actually getting to touch the earth and walk on the beach and the soil where all of that actually happened… it is a different level of understanding.’ (Interview Julia Canadian)

‘For me it hit home south of Caen and the battlefield topography is much more open and you can see how there were large losses and these guys kept pushing on…. It made me quite pensive, the open fields.’ (Interview Mark Canadian)

‘At the time I was visiting there was this smoking haze covering the back right hand side of cemetery which for some reason just really moved me. It was sort of eerie’ (Online 003).

Table 22: Remembrance as experiencing a sense of place in the landscape of war

The exemplars reflect the power of nature in evoking a connection with war memory, reflecting what Mels (2005) calls a geography of rhythms. Sensory experiences involving viewscape, natural sounds, climatic conditions and physical contact with the earth were significant moments in the construction of memorable moments, exemplifying the resonance and intimacy associated with sense of place as described by Bunkse (2004) and Tuan (2004). The next section explores the embodiment of the tourist performance of remembering, whereby individuals were observed physically connecting with the landscape.
Tourists Performing Acts of Remembrance

A range of acts are listed in Table 23, categorized as either in the form of taking photographs or leaving objects behind.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taking photographs and objects</th>
<th>Leaving markers behind</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Landing beaches, particularly zooming in on the sand (Figure 63)</td>
<td>• Flags, poppies, coins left on the cemetery plinth (Figure 65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Instrumental symbols of war: Bunkers, relics, cemeteries</td>
<td>• Woman and son leave pebbles on Stars of David markers at American Cemetery (Figure 66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Photos with veterans</td>
<td>• Comments written in cemetery registrars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Taking sand and rocks from the beach (Figure 64)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Tourist acts of remembering.

Tourist behavior was often characterized as getting physically closer to the sand: figure 63 shows a tourist at Omaha Beach using his zoom lens to photograph the sand. This illustrates what Larsen (2006) describes as the epistemic nature of photography, constructed through a different perspective offered by the camera’s lens. Sather Wagstaff (2008) describes the act of photography at the 9-11 sites as a means to mourn and memorialize, and is what is exemplified in figure 63. On another tour, a female American soldier stepped onto the beach and immediately knelt down to touch the sand, as if to feel a connection with hallowed ground.
In Figure 64, a woman carefully selects a stone from Omaha Beach as a souvenir. This act reflects the assigning of meaning to a stone (Sheldon and Love 1998), perhaps as a way to closure to the visitor’s pilgrimage, or simply as a way to remember her time and to evoke feelings associated with Omaha Beach. In this context, taking the stone is part of the visitor performance of remembering.
Figure 64: Remembering the moment and the place. With camera in hand, a tourist displays her souvenir from Omaha Beach (Photo source: the author 2008 original in colour).

For Bachelor (2004, p. 100-104), developing an emotional bond with a cemetery or site of memory may be demonstrated by placing gifts or for caring for the site (see also Lloyd 1998; Greenspan 2002). This is illustrated in Figure 65, showing mementos are left on the plinth at a Commonwealth War Graves cemetery as an act of remembrance and bonding. Poppies, pins and coins were placed near memorials or gravestones. In addition, more personal items such as photographs or copies of letters were also observed.
In addition, in Figure 66, a visiting Jewish family takes photographs of grave markers and leave pebbles on Stars of David. These acts also reflect the engagement of the mindful tourist (Moscardo 1996), a contrast from the imagery of disinterested visitors as imagined by Johnston (1918) in his poem *Highwood* and Diller and Scofidio (1994).
This section captures the embodied performance of remembering of mindful visitors, exploring sites of memory and finding a sense of connection through a range of acts such as photographing, collecting objects or leaving symbols behind. The next section focuses on the consequences of the visitor experience, specifically what thoughts or actions visitors perceive are a result of their visit to Normandy.

The Consequences of Visitor Meaning with Regard to Remembrance

Those interviewed or surveyed online indicated that visiting the D-Day sites had an influence on their view of remembrance. Several noted that remembrance has always been important (Online 839 209, 905), while others acknowledge remembering now being ‘more important’ (Online 383, 083), ‘validated’ (Online 827) or ‘strengthened’ (Online 667) by their experience. As another commented, ‘being there hones such feelings/perspectives’ (Online 951).
consensus among a collection of school kids was that seeing the graves ‘made it real’ (Online 464, 374,469).

Several responses reveal particular functions that tourism plays in remembrance, particularly for the post-war generation. One such function is with regard to associating history with an experienced place, as the following respondent suggests,

> When I remember now I can actually see the places where the battles were fought. I think seeing those sites for myself makes remembering D-Day a lot more powerful for me than it did before I visited the sites (Online 003).

Another self-proclaimed historian noted the importance of ‘touching of the battle area’ that made it much easier to envision and remember those who fought’ (Online 787). Conversely, those who claim little or no knowledge of D-Day before coming view the experience as a learning experience: ‘[p]rior to coming, I had no concept that the breadth of the operation…’ (Online 790) Collectively, these comments reflect the educational element of remembering, contextualized and made more relevant by experiencing the landscape of war.

In some cases, the experience involved a deeper, more transformative outcome for the individual. As one respondent explains: ‘[the experience] will stay with me as a life time memory that I know will return to me on November 11 and on June 6 for the rest of my life’ (Online 698). Julia, a Canadian interviewee, went on to write a play, Jake’s Gift, that explored the relationship between Canadian and French war memories, the veteran generation and youth. The American Ilene maintains her Facebook page entitled daughtersofdday, empowered by her personal memories of her father evoked by visiting Normandy.
Some responses acknowledged the power of the experience with statements such as ‘A very emotional experience for me’ (Online 698, 277), ‘very moving…the most memorable part of the vacation’ (156). These kinds of comments summarize the unique and powerful phenomenon of tourism as a function of remembrance. These kinds of responses sum up what White (2000, p. 507) describes as a social context of war remembrance where ‘meaning, value and emotion are all at risk.’ In the context of tourism to a landscape of war, the risk involves understanding war and what it tells us about ourselves. Rather than simply another act of remembrance, tourism not only shapes lives but also allows individuals to explore how war shapes lives and the world.

What then are the lasting meanings of visiting the Normandy landscape of war? The research was useful in capturing the immediate thoughts of individuals overheard and in discussion with individuals at the sites and on the tour bus as well as comments offered after the experience had elapsed. What is typical of battlefields and the visitor meaning are themes found in other research, such as national identity (see Slade 2003) and reverence (Kelly 2000). Seaton argues that meanings constructed from thanatourism experiences are polysemic, and therefore not bound to any particular pattern of conclusions. Rather than attempting to deduce such a pattern, the intention here is to consider meanings as they relate to remembrance, how people react to war and death as experienced on tour.

**Conclusion**

Given the power of sense of place to evoke images of war and death, visiting the landscape of war represents both a cognitive and emotional undertaking, drawing upon cultural memories of war, one’s own identity as well as one’s imagination and emotions. Hence, visitors are able to construct a connection to the landscape, be it through the forest of symbols employed at a cemetery, or the sense of place on an empty beach. Embodied acts of remembrance, such as touching the sand or taking a stone as a souvenir, also reflect a visitor
connection with the landscape. As was presented in Chapter Eight, tour guides interpret this landscape with meaning. The mindful tourist is also an important component in making meaning, enabling memorialized battlefields to precipitate an educational, emotional and sometimes transformative experience. Tourists, reflected through their post trip discourse, become part of the dynamic evolution of cultural memories of war. In effect, tourists have become social activists in war remembrance, perpetuating memory by writing articles, plays, creating websites, taking more notice of commemorations, as well as passing on their own recollections of the landscape of war and its meaning to others, by way of photographs and narrative.

Rather than a selling of war, visiting Normandy does not necessarily result in either ‘pro’ or ‘con’ views toward conflict. Instead, visitors tend to co-construct political meanings related to war and peace based on their existing worldview. Whereas the examples employed here point to the dissonance in meaning and representation of war, this discussion can also be seen as a normal and anticipated element of war remembrance, given its dynamic character.

Despite notions of state sanctioned war memory, a landscape of war embodies a range of divergent meanings. This dissonance reflects the range of voices involved in war remembrance, and is an acknowledgement that cultural memories of war and associated politics of remembrance are dynamic. From a tourist perspective, there is a spectrum of views as to the meaning of a given site or collection of sites. In this research, themes related to national and social identities and death were examined. These themes can be seen as motivations, memorable moments or narrated in the post-trip reflections of visitors.

The concluding chapter provides an opportunity to present and discuss the three main contributions to knowledge from this research. Two conceptual models are proposed, along with a range of future research possibilities.
CHAPTER 11. Conclusion
Introduction

The chapter begins by outlining the contributions to knowledge and then goes on to discuss these in more detail by drawing upon the analysis from previous chapters. The chapter draws to a conclusion by discussing areas for future research.

The aim of this thesis was to better understand the relationship between tourism and remembrance in the landscape of war. The empirical evidence was gained through an ethnographic approach involving fieldwork in the D-Day area of Normandy. The unique contribution of this thesis is that it provides a deeper understanding of the context, conflict and benefits of tourism as a worldmaking agency in remembrance. In addition, an examination of the tourist performance of remembering was also undertaken, significant in that it explored the sensory dimension of the landscape of war and the transformative potential of the experience. The research has also been an exploration of arguments directed at tourism as a negative force in remembrance, specifically with regard to commercialism (see Winter 2006; Scates 2008), the politics of remembrance (Seaton 2009b) or in its mis-representation and interpretation of history (Cole 1999). The following section presents the contributions to knowledge of this research.

Contributions to Knowledge

The research contributes to knowledge in several ways. Firstly it reveals tourism’s dual role as both an act and an agent of remembrance. As an act, the meaning constructed through the tourist performance can provide an educational, emotional and even transformative experience. As an agent, tourism is a worldmaker in mediating the landscape and its war memory. In particular, as the veteran generation passes on, the role of tourism will continue to gain prominence in terms of its significance in connecting people to the memory of the past. These contributions provide new insights into the literature
related to battlefield tourism and cultural memory studies by not only addressing a gap in understanding the relationship between tourism and remembrance. In particular, this work helps to redefine how remembrance as defined by Jay Winter and refuting his criticisms directed toward tourism. The research therefore provides a broader conceptual understanding of the relationships between a range of conceptual phenomena. For example, the research provides insight in terms of the tourism – landscape – meaning nexus, such that war remembrance is not merely experienced, it is also performed. Meaning is co-constructed by the interaction of the visitor’s context as informed by vectors of memory and triggered through imagination, emotion and memory in the mediated setting of the landscape of war. More broadly, literature examining the worldmaking context of tourism gains insight in terms of the ways in which the various mediating components of tourism – such as tour guides, destination management organizations, guide books and museums – each play a role in worldmaking. Such theoretical contributions allow for the study of battlefield tourism and its relationship to remembrance to be refashioned in terms of what is referred to here as a cosmology of tourism and remembrance.

Another contribution involves the methodology. This research demonstrated the utility of reflexivity as an element of empirical research. That is to say, not all research should be take an objective stance, as certain types of sites require a researcher to bring him / herself in as a ‘subject’ of study so as to more fully engage with what the sites represent in order to try and understand them. As the researcher, the ‘I’ of the thesis could not (and did not want to) ignore his own background, education, military training and other life experiences. To do so would be to ‘pretend’ the sites had no effect upon the researcher, that his positionality did not affect what was collected, interpreted & analyzed. The researcher had to be open to positionality and in so doing, the reflexive approach allowed the research to gain a more thorough understanding of the qualitative data collected. This was particularly important in this research as it
facilitated a deeper exploration of meaning, particularly the more emotional and personal thoughts involved in contemplating the Other of Death. In this context, the methodology can inform other researchers exploring more emotionally charged tourist experiences, shedding light on motivations, visitor behavior such as embodiment, and meaning-making.

In light of the above, two conceptual models are provided that contribute to the future study of the tourism-remembrance relationship: the resonance of remembrance (figure 68) suggests a multi-tiered conceptualization of remembrance, and; the cosmology of tourism and remembrance (figure 70) presents both the essential concepts and theories to consider in assessing this subject area, as well as various scales of tourism worldmaking and mediation. The breadth of the theories and concepts employed leads to a more holistic contextualization of the tourism-remembrance relationship. Each of these contributions is now explained, with reference to the area of knowledge that is informed by this research.

Before discussing the contributions to knowledge in greater detail, the context of the tourism-remembrance relationship as discovered in the research, is presented. Specifically, what typically taints much of the discussion with regard to these two phenomena is the suspicion of tourism as simply commercial gain involving tourists who do not care, let alone who reflect upon what they are experiencing. In order to gain insight, this suspicion about tourism must be set aside.

**The Tourism-Remembrance Context: The Grand Cliché**

In discussing tourism to Gallipoli and the association to remembrance, Scates (2008) encapsulates the perception of tourism as in conflict with remembrance. He writes:
...the sanitized landscape of Gallipoli bears no real resemblance to war’s actual reality. And of course the terror of the campaign, the fear, pain and stench of war, defy the most enterprising travel agent’s power of reconstruction. History, it seems, has been held to ransom by tourism, the memory of war popularized to the point of forgetting. (p. 56)

The extremes of war, with its chaos, horror and emotional and psychological darkness experienced by combatants cannot be performed or represented in any act of remembrance. Casey (1987, p. 218) argues that remembering occurs through commemorative vehicles such as ritual and text to overcome the “anonymity and spatio-temporal distance” to make wars and those who were killed, accessible. However, King (1999) and Daines (2000) note the challenge of commemorations and memorials to make meaning of war and loss. Thus, the challenges associated with remembering cannot be placed upon tourism. The limitation to remembering war is owing to a number of factors, including temporality, myths and legends as well as the cosmology of the military and warfare and the inability to understand something not experienced. These challenges are not characteristic of tourism, but of remembrance.

To holistically contextualize the tourism-remembrance relationship involves recognizing, to coin Hollinshed’s phrase, a grand cliché:

‘War remembrance would be better off without tourism as it undermines remembrance’.

The cliché assumes a certain pure form of remembrance, free of dissonance of conflicting voices, narratives and images. As Frost et al (2008, p. 170) argue, such comments ‘reveal judgmental attitudes about degrees of solemnity and moral worthiness’ with regard to acts of remembrance. To think of remembrance in this way is to simplify what is a complex, ever-present and dynamic phenomenon. Another argument inherent in this cliché is with regard to the notion of tourism as a form of amnesia (see Cole 1999). As Lowenthal
(2001) argues, forgetting is a normal part of the human condition, and an important element in remembering. It is clear that tourism can be a worldmaker in remembrance at a battlefield, but the silences and forgetting that are part of the cultural memories of war are also being mediated, contested and refashioned. As Sturken (1997) explains, the nature of cultural memory involves a dynamic discourse. In this context, tourism as a worldmaker is part of the discourse on war memory, shifting, affirming and renegotiating history along with other entities such as the media and academic research.

The cliché stands as a point of departure for future research involving tourism and war memory studies, questioning those arguments that are dismissive of the significance of tourism. Specifically, this research asserts that the study of tourism as a significant element in understanding war remembrance in the 21st century. With this perspective in mind, the next three sections expand upon the contributions to knowledge.

**The Tourist Performance as an Act of Remembrance**

The tourist performance is not only an act of remembrance, but it signifies a more resonating and intensive experience that internalizes remembrance. This section presents various findings that formulate this contribution to knowledge:

- Tourists as part of fictive kinship;
- Tourist engagement and the auratic quality of the landscape of war;
- How cultural memories inform, and are informed by, the tourist, and;
- Conceptualizing war remembrance in the context of the post-veteran generation individual, referred to as the resonance of war remembrance.

Winter (2006) argues that family members and veteran comrades are the primary social agents who take responsibility for maintaining the war dead by way of organizing commemorations and engaging in other acts of remembrance (see also Vance 1997). From this perspective, tourists can be
viewed as an extension of the fictive kinship of remembrance, social agents involved in the memory work and in perpetuating war remembrance. As a reflection of the power of the visitor experience in a landscape of war, some tourists respond by becoming activists in war remembrance, manifested in a range of post-trip practices: perpetuating memory by writing articles, plays, creating websites, taking more notice of commemorations, as well as passing on their own recollections of the landscape of war and its meaning to others by way of photographs and storytelling. The significance is that, through tourism, visitors feel a connection with the war memory and become active in its perpetuity. This will be further discussed in the conceptual model depicting the resonance of war remembrance. This finding recognizes the tourist as an individual not only engaged in but often deeply committed to remembering.

Part of this engagement is owing to the power of the landscape and its auratic quality, establishing the battlefield as a sacred site of memory and remembrance. Throughout the research, the sensory element of the landscape was an engaging aspect of the experience. Whereas the landscape of war is represented by the materiality of cemeteries, memorials and relics of war, the intangible sense of place provided a spiritual, spatial and temporal connection with the war memory. This was demonstrated at Abbaye d’Ardenne, where the rustle of leaves led to imagining the last sounds heard by a soldier before he was executed. One visitor spoke of the powerful feeling of sand ‘under foot’, while another imagined death and carnage by standing on a beach. These are all examples of the embodiment of meaning and memory by the sensory connection to the place. But they also reflect how sensory ‘scapes act as a temporal crossroads with 1944, whereby the visitor is able to stand in a place, hear a sound or feel the wind, thereby sensing a connection with the past. The significance of this is that tourism provides a cosmological level of connection with war memory that is affective and memorable, a topic revisited later in this chapter.
Cultural memories inform, and are informed by, the tourist. Chapter Two presented seven vectors of cultural memory that were relevant to this research: the legend of D-Day, Canadian, British, American, French, war films and veterans. The research found that the landscape of war is framed by various cultural memories of war. An example of this was found through touring the Canadian sector, an experience that provided a range of powerful reflexive feelings and thoughts to this Canadian researcher. What was also observed was that cultural memories of war overlap, resulting in complementary and, at times, conflicting narratives. This was perhaps best illustrated at the Arromanches commemoration that involved the tourist/researcher negotiating the layering of several national memories, Canadian, Dutch, British and German. Whereas cultural memories inform the tourist performance, as Edensor (1998) suggests, it is argued that the contested experiences reshape visitor understanding that in turn is voiced and becomes an influence upon cultural memories. Sturken (1997) argues that despite the formal discourses of the state and media that shape the cultural memory, the voice of individuals can influence its recollection, informed by their own experience as a tourist.

The mediation of cultural memories was a defining element in travel guide books, guided tours as well as the representation and interpretation at museums such as Juno Beach Centre and Pegasus Bridge. Guide books were written for a certain audience that represented a certain cultural memory or memories. For example, Steves and Smith (2007) focused predominantly on the American war memory. Cultural memory also defined the tourist experience, an example being the Band of Brothers tour or the British Sector Tour. In these two contexts, the itinerary and narrative was influenced by film or British war history and memory. In other cases, tourism mediation, particularly involving battlefield tour guides, involved a deepening of historical knowledge forming a place-insiderness that went beyond the legends and mythologies of D-Day. Here again, the visitor experience gives authority to
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voicing new perspectives and knowledge which inform cultural memories of war.

The relevance to the tourism-remembrance relationship is that mediating agencies of tourism actively engaged in affirming, re-defining and expanding cultural memories of war. The richness of meaning of the memorialized landscape is only uncovered by touring the landscape and through mediated experiences. The depth of meaningfulness and the resonance of remembrance through tourism are conceptualized at the end of this chapter.

**Conceptualizing the Resonance of War Remembrance**

It is argued that touring a battlefield can result in a profoundly resonate experience that supports a deeply personal form of remembrance. In this sense, tourist meaning-making in a landscape of war is arguably more memorable and personally significant than other acts of remembrance. As one measure of the meaning, Normandy is one of the most popular war heritage sites in the world. The observations on conducted tours, augmented by interviews and the online survey tool reflected the deep level of engagement visitors. Emotional reactions by visitors to sites such as cemeteries and the landing beaches reflected a need, willingness or curiosity to connect with the war memory. They took photographs, collected stones from the beaches, left pins and coins at cemeteries as tokens of remembrance, reflecting a connectedness with the war memory through the sense of place.

The following conceptual model (Figure 67) proposes that remembrance is a graduated cognitive and emotional phenomenon that involves a feeling of connectedness experienced. The concept of resonance is defined as the depth of meaningfulness inscribed by an act of remembrance and its permanence over time. Figure 67 conceptualizes resonance of remembrance for the post-war generation. Each sphere represents a certain resonance upon which the next inner sphere is situated. General awareness is the first sphere of
remembrance, marked by knowledge of myths and legends related to cultural memories of war. The education sphere involves a deeper understanding of the battle and of World War II, as well as a deeper sense of the human sacrifice involved.

Figure 67: Conceptual model depicting the resonance of war remembrance (original in colour).

The concept of emotional remembering is adopted from White (2000) who argues that the process of *entextualizing* (Silverstein & Urban 1996) – the recitation of the institutionalized national narrative of war memory – is emotionally internalized when individuals are exposed to, for example, the personal narrative of a veteran. Whereas his arguments are based on his observations of veteran testimonials that are part of a presentation to visitors to the Pearl Harbor Memorial, White does not take into account the power of the memorial site as a landscape of war, one that Linenthal (1991) describes as *hallowed ground*. White notes that the voice of veterans will be maintained to a
degree in electronic and video format for the future, but it is the spatial context, that will continue to provide a powerful entextualizing connection for visitors. Based on the observations in the research, the visitor performance of remembering in the landscape of war involves a unique perceived sense of proximity to the aura of war, gained through the senses, imagination and emotion, resulting in a powerful and emotionally resonant form of remembrance.

Finally, the inner sphere is entitled transformative remembrance. This phrase is inspired by Pine and Gilmore (1999) who argue that experiences can transform an individual's worldview. Transformative remembrance builds upon awareness, education and emotional remembering and involves changing one's worldview as a consequence of remembrance.

However, transformative remembrance does not necessarily represent a change in opinion to believe in world peace or that war is just. Rather, it may involve reflecting upon what one might have done in the same position. One example of transformative remembrance is the triggering of questions as one woman asked herself, '[a]fter visiting a place like that [Utah Beach], I wonder what I would have done. Would I have protected someone like Anne Frank?' (American female 50). In this sense, the visitor experience has had a resonating consequence, manifested in thinking about what she is willing to die for. As presented in Chapter Ten, consequences of their visit observed or mentioned by visitors were:

- Greater participation in acts of remembrance and its importance
- A change, either as a further affirmation or dissonance with one's worldview
- Joining the military, engaging in public service
- Wanting to learn more about the battle and the war, taking a course
- Writing a play (Jake’s Gift 2006)
• Creating a website / blog / Facebook page (‘daughters of D-Day’)
• Wanting to be a better citizen / person
• Sharing stories and photographs upon return home
• A longer lasting reflection of the sacrifices of others through war in the fight for freedom

Figure 68 provides a comparative perspective of different acts of remembrance: war films, commemorative rituals such as Remembrance Day and, the tourist performance of war remembrance. An axis of intensity is adapted from the concept of intensive remembering (Casey 1987). The term acknowledges that war remembrance involves a concerted reflection on the war dead that occurs within the context of a ritual commemoration. The intensity comes from focusing reflection at a specific period of time at a certain place. As Winter (2006) argues that war films are an act of remembrance, the duration of the film provides a set period of time to reflect on war. Touring a battlefield is also a dedicated period of time to reflect on war. Not only is it of longer duration than watching a film or attending a commemoration, it involves a connection with the landscape. As a result, it is argued that the tourist performance of war remembrance spans the various spheres of remembrance and, as an experience in the landscape of war, the act has more resonance and intensity than other acts of remembrance.
This conceptual model assists by acknowledging that there are different acts of remembrance with gradations of emotional and cognitive influence or connectedness for the individual. This assists in framing the contribution to knowledge expressed here, that tourism is not only an act of remembrance, but a resonant and memorable one that potentially leads to war memory affecting the lives of post-veteran generation individuals. This model may assist researchers in gaining a deeper insight into the tourist performance and meaning-making at other auratic places of war memory, such as the 9-11 site, Gettysburg, the Somme, Mai Lai and Holocaust sites. It may also provide a point of departure in establishing a stronger theoretical base for thanatourism as it relates to remembrance and the visitor experience.

The next section presents the second component of tourism and its relationship to remembrance: tourism as a worldmaking agent in remembrance.
Tourism as a Worldmaking Agent in Remembrance

Winter (2006) defines agents of remembrance as the veteran generations’ familial and fictive kin, such as veteran comrades, who perpetuate war memory. Earlier, it was argued that tourists are also part of the fictive kinship, traveling to engage in acts of remembrance and by the resonance of their experience, may in turn play a role in perpetuating the war memory. This research also considered the memory work enacted by guided tours and tour guides, travel guide books, museums and other interpretive agencies. As mediating agents, they are also agents of remembrance, significant in that they participate in the preservation, discovery, representation and interpretation of war memory in the Normandy landscape. This section presents findings that inform this aspect of the contribution to knowledge:

- The mediating role of museums, battlefield tour guides and travel guide books in war remembrance;
- Politics of remembrance and the evolving importance of tourism;
- The evolution of a World War II battlefield as both a tourism destination and as a site of memory, and;
- Conceptualizing the cosmology of tourism and remembrance.

Museums, battlefield tour guides and travel guide books were all viewed as playing a mediating role in landscape of war. Overall, the research indicated that interacting with mediating agencies of tourism enriched the meaningfulness of the experience by connecting the tourist to the landscape and its war memory. This was demonstrated at the Pegasus Memorial Museum, where artifacts and relics of war were instrumental symbols that established a physical existence of the war memory. These objects and the stories associated with them evoked the imagination and emotions of visitors, leading to powerful reflections on what transpired in the landscape. Museums and interpretive centers also act as hubs of commemoration, condensing war
memory to one particular site and a set of narratives. This is illustrated at the interpretive center at the Normandy American Cemetery.

Travel guide books were examined in terms of how they interpreted the Normandy landscape of war. Several observations were made regarding the brevity of text that, as Laderman (2009) notes, often misrepresented history and gave credence to certain war memories over others. Specialist guide books employed war photographs and maps to situate the visitor in the landscape and history, providing an extensive amount of detail for the battlefield tourist. In summary, guide books play a role in the ‘what’ and ‘where’ of remembrance. To varying degrees of historical degree and range of war memory, they inform visitors of what to see and where to go.

In contrast, battlefield tour guides provided a more coherent flow to interpreting the landscape of war by employing a range of techniques. They are unique in that they are able to take the visitor and construct a sense of place insideriness. Battlefield tour guides also play an increasingly important role as guardians of memory, owing to their historical expertise, coupled with their knowledge of the landscape of war, affiliations with veterans and interactions with visitors. Guides enact this role when they triangulate historical knowledge, the personal memories of veterans as well as local stories and situate them in the landscape. Nevertheless, there is a form of silence practiced by guides, a self-regulated narrative that avoids controversial aspects of history that are in conflict with the more popular legend of D-Day.

One concern with the centralization of this amount of knowledge is that war memory can be too easily lost. For example, a battlefield tour company that was part of this research has since disbanded, leading some guides to leave the vocation. With them may go certain veteran stories and knowledge of the landscape, eroding what is remembered and commemorated.
The relevance to the tourism-remembrance relationship is that these mediating agencies form three interconnected avenues for visitors to engage with the landscape of war. Each agency has its benefits and weaknesses in terms of presenting history and memory. Given that they are all typically employed by a visitor, they mediate the engagement to history, memory and the landscape of war.

As an agent of remembrance and by way of the representation and interpretation of war memory, tourism is embedded in the politics of remembrance. Identifying and then understanding how these entities interact is a gap in the literature (see Seaton 2009b). Therefore, exploring the tourism-remembrance relationship involved considering the nature of political or contested issues and provided a reflection of the significance of tourism worldmaking in remembrance. Examples of politics of remembrance were observed at museum sites such as the Juno Beach Centre (JBC) and in the landscape surrounding the Pegasus Memorial. The context of the JBC was a heritage force field that contested the representation of the Canadian war memory. Specifically, the range of different interests – management, visitors, veterans and the media – reflected a contested interpretation of the mandate of JBC. In addition, there was an awareness of the impending change in stakeholders with the passing of veterans, and the inevitable recalibration of interests and power in the force field. This was predicted by some as a refashioning of the Canadian war memory as represented and interpreted at the JBC.

At Pegasus Bridge, the politics of remembrance are represented in a myriad of issues, perhaps the main one being the ongoing legal discord between the owner of the Café Gondrée and the Pegasus Memorial. However, other less serious forms of politics are found in the subtle misinterpretations of cultural memory and how they guide the tourist performance. An example of this is the Piper Millin story, and the draw of the site for re-enactors to recreate the scene
of marching across the bridge. This was presented in the film, *The Longest Day* (Zanuck 1962), but historically, it never happened. This is significant because it demonstrates the influence of film on what is remembered, and exemplifies the role of the media in the heritage force field.

In future research, it will be important to go further into the discussion of tourism and the politics in remembrance, given the significance of the commemorative landscape for so many nations. For example, commemorations in Normandy are utilized as a valuable contemporary political backdrop, as was illustrated by Pickering (1997), Brinkley (2004) and Noon (2004). The 2009 commemoration that involved heads of state was observed, although not examined in this research. For invited guests only, it was not viewed as generally accessible to tourists, as all other commemorations usually are. However, other commemorations attended by tourists, reflect political issues as signified in the remembrances, silences and forgetting associated with a range of commemorations such as Arromanches, Basly, Abbaye d’Ardenne and many others that were attended. What is significant about the politics of remembrance at commemorations in Normandy is the complexity of cultural memories that are activated with the multitude of international visitors. This reflects the conciliatory tone that pervades commemoration of World War II. This is an interesting observation of the tourism-remembrance relationship in that the interaction of visitors of various nationals can be viewed to embody the notion of peace through tourism (see D’Amore 2009).

Given the popularity of visiting Normandy, it is also important to consider the broader political meaning of what is remembered of World War II. Winter (2009) argues that the horrific legacy of the war leads to the Holocaust and Hiroshima framing what is remembered. As one of the most visited war heritage sites in the world, the D-Day area is not only acknowledged as a prominent site of memory, but that it stands as distinct and separate from the war memories associated with Auschwitz and the Holocaust. The D-Day
landscape of war manifests the sense of a turning point in the war, of hope born out of the efforts of thousands of individual soldiers that involved courage, sacrifice and fighting for liberation.

Despite notions of state-sanctioned war memory embodied in the memorialization of the landscape (i.e. Mosse 1990; Filippucci 2004; Doss 2008), a landscape of war embodies a range of divergent perspectives as to how the memory is best represented and what is to be remembered. The Canadian sector is testament to this. However, whereas various authors (Sharpley 2009a; Stone 2009a) suggest ways to mitigate such dissonance by way of balancing interests within the heritage force field, such conflict can be looked upon as a reflection of the dynamic and healthy characteristic of Normandy war remembrance. This situates tourism in the frontline of the war memory discourse, an argument elucidated later in this chapter.

Related to the political context of remembrance and tourism is the exclusion of a particular voice in local decision making: Battlefield tour guides are not viewed as part of Seaton's (2002; 2009a) definition of the heritage force field as the concept is focused on the operation of a heritage site. As mentioned above, battlefield tour guides can be viewed as guardians of memory and therefore can be seen as significant players in the remembrance-tourism relationship. However, despite their experience, tour guides lack organization as a single political voice. As a result, they are often viewed as peripheral and transient, and therefore inconsequential to discussions that define how war heritage is represented and interpreted at sites of memory such as museums, cemeteries and other memorialized sites. However, broader planning and decisions related to Normandy’s war heritage would benefit from their experience gained through interacting with visitors and veterans and the intimate knowledge of history and the landscape.
Another finding that supports the contribution to knowledge that tourism is an agent of remembrance involves consideration of the evolution of the battlefield as both a tourism destination and a site of memory. As an agent of remembrance, it is noted that the significance of tourism as a worldmaker of remembrance is one that has evolved over time and will continue into the future. As Farmer (1999, p. 213) contends, once the wartime generation has passed on, the history of the war will ‘become the territory of professional storytellers – historians, filmmakers, novelists and writers of historical potboilers’ (p. 213). This transition is taking place in Normandy with the construction of more memorials and museums, illustrating how war memory will ultimately involve the landscape benefiting from its position as a tourist destination.

However, with the evolution as a destination, the interests of war remembrance and preserving battlefields become a formal objective in destination management. The research analyzed the evolution of tourism and remembrance in Normandy, focusing on the present role of Normandie Mémoire and the Committee of the Landing in managing the tourism – remembrance relationship. What was found was an organization that was competing for resources, continuously working with the government and local communities to maintain awareness of the link between war remembrance and tourism. In addition, the organization is engaged in ensuring that remembrance is appropriately practiced, evident with the development of the Good Conduct Charter, discussed in Chapter Six. Discussions have turned to applying for World Heritage status, as well as establishing quality assurance for tour guides. In January, 2011, the Chair of the Committee, Admiral Christian Brac de la Perrière, formally spoke out against the proposed wind farm to be situated 11 kilometres off Juno Beach, stating that the decision was ‘inappropriate and incoherent’ and that the French government was failing in its duty to protect the ‘essential character’ of the landing beaches (Lichfield 2011). It is therefore clear that Normandie Mémoire represents another dimension of the heritage
force field, a pivotal entity in lobbying for the interest of remembering World War II, preserving the landscape as well as maintaining what is remembered and how it is remembered.

Since 2002, Normandy has witnessed the construction of several new museums (Pegasus Memorial Museum) and interpretive centers, (the Juno Beach Centre and the Interpretive Center at the Normandy American Cemetery). In addition, Holt and Holt (2004) identified 300 memorials in 2004 in their specialist guide book of Normandy landscape of war, defined as everything from memorial plaques to cemeteries, from interpretive signs to museums. In 2010, the author explained in an interview the number has increased to 500 memorials. This reflects the continued popularity of remembering D-Day in cultural memories, and it also marks preparation for the end of the living memory with the passing of the veterans. As Prost (1998) notes, sites of memory such as Verdun experienced the transition from veteran-based commemorations to a focus on museums and interpretation over time. In the case of the American Battle Monuments Commission, the emphasis in remembering the war dead will involve marketing to Americans to visit military cemeteries and then providing interpretative services at the cemetery. Thus, over time, remembrance by learning gains in prominence, and tourism will inevitably evolve in its significance as a worldmaking agent of remembrance.

Conceptualizing the Cosmology of Remembrance and Tourism
Worldmaking

This conceptual model provides an opportunity to refashion the study of battlefield tourism and its relationship to remembrance. Hollinshead (2007, p. 166) offers some context for this model when he argues that Meethan (2001) shows how ‘tourism is potentially – if not already – a lead vehicle in the valuation/revaluation of local places and...of held inheritances, cultures and cosmologies.’ This perspective is part of what is described as the critical turn
in tourism studies, presenting an opportunity to re-make an understanding of ‘the mercurial roles’ (Hollinshead 2007, p. 167) of tourism. In this context, the following models attempt to conceptualize tourism worldmaking as it relates to war remembrance.

Viewing tourism as a worldmaking agent requires consideration of what is actually ‘made’. The term cosmology is useful here, as it refers to understanding the world or universe as an ordered system. Its anthropological usage involves understanding the whole through its parts, the ‘macrocosm and the microcosm’ (Barnard & Spencer 2002, p. 196) and has been employed to explain, for example, the relationships between ritual, myth, spirituality and the material culture of Stonehenge (Pollard 2009) as well as the meaning associated with cultural objects (Miller 1998). In the context of tourism as a worldmaking agent in this research, the ‘universe’ that is made is a resonant and meaningful form of remembrance in a landscape of war. To understand the different components involved in this cosmology, Figure 69 is presented and then explained.
Figure 69: Cosmology of remembrance and tourism worldmaking (original in colour).

The components are place, time, tourism worldmaking and sense of place. The entities overlap, representing their symbiotic interaction and influence upon one another. Within three circles, various scales are identified. The concept of scale is adapted from Tuan (1977, p. 168) who notes the importance of being aware of place and how it is created and defined at different scales. For example, this research observed how the tourism-remembrance relationship
occurred at the scale of the tourist interacting with the tour guide at a particular site of memory, or at the scale of the museum, a multitude of memories were condensed to form a hub of memory in the landscape. Commemorations redefine scale by designating the significance of a particular site by a particular date to remember a certain event. At a regional scale, Normandie-Memoire provided management and marketing of remembrance tourism. The interaction between tourism worldmaking and scale of time involves recognition of the tourist remembering the past, experiencing the present and future memories recalled. A larger scale of time involves the cultural memories of war, the sum of history, myths and legends as well as national, media-created and individual memories that frame tourist meaning and their interpretation of the landscape. All of these forces interplay to frame and construct the sense of place of the landscape of war, what has been described here as the constructed aura that is associated with the Other of Death.

The model is useful in that it provides insight into the range of connections and dimension in understanding the tourism-remembrance relationship. It also reflects the complexity of interactions as well as the breadth and reach that are involved in tourism worldmaking. The model can provide a framework for research related to battlefields and remembrance, ensuring inclusion of concepts such as sense of place, cultural memories, mediating or worldmaking role of tourism and tourist performance. In addition, it suggests that there needs to be consideration of both the micro and macro scales that are at play in tourism worldmaking. The next section provides observations regarding the benefit of a reflexive approach, viewed as a methodological contribution to knowledge.

Reflexivity in Thanatourism

Employing a reflexive approach was valuable in providing an added dimension to the research. As Dunkley (2007) notes, the emotional element of the thanatourism experience is difficult to uncover purely through observation and
interviews. Reflexivity is particularly relevant when experiencing The Other of Death. Remembrance is not so much something seen or heard but felt. Therefore, for a holistic understanding of silences, remembrances and even forgetting, a reflexive approach was an essential of the research design.

As a contribution to knowledge, the reflexive approach taken in this research attempted to give voice to the emotions associated with the ritual of remembrance as well as the private thoughts based on one’s own positionality. According to Winter (2006), this is what remembrance is about: public acts of commemoration that involve a collection of individuals with their own thoughts. Also, guided tours and time alone involved acts of remembrance, where personal thoughts, feelings and the imagination played in the sensory intensive setting of the Normandy landscape of war. Moments could be constructed to trigger the imagination. For example, visiting a beach early in the morning, or a cemetery at night triggered thoughts that were, at times, sad or uncomfortably haunting. Fernandez (2010, p. 246) notes the mental awkwardness of exposing thoughts and feelings, and wondering if they are ‘right’. The challenge was in the writing of the reflexive ethnographic text, and the inadequacies of narrative to capture the essence of thoughts and feelings. The challenge was to somehow examine the experience, to glean its significance to the larger context of the research and to avoid self-indulgence.

In this context, a balance in presenting other voices was important to establish a trustworthiness of visitor meaning. Reflexivity was thus useful when there was no way to learn about the experience in the moment, when asking the question of an individual would be to lose the spontaneity of thought. In addition, experiences that were solemn were best experienced reflexively, to meditate on what was happening and then to record the experience in the form of thoughts and feelings soon after. The result was an extensive range of commentary, much of which did not make it to the final draft owing to limited space.
A challenge with this research was the constant presence of thoughts of death and war. Whereas the physical presence in the field ended, reflections upon war remembrance continued by watching films, readings books, attending commemorations and meeting with veterans. Recalling memories by way of field notes and photographs was also an emotional investment that was draining at times. It was therefore important to mentally escape from time to time. This was achieved by jogging and listening to music, an experience that often resulted in other reflexive experiences as characterized in the observations on pages 237-238. In short, it was difficult to escape positionality, intertwined as it was with the researcher’s daily life in the field.

Nevertheless, the rationale for a reflexive approach was to increase the breadth and depth of awareness in observation. In addition to digitally recording or writing, photography was useful as another reflexive tool. Coupled with narrative, photographs (as a form of visual data and not merely illustrative accoutrements) were able to better capture the essence and power of sites. The result was a rich pool of thoughts and images which augmented the observations, interviews and online survey tool.

**Future Research**

Future research can continue to help inform how tourism plays a worldmaking role in landscapes of war and remembrance. In addition, future research can assist in gaining new insight into the tourist experience as an act of remembrance. A range of research themes that focus on gaining a greater understanding of what is happening in the Normandy landscape in terms of remembrance and tourism are discussed below. This section also suggests other explorative themes related to tourism, cultural memory, place and remembrance in other sites of war memory.

The Normandy landscape of war symbolizes multiple heritages. Of focus in this research were the Canadian, British and American and to a lesser extent
the French cultural memories of war as memorialized, commemorated and experienced, inter alia, by visitors. Future research could explore each of these in more detail, as well as consider other nationalities, specifically French, German and Polish. Of particular interest is the lack of a German voice in Normandy and here the work of Prince (2009) is useful when exploring German war memory as manifested in sites such as military cemeteries. Other research could involve a more detailed discussion of specific sites such as Pointe du Hoc and Ste Mere Eglise, iconic sites of memory, to gain further insight into the cosmology of tourism and remembrance. Specifically, these sites are memorialized both in the landscape and through film, becoming significant hubs of remembrance for re-enactors. Understanding the evolution of meaning of these sites and how they are memorialized would allow exploration of concepts such as the politics of remembrance and visitor meaning. In addition, how tourism informs cultural memory would contribute to the work of scholars such as Sturken (1997; 2007) and Palmer (1999; 2003; 2005).

In addition, areas of future research could include exploring the micro narratives of local war museums and sites. Joly (2000) notes the proliferation of these narratives which are housed in small privately owned museums. These sites dot the Normandy region and are typically owned and managed by someone with a passion for local history. With owner/operators retiring, the future of these museums, their artifacts and the stories they tell are in danger of being forgotten. Exploring these sites would provide insight into the role of individuals employed in tourism in the preservation of memory, silencing and forgetting. Such study would also permit deeper consideration of French cultural memory of war (Rousso 1991; Farmer 1999; Thatcher 2006) and how it manifests itself in the management of war museums.

At the scale of the tourist performance, the concept of embodiment warrants attention to better understand why physical contact with a place and objects
such as relics of war and memorials leads to, or is associated with, a greater sense of connectivity and a deeper more resonant meaning. The works of Crouch (2000) and Pritchard (2007) would help to explore the way in which individuals attempt to grasp the power of place associated with the Other of Death. Understanding why this occurs at certain sites may provide insight into how a landscape of war is constructed at the scale of the individual tourist. In addition, the psychological theories related to terror management theory and mortality death salience (Rosenblatt et al. 1989; Arndt, Greenburg and Cook 2002) may also be useful in terms of understanding how tourist meaning is shaped by worldviews and the unconscious fear of death.

There is also opportunity for collaboration with, for example, Dunkley, Morgan and Westwood (2011) and their recent study on motivations and meanings associated with battlefield tourists. One possible area for collaborative research could be to explore the transformative nature of the battlefield tourism experience, or the role of the tourist in perpetuating remembrance. Practices with regard to reflexivity at battlefields may also be area of study (see also Cappelleto 2005). In addition, exploring the work of authors such as Feldman (1994; 2004) and Adelman (1995) with regard to witnessing of trauma and the intergenerational transmission of those memories would assist in better understanding this transitional epoch in war memory. These two works also point to the significant amount of research with regard to Jewish war memory. Another possible area of future research is to consider how this field of study, as represented by authors such as Young (1003), Clark (1998) and Cook (2000), can assist in better understanding the contested nature of war related heritage and the politics of memory and to consider World War II memory, rather than various elements, as a whole.

The interaction of place, cultural memories, tourism and remembrance was explored in the context of what is accepted as a just war. Research at sites such as Mai Lai in Vietnam, the Falkland Islands, the Medak Pocket in Croatia
and the 9-11 site in New York would provide insight with regard to contested conflicts. How these sites are memorialized and the meanings associated with them may expand knowledge with regard to how and what is remembered. Given their relatively recent occurrence, the politics of remembrance may be more pronounced, leading to a more dynamic and fluid form of tourism worldmaking with regard to what is memorialized through the representation and interpretation by mediating agencies.

This thesis has provided significant new insights into the tourism-remembrance relationship. Further examination of tourism and its involvement in other landscapes of war will provide a better understanding of remembrance and by revealing the complexities of mediated experiences and visitor meaning-making. It will also help to further highlight the significance of war and the memory of war in shaping understandings of society in the 21st century.
Endnote for graph on page 172

Bibliography
Bibliography


Assemblée Nationale (1947a). Proposed Resolution No. 519. (February 1947)


Canada. (2000). *Vimy declaration for the conservation of battlefield terrain*.


Comité du tourisme de la Somme. (2010). *Bilans-de-frequentation - Somme*.


Everett, S. (2008). Beyond the visual gaze?: The pursuit of an embodied


Foran, R. F. (1944). The day a robin sang at Carpiquet. In M. Milner (Ed.), *D-Day to Carpiquet. The North Shore regiment and the liberation of Europe* (pp. 120-121). Frederiction, New Brunswick: Goose Lane Editions.


Geertz, C. (2003). Thick Description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In Y. S. Lincoln & N. K. Denzin (Eds.), *Turning points in qualitative research: tying knots in a handkerchief* (pp. 143-168). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.


Henry, M. G. (2003). 'Where are you really from?': representation, identity and power in the fieldwork experiences of a South Asia diasporic. Qualitative Research, 3(2), 229-242.


Kenyon, F. S. (1918). *War graves. How the cemeteries abroad will be designed.*


Paget, D., & Lipkin, S. N. (2009). 'Movie-of-the-Week' docudrama, ‘historical-


Schatz, T. (2002). Old War/New War: Band of Brothers and the Revival of the WWII War Film. *Film & History, 32*(1), 74-78.


Zanuck, D. F., Ryan, C., & Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corporation. (1962). *The longest day [Motion picture]*. Darryl F. Zanuck Productions. Made at Studios de Boulogne, Boulogne s/Seine, France. Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.


APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Interview question themes

Delineated by visitors, site managers, tour guides/tour operators and veterans
General Questions for interviewing visitors (typically post-trip, either by phone or face to face)

a) Age:
b) Gender:
c) Nationality:
d) Have you any relatives that fought in the war?
e) Any family connections to the site? (e.g. father fought in the war, etc)
f) How long was your stay?
g) How many times have you visited?

1. What motivated you to come here?

2. In your own words, what does D-Day, June 6, 1944, mean to you?

3. What particular sites stand out in your mind and why?

4. D-Day occurred 64 years ago. In what ways, if at all, are this place and its story important to our lives today?

5. Did you have any opinions, values or beliefs that your feel have been questioned, reinforced or changed by your visit? If yes, how so?

6. Is there anything that you gained from visiting the D-Day site that you could not have gained from watching a movie, reading a book or visiting a museum somewhere else?

7. If you were planning a tour for others that were coming here, what would your top 5 places or things would you tell them to see and why?

8. Sometimes we say to people ‘go see for yourself’ when we want to them to experience something first-hand. Who would you specifically recommend
to ‘go see for themselves’, in terms of visiting the D-Day area, and what is it that you would like them to walk away with afterward?

9. What is the most powerful place that you visited? What did you feel when you visited ______________?

10. What have you learned about our society in the 21st century by coming here?

11. Do you have anything else to add? Do you have questions for me?

For site managers

1. General age:
2. Nationality:
3. Organization:

4. What is your role of the organization/museum?

5. What is the mandate of the organization/museum?

6. When was it constructed / opened?

7. In your own words, what is D-Day, June 6, 1944?

8. D-Day occurred 64 years ago. In what ways, if at all, are this place and its story important to our lives today?

9. What is it that this site aims to emphasize?

10. How does it do that? How is it best experienced?
11. In your opinion, what is gained from visiting the D-Day site that you could not have gained from watching a movie, reading a book or visiting a museum somewhere else?

12. Sometimes we say to people ‘go see for yourself’ when we want to them to experience something first-hand. Who would you specifically recommend to ‘go see for themselves’, in terms of visiting the D-Day area, and what is it that you would like them to walk away with afterward?

13. You have visitors come here each day. Do you think their opinions or beliefs questioned, reinforced or changed by their visit? If yes, which ones? how so?

14. D-Day happened 64 years ago, and the veterans are becoming fewer and fewer. Sites are turning more to educate visitors on what happened here, rather than as a site of mourning. To what extent are the messages that your organization attempts to communicate to the visitor evolving/changing?

15. What is the link between what is experienced here by a visitor and its meaning to their lives today?

16. What are the essential elements of the D-Day that need to be remembered today? How does your museum assist informing visitors about these essential memories?

17. How, if at all, do you think opinions differ from other nationalities? Other generations?

For tour guides, tour operators

a) General age:

b) Nationality:

c) Organization

1. In your own words, what does D-Day, June 6, 1944 mean to you?

2. What would you say is the main theme or themes or your tour experience?
3. What are the main sites to visit in this area?

4. Why?

5. D-Day occurred 64 years ago. In what ways, if at all, do your visitors see this place as being important to their lives today?

6. You have visitors come here each day. Do you think their opinions, values or beliefs are questioned, reinforced or changed by their visit? If yes, which ones? how so?

7. In your opinion, how is visiting the site different from simply watching a movie or reading about it?

8. Sometimes we say to people ‘go see for yourself’ when we want to them to experience something first-hand. Who would you specifically recommend to ‘go see for themselves’, in terms of visiting the D-Day beaches, and what is it that you would like them to walk away with afterward?

9. D-Day happened 64 years ago, and the veterans are becoming fewer and fewer. Sites are turning more to educate visitors on what happened here, rather than as a site of mourning. Have you experienced a change in the type of visitor/kinds of questions that you receive on a tour?

10. How, if at all, do you think opinions differ between nationalities today? For other generations?

+++++++++++++++ For veterans

1. Can you please tell me a little bit about yourself, and your role on D-Day.

2. How many times have you visited the D-Day area since then? What did you last visit? Dozen times
3. What is it like for you to return to the beaches and stand where you once were on June 5 and 6th 1944?

4. Why do you think people visit the D-Day area today? For some people, ‘being there’ is a very powerful experience.

5. From your visits to the area after the war, what some are memorable moments for you?

6. Is what happened at D-Day important for us to remember today? Why?

7. If you were advising someone about visiting the D-Day area, for example someone English, what would you say that they must see in order to understand what happened?

8. What do you hope they learn from their visit?

9. What concerns do you have, if any, about the memorializing and remembrance of what happened at Pegasus/D-Day?

10. What concerns do you have about the area today with regard to tourism? (examples: re enactors, commercialization, Merville battery issue)

11. What is the best way for people of today to honor those who fought? What do you personally appreciate, as a vet?
APPENDIX B: List of Interviewees

Categorized as site management, tour guides, visitors and veterans
### Site Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Michael Conley</td>
<td>5-Sep-07</td>
<td>Director, Public Relations, American Battle Monuments Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Garth Webb</td>
<td>14-Apr-08</td>
<td>President of Juno Centre, Veteran, active in establishing Juno Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Andrew Whitmarsh</td>
<td>20-May-08</td>
<td>Curator, D-Day Museum, Portsmouth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Frederic Sommier</td>
<td>23-May-08</td>
<td>Director, Museum of Arromanches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Monsieur Jardin and Adrian Cox</td>
<td>10-Jun-08</td>
<td>Mayor of Arromanches, &amp; Member of Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nathalie Worthington</td>
<td>22-May-08</td>
<td>Director, Juno Beach Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Marie-Josee Lafond</td>
<td>4-Jun-08</td>
<td>Program Manager, Juno Beach Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Marc Jacquinot</td>
<td>21-May-08</td>
<td>Director, Pegasus Memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Mark Worthington</td>
<td>7-Jun-08</td>
<td>Curator, Pegasus memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dan Neese</td>
<td>9-Jun-08</td>
<td>Superintendent, ABMC Normandy American Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. James Woolsey</td>
<td>9-Jun-08</td>
<td>Director, Visitor Services, ABMC Normandy American Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Paula Bauer</td>
<td>8-Jun-08</td>
<td>Deputy Director, Visitor Services ABMC Normandy American Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lucien Tisseraud</td>
<td>9-Jun-08</td>
<td>Director and Curator, German Cemetery and Interpretive Center, La Cambe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Frederique Guerin</td>
<td>09-Jul-08</td>
<td>Secretary General, Normandie Memoire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Admiral de la Perriere</td>
<td>23-Jul-08</td>
<td>Chairman, Normandie Memoire, Comite du dembarquement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Peter Francis</td>
<td>12-Jun-09</td>
<td>Director, Public Relations, Commonwealth War Graves Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interviews</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Steve</td>
<td>18-Apr-08</td>
<td>Tour Guide, Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. John</td>
<td>17-Apr-08;</td>
<td>Canadian Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-May-08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Philippe</td>
<td>May 26,</td>
<td>French Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June 5, 8, 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Oliver</td>
<td>29-May</td>
<td>French Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Stuart</td>
<td>30-May-08</td>
<td>British Guide based in Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Sean</td>
<td>3-Jun-08</td>
<td>British Guide based in Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Bob</td>
<td>7-Jun-08</td>
<td>ex-military; regular visitor; guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Terry Copp</td>
<td>July 16-08</td>
<td>Canadian, history professor and guide; runs Canadian Battlefields Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Ed</td>
<td>Apr 2-09</td>
<td>Canadian, Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Paul</td>
<td>April -09</td>
<td>British, Owner and Guide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ellwood</td>
<td>April 9, 2009</td>
<td>British; Battlefield tour guide based in Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Carly</td>
<td>April 23, 2009</td>
<td>Canadian, guide at Juno Beach Centre in Jan-May ’08; works in Victoria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Jodie</td>
<td>May 9, 2009</td>
<td>Canadian, guide at Juno Beach Centre Aug-Dec, ’08; studying in Vic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Tonie</td>
<td>July, 2010</td>
<td>Tour guide, author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Valmai</td>
<td>July, 2010</td>
<td>Tour guide, author</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Veterans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Jim Wallwork, Glider pilot (visitor)</td>
<td>Jun-20, 2008</td>
<td>Returned frequently; first glider to land at Pegasus Bridge on June 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Neil Stewart, Fort Garry Horse, Chair, Calgary War Museum (visitor)</td>
<td>Jul-14, 2008; over seven meetings since</td>
<td>Returned; author of two war memoirs; Landed on Juno Beach in a DD tank on June 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Glen Bishop, Irish Guards Armored Division (visitor)</td>
<td>Jul-11, 2008</td>
<td>Returned; landed in Normandy in July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Garth Webb, Chair, Juno Beach Centre, former Canadian Artillery (visitor; manager)</td>
<td>Apr-14, 2008</td>
<td>Returned; Landed on June 6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Jim Cross, RCAF, Bomber navigator</td>
<td>Aug-02, 2008</td>
<td>Returned, but not involved with Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Michael, Royal Engineers</td>
<td>July 25, 2008; Sept, 2009</td>
<td>Landed on Juno; never returned. Blinded in 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Mr. Kennel, Royal Navy, Seaman</td>
<td>Oct, 2009</td>
<td>Never returned, not involved with Normandy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Mrs. Struiker, American Women’s Auxiliary Corps</td>
<td>Dec 12, 2008</td>
<td>Female American veteran, stationed in Normandy; never returned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Cullis Lancaster, Royal Canadian Naval Reserve (visitor)</td>
<td>August 16 &amp; 20, 2009</td>
<td>Returned; landed on Juno Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Ian 1-Apr-08; tourist, 1993; serving in Canadian military</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Cam April 25, 2008; Tourist, 2007; served in Canadian military, master of ceremonies for local commemoration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>‘John’ October 10, 2008; tourist, Sept., 2008</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Stephen October, 2008; History prof and guide; visited in May, 2006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Mary April 20, 2009; Canadian, teacher, took her students in 2007</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Carol April 25, 2009; American, Daughters of D-Day, father portrayed in Longest Day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Julia June 26, 2008; Canadian; Visited in 2004; wrote Jake’s Gift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Mark November 20, 2010; Canadian, father is Cullis Lancaster; visited in 2009</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C: Museums visited for observation, 2008 and 2009
## Visits to Museums (cemeteries, sites not listed; these visits include visits with guided tours)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>On own</td>
<td>June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airborne Museum Ste Mere Eglise</td>
<td></td>
<td>On own</td>
<td>June 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>On own</td>
<td>June 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2007 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>April 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musee d'Arromanches</td>
<td></td>
<td>group tour</td>
<td>17-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwick House, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>guided tour</td>
<td>20-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Day Museum, Portsmouth</td>
<td></td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>20-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>for exhibit opening</td>
<td>21-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>21-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Centre, ABMC</td>
<td></td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>22-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battle of Normandy Museum Bayeux</td>
<td></td>
<td>On own</td>
<td>23-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>NST, on own</td>
<td>25-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caen memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>26-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>NST, on own</td>
<td>27-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airborne Museum, Ste Mere</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battlebus, on own</td>
<td>28-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battlebus, main exhibit</td>
<td>30-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Man's Corner Museum</td>
<td></td>
<td>on own, with Jules</td>
<td>31-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pegasus memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td>Battlebus, on own</td>
<td>3-June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xiii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Juno Beach Centre</th>
<th>Juno Beach Centre</th>
<th>4-June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merville Battery</td>
<td>On own</td>
<td>7-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum at Falaise</td>
<td>on own, with Philippe</td>
<td>8-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Beach Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>9-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretive Centre, ABMC</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>9-June</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airborne Museum at St Mere Eglise</td>
<td>Overlord Tours</td>
<td>2-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Beach Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of the Occupation</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Museum of Liberation</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunker at Aineville?</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Relic Museum near Colville</td>
<td>On own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Day Museum near Colville</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Rangers Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>4-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilly-sur-Suelles Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>7-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Red One Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>8-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D-Day Sea Wreck Museum</td>
<td>on own</td>
<td>8-Jun-09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* does not include listing of non museum sites, such as cemeteries, monuments, beach and battlefield visits
APPENDIX D: Guided tours observed, 2008 and 2009
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tour Sector</th>
<th>Tour Company</th>
<th>Duration (hours)</th>
<th>Number of tourists</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British sector</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded British sector</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British and American highlights</td>
<td>Caen Memorial</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sector</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded British sector</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sector</td>
<td>Battlebus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sector</td>
<td>Overlord Tours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian sector</td>
<td>Battlebus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30-May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sector</td>
<td>NST</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British sector</td>
<td>Battlebus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian sector</td>
<td>Private Guide</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2009 Visit</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American sector</td>
<td>Overlord Tours</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2-Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Band of Brothers American Sector</td>
<td>Battlebus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3-Jun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Number of tours by sector**

- Canadian sector tours: 2
- British sector tours: 4.5
- American sector tours: 6.5
APPENDIX E: Itineraries of guided tours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>British Sector 3 hours (Gen)</th>
<th>Extended British Sector 6 hours (Gen)</th>
<th>British Sector, 9 hours (Specialist)</th>
<th>British-American Sectors, 5 hours (Gen 2)</th>
<th>American Sector 3 hours (Specialist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longues-Sur-Mer</td>
<td>Pegasus memorial</td>
<td>Varaville Chateau</td>
<td>Arromanches hilltop</td>
<td>Pointe-du-Hoc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arromanches hilltop, 360 cinema</td>
<td>Ranville Cemetery</td>
<td>Merville charge jump off point</td>
<td>Longues-sur-Mer</td>
<td>Omaha Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Beach Bunker</td>
<td>Sword Beach, French monument</td>
<td>Merville Battery - stop to view</td>
<td>American Cemetery</td>
<td>American Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Atlantic Wall Museum, just outside</td>
<td>Ranville Cemetery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty Statue - stop to view</td>
<td>Pegasus Memorial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillman Bunker</td>
<td>Sword Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pointe-du-Hoc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monty House - stop to view</td>
<td>Hillman Bunker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Beach</td>
<td>Stanley Hollis field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where he won the VC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>War Grave near Ryes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arromanches town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some tours were observed more than once, therefore the number presented here does not align with the total number of tours observed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Sector 9 hours (Specialist)</th>
<th>American Sector, 9 hours (Specialist 2)</th>
<th>Cdn Sector Tour 9 hours (Specialist)</th>
<th>Band of Brothers Tour (Specialist)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ste Mere Eglise: church, museum</td>
<td>Longues-sur-Mer</td>
<td>Juno Beach, Nan Sector</td>
<td>Ste Mere Eglise: town hall, museum, drop zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angoville Church</td>
<td>Omaha Beach</td>
<td>Canada House, Queen’s Own Rifles</td>
<td>Crossroads ambush</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah Beach</td>
<td>American Cemetery</td>
<td>Juno Beach, Mike Sector</td>
<td>chateau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perogary Medal of Honor site</td>
<td>Carantan</td>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td>Brecourt Manor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pointe-du-Hoc</td>
<td>Chateau - band of brothers</td>
<td>Beny-sur-Mer Cemetery</td>
<td>Various 101st regiment memorials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Beach</td>
<td>Chateau battery - band of brothers</td>
<td>Buron</td>
<td>Dead Man’s Corner Museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Cemetery</td>
<td>Utah Beach</td>
<td>Hell’s Corner</td>
<td>Carantans Charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Authie</td>
<td>Entry into Carantans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abbaye d’Ardenne</td>
<td>June 13th battle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bretteville d’Orgeuilles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F: Commemorations attended for participant observation in June, 2008 and June, 2009
### 2006 commemorations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location, type of event</th>
<th>Attended by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 6</td>
<td>Service on Omaha Beach</td>
<td>Local ceremony, town’s people, tourists (total approx 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service at June Beach Centre</td>
<td>Town’s people, Canadian representatives, two veterans. (total approx. 200)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7</td>
<td>Abbaye d’Ardenne</td>
<td>Town’s people, Canadian representatives, veterans (total approx 100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2008 commemorations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date, duration</th>
<th>Location, type of event</th>
<th>Attended by:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May 21</td>
<td>Juno Beach Centre&lt;br&gt;Opening ceremony for a temporary exhibit</td>
<td>Town’s people, Canadian representatives, two veterans. (total approx. 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 3</td>
<td>Andovill&lt;br&gt;Village dinner to honor a returning veteran.</td>
<td>Town’s people, specialist tour company staff, Dutch and Belgian, veterans and families. (total approx. 50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5</td>
<td>St Menvieux Commonwealth War Graves Cemetery</td>
<td>Returning British vet and family. (3 in total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mesnil-Patry: commemoration and vin d’honneur</td>
<td>Local town’s people, Canadian representatives and tourists. (total approx. 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pegasus Bridge: Midnight ceremony&lt;br&gt;wreath laying, the playing of a recording of commanding officer, now deceased.</td>
<td>Veterans and families, locals and tourists. (total approx. 300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Juno Beach, Bernieres-sur-Mer:&lt;br&gt;commemorative ceremony in front of Queen’s Own Rifles House.</td>
<td>Veterans and families, Canadian representatives, locals and tourists (total approx. 80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayeux Cathedral, commemorative mass.</td>
<td>Royal British Legion and families and tourists. (total approx 120).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bayeux Commonwealth War Graves wreath laying.</td>
<td>Normandy Veterans Association (UK) and families, locals and tourists (total approx 250).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha Beach and American Cemetery – no formal ceremonies at that time.</td>
<td>Individual acts of remembrance. Veterans, tourists. (total unknown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 4th</td>
<td>Ste Mere Eglise</td>
<td>Vintage trucks, reenactor encampment, music, food stands. No formal commemoration,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>but a reenactor central gathering point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5th</td>
<td>Pegasus Bridge</td>
<td>British Airborne Regiment drop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 5th</td>
<td>Pegasus Bridge</td>
<td>Commemorative flypast by vintage aircraft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Juno Beach Centre</td>
<td>Unveiling of memorial to the Canadian Navy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6th</td>
<td>Juno Beach, Bernieres-sur-Mer</td>
<td>Commemorative ceremony in front of Queen's Own Rifles House.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14th Field Artillery Regiment (Canada), commemorative ceremony at regimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>memorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normandy American Cemetery</td>
<td>Official Commemorative Ceremony for the 65th anniversary, involving heads of state.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 7th</td>
<td>Abbaye d'Ardenne</td>
<td>Commemorative ceremony for executed Canadian soldiers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2009 Commemoations
Online survey used from May, 2008-April, 2009. Response boxes after each question have been removed.

Hello:

As you are a recent visitor to the D-Day sites in Normandy, I invite you to participate in my research on the meaning of the visitor experience gained at the D-Day sites. The research is conducted as part of my PhD studies at the University of Brighton, UK.

The survey will take approximately 15-20 minutes to complete.

Your responses may be used for academic purposes (for academic papers or book chapters). If I quote your response, your identity will remain confidential. If you have any further questions or if you wish to participate in a short telephone interview, you can contact Geoffrey Bird at ddayvisit@hotmail.com.

Thank you very much for your time and support. Please start with the survey now by clicking on the Continue button below.

Please contact ddayvisit@hotmail.com if you have any questions regarding this survey.
Age:
- 14 years old or less
- 15-19 years old
- 20-29 years old
- 30-39 years old
- 40-49 years old
- 50-68 years old
- 69+ years old

Gender
- Female
- Male

Nationality:
- American
- Australian
- Belgian
- British
- Canadian
- Dutch
1. How many times have you visited the D-Day area?

2. When did you last visit the D-Day area? For how long?

3. Which sector(s) of the D-Day area did you tour? (American, British, Canadian)

4. Why did you visit the D-Day sites (e.g. beaches, other sites of battle, cemeteries, museums, monuments)?

5. From your D Day visit, what are two or three of your most memorable moments? Do you have any thoughts as to why these experiences are particularly significant for you?

6. In your opinion, is D-Day important for us to remember today? Why or why not?

7. What, if anything, did you gain from visiting the D-Day sites with regard to remembering World War II and those who fought and died that could not be gained by, for example, watching a film, reading a book, attending a Remembrance Day ceremony or speaking to a veteran?

8. How, if at all, did your visit to the D-Day sites have an impact on you personally?

9. How, if at all, did your visit to the D-Day sites have an impact on your perceptions of the world today?
10. What did your visit to the D-Day sites say to you about your nationality (Canadian/ American/ British/ other nationality)?

11. Is there anything you wish to say about your experience of visiting the D-Day sites?

12. If you are willing to participate in a phone interview in the coming weeks, please provide your email address below and I will contact you to arrange a time to call.
APPENDIX H: Examples of interview transcripts – two excerpts

Manager – Juno Beach Centre, May 22, 2008 (translated from French)

Tour Guide – Paul, April 6, 2009
**Interview with Nathalie, Site Manager (translated from French)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. <em>What is your role in the organization?</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I run the Juno Beach Centre. That is to say that I am in charge of the operations of the museum. I am the person who is in permanent contact with Canada to inform them of what happens here. And I am in charge of promoting the Juno Beach Centre in France, making the promotions so we get as many visitors as possible coming from the French and European markets. I am also in charge of the staff and also the relationships with the French institutions and everything that makes it possible for the Juno Beach Centre to be included in a network of tourism institutions and partners. And I am also in charge of giving life to this place. That is to say that it is open for 11 months of the year, tourists are here from March to October, and the rest of the year we have got to make this place live and been seen as a dynamic place. So I am in charge of the animation of the Juno Beach Centre on the French side in the winter time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**So, you work with two Boards then, one in Canada and one here, I understand?**

| There is a board here, but it’s just the [extension ] of the Canadian Board. So I work here with a French board, but it’s really not a step, it’s not something that we use every day. |

**Is the Juno Beach Centre with the Committee of the Landing?**

| No. The Committee of the Landing is something that was created after the war by Triboulet, and it used to be a pool of several museums that included Arromanches, Benouville [Pegasus] and there was also there was a museum in Bayeux and all sorts of activities. The Committee of the Landing now only owns Ranville [Pegasus] |


but Arromanches went back to the town, and they have always had the mission of organizing the international ceremonies so that it is what they keep doing. That is the Committee du dembarquement. The network that we belong to is Normandie Memoire. It is completely different. It’s got the same President but it is completely different. Normandie Memoire is something, actually the story started as early as 1994 for the 50th anniversary. The region decided to set up an institution that would make a connection between all the various places of commemoration – it could be museums, but it could be sites, it could be cemeteries, that were to do with the Second World War in Normandy. So, they created a concept called Espace Historique de la battaille de Normandie and this concept was run by the region and the Department. And they are the ones who set up those boards that say ‘L’assaut’, ‘La battaille’ and there is always a seagull as an emblem. During (sic) 10 years, the way this association was working and I would say due to big ego problems between directors of large museums such as the Caen Memorial and Arromanches, not very much happened except that each year they were producing a document, a map, telling all the places where people could go, could visit. And, there was a pass system: if you went in to one museum, you would ask and they would give you a paper and you would get a reduced price in all the other museums. That was about it. There was not much more than that happening in this network but in 2004, what happened was that, a mission, Normandie Memoire was created. What was created in 1994 was not called Normandie Memoire, it was called Espace Historique de la battaille de Normandie. But in 2002, 3, 4, a mission was created that was Normandie Memoire was created to coordinate all the ceremonies for the 60th anniversary. And that was run by the President, Admiral de la Perrierre. After the ceremonies had taken palce, it was decided that there was to be a merger between Espace Historique and Normandie Memoire. So it is now Normandie memoire, runs Espace Historique de la battaille de Normandie. So they have continued to create a document each year which is a map. But there has been a big evolution because it has become a real central head for a network. That is to say we have meetings, all the members have meetings, and there is still a pass
system which is now much more [effective], because we now sell the pass to visitors. They get a card and then after this, we can actually, they get a reduction in the other museums, that was done for the first time last year, and now we have got a huge bunch of statistics, thanks to the card. So, with the card whenever a visitor comes here with a card, we scan it, so we where they come from, where they are going to, and there was also, with the card, a file that they can fill up, and last year in 2007 we got 11,000 of them. So that gave us information about which was huge. There is not usually that much resources available for analyzing statistics so we have got plenty of information on who our visitors are, and where they come from and where they sleep, how long they are here for and when they are here, what type of reasons why they are here. All sorts of social information. So that is the big thing that Normandie Memoire established last year. But we also work with Normandie Memoire to, do you say that in English, mutualize our needs, our resources? That is to say that Juno Beach Centre is going to spend a lot of money making communication, for example, I will go to a trade show in Paris, and I will be standing beside the Museum of Arromanches and a few others.

So the idea is to get together to promote the Espace Historique de la Battaille de Normandie before anything else, and then once the visitors are here in this area to attract here, to one museum or another. So, the idea is that we are in competition at the last minute because people are only here for one day and they only have time to visit one or two museums but we are partners in order to provide the information to the visitors to get them to Normandy.

That is very helpful for me as I have found some of that information but I didn’t have a sense of how they were related.

So this year, this is a card for individuals, and this year, they have printed a document for groups. So when a group comes here, that gives them the offer to the Espace Historique de la battaille de Normandie. But there is no pass for the
group, that is the next step. It is to encourage people to go from one museum to another. So you see, that is a problem this year, as they have done it this way [go to a website]. People seem to be filling out less of these. Last year, we had many people fill it out because it was a different system, but this one is not too good. But still, they think they will get 4 or 5,000 of them.

But you are able to see the patterns that people are taking when they visit this area, as far as the museums they are going to, how long they are staying,

Yes. And the number of museums they are visiting. The average is 2.5 museums. That is to say, that they buy the pass and they don’t make it worth it. Because they buy it for 1 Euro and with 2.5 museums, the reductions they get in a second museum does not cover the Euro they spent. So, that mean that we can really increase the number of museums visited by each visitor.

You said 11,000 purchased this last year?

No. 45,000. 11,000 actually filled the form filled out the form, which was unexpected. They only printed 35,000, they ran out of it. And this year, they have extended it to places which are not to do with the Second World War, but you cannot buy a pass there. For example, at the Bayeux Tapestry you can get a reduction but you cannot buy a pass there. So this is the next step. It has not been agreed...so museums are against that, they only wanted to remain Second World War. So we will see what the result is. So long as the 2.5 average number of museums visited doesn’t decrease for Second World War museums. It doesn’t really matter. So, anyway, I am in charge of all of that, because I am French and I am local, and I have big experience, I worked 11 years at the Caen Memorial before I came here. So I am in charge of ...I am not specifically in charge of this. The Canadians have given me the mandate to try to have as many visitors to the museum as possible, to use all the networks, and I include the museum in all the
possible things that are a chance for us for promotion and to give more visibility to
the Juno Beach Centre as we have got to well aware that the Juno Beach Centre is
not that famous in France. It is something that started at 0 in 2003, and its
notoriety has got to be built up completely from scratch on the French side.

I saw in the Bayeux Tourist Office statistics for the past three years. You received
about 70,000 last year?

How much would you say?

50,000?

58,000 last year. Which was a big jump from the year before which was 46,000. So
we add 12,000 more in 2007.

Was that owing to the Vimy pilgrimage in 2007?

Part of it. Part of it. But the interesting thing it is not only due to that. I would say
that, in fact, of the 12,000 extra, we had 4000 visitors from Vimy. And we had a big
increase in French visitors. So the success of the increased number of visits last
year is due to several things. First, there was Vimy, of course. Second, the notoriety
of the Juno Beach Centre after 4 years of operation is starting and all these
activities is starting to pay. We have also had the chance to buy the network of
billboards which belonged to the aquarium on the other side of the harbour. They
have closed and we have bought they billboards at the end of the town. So that has
helped. I could see it because in August last year, all the museums, because there
was bad weather, either had a drop in attendance or were the same as the year
before, and we are the only museum that had an increase, we had an increase of
13% in August. And the fact is that the billboards were installed at the end of July.
So I think that for the tourists that were here, and looking for something to do, it
helped a lot. So, several factors like this have been [important] So for this year, we
are hoping, we have built a budget on the same amount, on 60,000 visitors, and we
are really hoping that we are going to have it, as that will be the sign that the increase was not just [by chance] (conjunction?) but structural, due to a better implementation of all the promotion.

Interview continues.
## Interview with Paul the tour guide, based in France

### 1. What does D-Day mean to you?

The first one was the most tricky! To me, it’s everything. It’s a love and hate relationship. There’s my interest in the events at a personal level as a historian and then there’s the fact that my entire livelihood and my entire life 7 days a week revolves around D-Day. It’s like being married to D-Day. I love it and I hate it at the same time, so it’s not an easy question for me to answer. I don’t know where I end and D-Day begins. I am Mr D-Day in a sense, because it means absolutely everything to me because I do, read, socialize is tied up in it. That’s the worst question!

I think it will be clear from my other answers but I can’t sum it up anymore. It’s like saying why do you married to your wife or something? It’s like like I don’t think about D-Day it’s that I have never not thought about D-Day.

### 2. What is your motivation to be a guide/run a tour company specializing in D-Day tours?

My family’s connection with World War II. I was born at the right time to have male relatives who had done their bit. So, I grew up with toy soldiers and Action Men, lots of military toys and army comics and my granddad and uncle, there was always a connection. There was RAF uniforms around and army boot brushes and army boots and army great coats laying about. And so, whereas some boys have an obsession for cars, for me it was the military. And then there was my Uncle Ceril who landed on June 6th, he was the one who would tell me about the landings on the beach, and made it very real, going from a comics point of view to a real guy who saw men die. So, my Uncle Ceril was my biggest inspiration.

My story of coming over here is a long, sad and boring story. It was about getting out of the rat race over there and happening to marry a French wife, and us looking for a lifestyle change first and looking to France and me thinking about working in a museum and then I opened a company. But it wasn’t really an ambition, it was something that happened. We started in 2002, we are one of the established companies. So, many have fallen by the wayside, and now there are new ones starting up now and we are seen as established.

### 3. What would you say is the main theme or themes of your D-Day tours? (Philosophy of your company? Cover of the tour)
I think there are 3 levels of detail about any battle: The first level, is if we take Pegasus Bridge – it was the only crossing point between the beaches and Caen. So, on any tour, we have to establish in the mind of the tourist why we are standing on that particular place? Where does it fit on the jigsaw puzzle of D-Day. Without that, if you don’t know why you are standing on that particular part of the beach, everything else is nothing. The second level of detail is who commanded what battalion, and what weapons they were using and what airfield they left from at what time, and how many men fit into a landing craft and the weight of the bombs they were carrying – you know, all the detail. And the third, is about who was the guy in the glider who landed at Pegasus Bridge, where was he from, why was he there, did he have a little child at home? Now, those three levels, what we try and do at Battlebus is to try and do as little of 2 as we possibly can get away with, and focus on 1 and 3. So, when we go to Pegasus Bridge, we say, you gotta build up why you are there in the first place. And I personally try and get through the detail as quickly as possible because you have two types of people on the tour, generally. You’ve got the people who know it all already, and you don’t need to remind them of it – they know the weapons they were carrying and how many bullets they had - and the rest of the people don’t care. Every customer, whether an expert or not of D-Day, can relate to an eighteen year-old kid a long way from home being scared, or being nervous about carrying through with the job. So, that is what I try and do. I have tried to instill that in my guides but I don’t stifle – they are all different. You have toured with some of the different guides. There’s no right way or wrong way. If Battlebus has a reputation, we try and satisfy the military buff but also the wife dragged along by the history buff, no to be sexist and say that women don’t like war and history. So that is my philosophy. That is how I think of it. We are not teachers, we are not entertainers, but somehow we have to combine the two elements. Now, you and I both are interested in this sort of stuff. But I would never sit down and read a book on flying fortresses for nine hours. We have our guests with us for nine hours. You have to keep it undetailed in a sense – otherwise, people would keel over. So, we have a curious role. You can’t be too factual, but you can’t be too blasé theatrical about it either. You have to be in a mid ground to open up people’s imagination.

4. What places, be they beaches, cemeteries, museums or relics of war, are essential for the visitor to experience in order to understand the meaning of D-Day?

That’s a tricky one in some ways because with some people, you can tell that they need to see something. If there isn’t a monument to take a photo of, they feel awkward standing in the corner of an open field because they can’t connect to it because there’s nothing tangible there for them to see. And so, they might get more from the museum, whereas other people can get more from standing in a field in the rain. So, in many ways, it’s not really the places, it’s the information that you get across at the places. There’s so many places...
we stop on our tours and there’s actually no inherent interest in the site at all. It’s just a field. A case in point would be Brecourt Manor on the Band of Brothers tour. It’s a grassy field with trees around it, one of millions in the world that look exactly the same. People have their back gardens look exactly the same and yet when they are standing in the field with me or with [another Guide] and suddenly it is an interesting place because of what happened there not because of the place itself so, it’s why ... I read pieces on travel forums and people say, “We went to Omaha Beach, there wasn’t much to see. We were there for 15 minutes and then we moved on. And that’s obviously because they have gone there and seen it as a beach, as opposed to exploring it as a place where men landed, got killed and a battle took place that lasted the whole day. So, it’s a weird answer for you but, some places have something to see, like museums, cemeteries, there’s something to see but without the information, there’s nothing there to see. It’s not like an art gallery where it’s the paintings, or a museum with there’s artifacts, or a cathedral where it’s the architecture. The places we are going don’t have an inherent interesting appearance, shall I say.

So, for an independent traveler who rents a car and who has a map, versus someone who comes on your tour, what is the difference in their experience?

Personally, I don’t think they will get anything from the visit at all, other than a nice album of photos. Unless they have done a lot of research in advance and a lot of people do. You can have a good self-drive tour when you have done the work in advance and they know what they want to say but you know it’s very sterile. All the information boards are about the battalion landing as opposed to Fred Smith from Toronto and I think it doesn’t personalize enough for me. But that’s me, because I am wanting people to take tours, not necessarily my tours. But people who come and have a good tour can tell other people that taking a tour is the way to go.

5. **As a guide, what is the significance of your role, if any, with regard to:**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Providing information as to what happened on D-Day to visitors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Remembering or mourning those who fought and died?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Making D-Day relevant to remember in the 21st century?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Ensuring an enjoyable and meaningful tourism experience to visitors to the area?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. Evoking certain emotions, reactions or meaning during a tour?

I have ticked them all basically, because they are all sort of equally important, but moving to the next question...

6. When arriving to take your tour, do visitors have certain perceptions or assumptions of what D-Day is (what happened, its meaning), or with regard to the D-Day area? What are they (1 to 3 would be fine), and what do you think they are based on?

Firstly, it may be a trivial thing, but people are blown away by the size of the Normandy invasion area. Somehow, 90% of the D-Day people think that the D-Day beaches are spread of over 2 miles and that you can see anything in a day from Paris, and then they can go back home and say that they have ticked off Normandy. And they have no comprehension that it is 4000 square miles. I don’t quite know where that comes from exactly, but generally there is a perception that things are closer than they actually are. And the other biggest thing that we have to contend with is, partly the Americanization of World War II history, and that is tied up in the Stephen Ambrosification of World War II history. And this ties into number 10 again but when I came to Normandy 20 years ago, hitchhiking through Normandy, I would meet other historians doing the same thing I was—matching black and white pictures of Panthers knocked out in a little village. And I think what is happening is that the media that people use to study World War II—the internet and Wikipedia and those sorts of things—I think it is simplifying everything and the danger of all the individual actions, the Canadian regiments for example—their contribution is being entirely forgotten and people are thinking that D-Day was Tom Hanks and the 2nd Rangers and the 101st Airborne and a few British Paratroopers at Pegasus Bridge and that everything else never happened and they are simplifying it. And more people are coming to Normandy than ever before. And that is a fact from the Tourist Office but they are not spreading around like they used to. They are going to the same places again and again, and everybody—with their 30-second attention span lifestyle now are wanting to see their Normandy trip in even shorter time so that they can tick it off and I just don’t meet people anymore in villages staying for two weeks and researching, whatever, Canadian 3rd Division or something. They are all just saying I am going to Pointe-du-Hoc and I am doing Pegasus Bridge on the way back to Paris and that’s it, I’ve done it. And that’s the sort of Stephen Ambrose approach—simplifying everything to a single book and I don’t what the solution is and I don’t know how it happened. But I think D-Day is going to become a Wikipedia page, not like what I’ve got which is about 800 books or something. So, that is something, that people are coming here with the assumption that it is much simpler than what it really is. And, there’s the books that came out right after D-Day, like Winchester Wilmot 750 billion page book, and no one is ever going to read that
now. A nineteen year-old will go online and download a 200-page summary of D-Day and – type ‘summary of D-Day’ - so that is # 6 and #10.

Is this a fairly common trait across American, Canadian and British visitors?

Yes. More and more Canadians are coming over and doing the American tours, British visitors are coming over and doing the American tours, and they have read the American side of things, and the British kids are playing the same games as the American kids, as are the Canadian kids. They are American Rangers battling the SS, they’re not Canadian infantry. And, I don’t acknowledge the fault of the…I would stand and defend Spielberg in making a Saving Private Ryan, I think it is an excellent movie. It’s down to the British to make their own movie about D-Day. Guy Ritchie is our biggest hope, but his uncle landed at Sword Beach. But, you can’t blame the media, you can’t blame the computer game manufacturers. It is not their job to educate, they’re just making a game. It is definitely something that is across the board – Denmark, South Africa, Germany, Holland – they think that our standard tour is the American Highlights Tour. They think that the tour will cover all the D-Day sites. And that is our best selling tour and that is how I pay our mortgage but it is a bit of worry too, that they are simplifying to Utah and Omaha. And when we get Canadians saying “we want the American Tour” and then we email back and say “we have the Canadian Tour” the following day. And they say, “oh, no, we are probably not going to bother with that.” I think that is quite sad.

Interview continues.