
AlmaTourism

Journal of Tourism, Culture and Territorial Development

Tourism and Making the Places after War: The Somme and Ground Zero

Winter, C.*

William Angliss Institute (Australia)

ABSTRACT

The sites of war have varied from single fields of battle, to those at sea and in the air, to the long trench lines of the Great War (1914-1918), the vast cities and regions of World War Two and more recently, to small urban sites that epitomise the 'War against Terror'. This paper is primarily based upon the landscapes of the Great War in Europe, but it explores some of the similarities with the 'Ground Zero' terrorist attack in New York, with respect to the associations between memory, tourism and geography, and how these manifest as different landscapes. A core component in the commemoration and understanding of conflict is in actually visiting the site where events occurred. Tourists are known to perform a key role in the creation and maintenance of these important sites: not only do they 'consume' them, but tourists actively contribute towards creating a touristscape.

Keywords: Ground Zero; Memoryscape; Touristscape; Palimpsest; Somme; *Lieux de mémoire*

* E-mail address: carolinew@angliss.edu.au

Memory attaches itself to sites, whereas history attaches itself to events
(Nora, 1989, p. 22)

Introduction: Battlegrounds

Over many centuries wars have overlaid geography in different ways, from armies massed on a single field to small-scale guerrilla tactics, to the 700 kilometres of trench line of the Great War (1914-1918). The battles of the Second World War were played out over vast tracts of land across the globe, while more recently, not only the deserts of the Middle East, but small urban sites such as cafes, have epitomised the 'War against Terror'. Sea and air battles are fought in environments that are foreign to human survival, which require special technologies and overall they are, arguably, less well known by the public than those fought on land.

War is by its very nature a destructive force – against places and people. It is also, as Saunders (2005, p. 77) describes, 'the transformation of matter through the agency of destruction' and ironically, war is creative in the sense that it makes new 'places'. Weaver's (2000) 'war-distorted destination life cycle', for example, describes how war can create or develop tourist destinations in ways that would not otherwise have occurred. These close links between war, geography and tourism have been illustrated by tourism researchers (Hertzog, 2012; Iles, 2006, 2012; Seaton, 2000; Smith, 1998). When tourists visit war sites, they can be seen as consumers of the place, but they are also creators of meaning, and by leaving traces in a landscape they create their own 'touristscape' (Saunders, 2001, 2005).

Tourists also participate in the creation of memorial landscapes or 'memoryscapes'. These areas may be urban, rural and natural and their purpose is to hold and convey memories of the past for specific social groups, in what Osborne (2001a, p. 39) refers to as 'the geography of identity'. Importantly, as Foote and Azaryahu (2007, p. 126) emphasise 'memory pertains to the actualization of the past in some form of contemporary experience'. The characteristics of individuals attracts them to particular places, and therefore travel and the interactions of tourists with the features of a site, play a key role in actualising memory (Poria, Biran and Reichel, 2009). The study of war and tourism is a field of increasing interest. Miles (2014) for example, studied visitor connections with battlegrounds from the eighteenth century, while Viol, Theodoraki, Anastasiadou and Todd (2014) are concerned with the Cold War and events on the site of the Berlin Wall. Tourism researchers are advancing study of the contemporary effects of the Great War in their use of sociological rather than military and historical perspectives. Hertzog (2012) analysed the involvement of local people in development of tourism in the Somme areas, while Vanneste and Foote (2013) analysed the political aspects of tourism and war. Even more research is being generated with respect to the centenary commemorations of the Great War, which are now underway in several countries across the globe (Irimiás, 2014; Jansen-Verbeke and George, 2015; Vanneste and Foote, 2013).

This paper focuses on two sites: the Great War battlefields of the Somme, France, and Ground Zero in New York, where a terrorist attack at the World Trade Centre killed almost 3,000 civilians. The aim is to illustrate some of the commonalities in remembrance practice that may exist, even though there is a vast temporal distance between the commemorated events. It also illustrates the key role of geography and how tourists are part of the process of creating landscapes that hold within them the memories of war. This is primarily a conceptual paper, but part of the findings from a small study conducted on the Somme battlefields in 2014 is included to demonstrate some of the ways in which tourists may interpret a former battlefield.

1. Background

At both the Somme and Ground Zero, the nature of the war changed the world, in ways that were manifest in their impact on the daily lives of ordinary people. Both events generated an overwhelming need among societies and individuals, to remember those who had been killed, and to create an appropriate commemorative apparatus for them. The Great War sites were, and remain agricultural, and the war involved young men, most of whom were 'citizen-soldiers'. The Ground Zero site, involved a terrorist attack on a large metropolitan site, involving the deaths of civilians of all ages and backgrounds. On that same day (known as '9/11') other terrorist attacks using aircraft were made on the Pentagon and at a site in Pennsylvania, but because of its greater magnitude, the New York site has tended to dominate. Acute trauma was created throughout society from both the Somme battles and Ground Zero, which was exacerbated by the fact that so many of the dead were "missing": on the Somme, the men were lost in the mud of the battlefield, while in New York, civilians were lost in the great clouds of dust that emanated from the buildings' collapse (Sturken, 2004). Even though the two sites relate to events that occurred in different eras (cultural, technological, temporal and social), the ways in which they are remembered share some commonalities, not the least of which is an intense interest by tourists.

The Battle of the Somme 1916

The Great War was fought along a relatively narrow but lengthy (700 km) trench line, from August 1914 to November 1918, killing approximately 9 million soldiers. Battles were fought all along this line for the entire period, but some campaigns were particularly devastating and have epitomised this war for the past century. As major campaigns, involving the death and wounding of thousands of men, the Somme, along with Verdun (1916) and Passchendaele (1917) are remembered as some of the very worst, most destructive and violent of the war.

On the first day of the Battle of the Somme, 1 July 1916, the British army suffered 20,000 deaths and 40,000 men wounded. Over the following months to mid November, the total British casualties (dead and wounded) including Australian, Canadian, New Zealand and South African forces, reached 432,000 with similar

numbers for Germany (Prior and Wilson, 2005). In the tradition of this war, the men were buried as close as possible to where they fell, and for the British, the (then) Imperial War Graves Commission built a thousand cemeteries across the Western Front to hold the bodies of the dead. Monumental memorials were also constructed to list the names of the 'missing', their numbers thought to approximate one third to half of the dead. The naming, either on headstones or memorials remains one of the primary ways through which the war and the individuals who had fought are remembered (Laqueur, 1994; Longworth, 2003; Mosse, 1990). The German dead were also buried close to where they fell, but for various reasons, their cemeteries were more confined, with several men being buried in each grave rather than individually as were the British and their Allies.

Ground Zero and 9/11

'Ground Zero' refers to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on the twin towers of the World Trade Centre in New York. Two aircraft were flown into the two towers, which subsequently collapsed, killing 2,823 people trapped inside, and spreading dust and debris across 15 acres of metropolitan New York. Those killed included 343 of the city's fire-fighters and 70 police officers, who had entered the site in an attempt to help survivors. Of the total killed, only 1,102 were identified, and less than half of the fire-fighters who died were recovered. The process of clearing the site was a substantial undertaking that took nearly nine months, ending officially on 30 May 2002. In addition to the New York site, 189 people were killed when another jet crashed into the Pentagon and a further 44 were killed in Pennsylvania at fourth crash site (CNN.com, 2008).

To remember the attack and all of those killed on 9/11, as well as six people killed in the World Trade Centre bombing in 1993, the National September 11 Memorial opened ten years later, in 2011. The memorial site is an acre in size, and consists of two deep pools with "the largest man-made waterfalls in North America" that "sit within the footprints where the Twin towers once stood". The names of those who died in the 2001 and 1993 attacks are inscribed on bronze panels surrounding the pools (National September 11 Memorial & Museum, 2015).

2. Creating landscape

As Osborne (2001a) observes, geography is benign, but because of their materiality as 'historical traces', certain sites are seen to have a sense of authenticity or "authority" as Gough (2006, p. 41) states. The values and qualities of a society can be embedded to a site, thus creating a landscape. As Gough (2004, p. 21) noted, these areas may be "little more than a cleared and uncluttered tract of land to which historic significance is attached". Schama (1995, p. 7) describes landscape as "the work of the mind. Its scenery is built up as much from strata of memory as from layers of rock". Natural places hold an important place in a long standing tradition in which they have been culturally constructed as landscapes that represent ideas of "empire, nation, freedom,

enterprise, and dictatorship” (Schama, 1995, p. 17). They have also been used as symbols, representations, and may can be gendered or class-based, read as texts and used as metaphors (Schein, 1997). Even though they are sites of mass death and horror, many battlefields are held in high regard by nations and other groups, and used as exemplars of pride, honour and identity. Equally, they can be places for negative associations, of loss and cruelty (Osborne, 2001a; Tumarkin, 2005).

There are many ways then through which a battle site can be perceived, for example, according to its participants (state-organised, insurgency groups) or its later purpose such as peace and reconciliation (Woodward, 2014). A military focus can transform a site to a warscape, evidenced by destroyed buildings, remnants of equipment and fortifications (Osborne, 2001b). Tumarkin (2005, p. 13) defines a traumascape as “a distinctive category of places transformed physically and psychically by suffering”, and having a link between the place and its history that cannot be removed.

This paper relates to the way in which tourists and other visitors can be involved in processes which help to embed and reinforce memory into a geographic site and transform it as a landscape (Osborne, 2001a; Schama, 1995). Iles (2012, p. 193) observed that at the Lochnagar mine crater on the Somme, “landscape is not just a visual thing, but within it is embedded personal, social identities “and memories of previous movement” (Iles, 2012, p. 182). Filippucci (2012) notes that just as an individual death results in the absence of a loved one, violence, damage and loss can be inflicted on landscapes. She argues further that this is “because places are repositories and indeed, objectifications of identity and continuity” (Filippucci, 2012, p. 165). Osborne (2001) argues that the twin towers in New York were destroyed precisely because of their symbolic value and meaning. In the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks, mourning related not only to the losses of missing individuals, but also to the loss of a way of life, and extending from the local area, to the nation and the international community (Greenspan, 2005; Otto, 2010, 2014; Sturken, 2004).

3. *Les lieux de mémoire*

Special kinds of memorial landscapes are reflected in Nora’s (1989, p. 18) notion of *les lieux de mémoire*, which he argues we must now construct “because there are no longer *milieux de mémoire*, real environments of memory” where “true memory” (p. 8) occurs. *Lieux de mémoire* means that “spontaneous memory”, of people and events, which is created through the practices of daily, community life, no longer exists. As a result, memory must be deliberately constructed by means such as archives, ceremonies and anniversaries (Nora, 1989, p. 12). Nora (1989) defines three types of *lieux*: those which are symbolic including national flags, pilgrimages and the minute’s silence, and functional *lieux* such as a veterans’ reunion. Material *lieux de mémoire* can include cemeteries, museums, anniversaries, generations, lineage, local memory, topographical and monumental sites. As material *lieux de mémoire*, ‘The Somme’ and ‘Ground Zero’ hold meanings that extend beyond their geographical boundaries to incorporate, at the very least, the memory of war and identity (Osborne, 2001a).

By their very nature Nora's (1989) *lieux de mémoire* allow for the separation of geography and events such that memory does not necessarily exist within the geographic vicinity of a remembering community. This is almost always the case for battles and other events that have occurred at sea or in the air, and thousands of war memorials were built in the home countries, distant from the European battlefields of the Great War. Sumatojo's (2009) analysis of Trafalgar Square in London shows how *lieux de mémoire* relating to multiple events and prior times, can be created in an urban space, far removed from the initial land and sea scapes in which the commemorated events occurred. Even so, Kerr's (2013, p. 78) example of a failed war memorial (the Great Ocean Road) in Australia illustrates the potential difficulty in attempting to create a memorial, when the geography has no 'authority' of historic association (Gough, 2004, 2006). In this case, a road, designed as a Great War memorial was constructed just after the war by returned war veterans, but instead it developed as a successful tourist attraction, because of its location on a section of coastline that had been the site of a number of shipwrecks. Its original purpose, and the fact it had been built by war veterans was forgotten. A local group is now acknowledging the 2,400 ex-servicemen who built the road (in very difficult conditions), based upon their direct link with that part of the landscape (Gerritsen, 2009).

As Ziino (2007) shows in his analysis of *distant grief*, memory depends upon the knowledge that the actual site at which the remembered events occurred, continues to exist. He argues that the bereaved of the Great War were comforted knowing that their deceased family members were buried in carefully tended graves. Tourists, who travel to and witness the sites, can provide evidence for the existence of the graves to those who cannot travel. This tradition continues today.

4. Creating memory

Gough (2006) describes J. Winter's (1995) three phases in the production of memory, beginning with monument building, which incorporates the selection, forgetting and articulation of memory (Halbwachs, 1992). At sites of the Great War, and in the home countries of the combatants, the first phase was completed by the late 1930s, following clearing of the battlefields and construction of memorials and the cemeteries (Osborne, 2001b). Thousands of citizen-soldiers were officially acknowledged by the state, and their individual burial on the battlefields created new memorial landscapes (Laqueur, 1994; Longworth, 2003; Mosse, 1990). In addition, people were no longer satisfied with passive commemoration of the political and military elite (Gough, 2000). As Lloyd's (1998) description of the unveiling of the Cenotaph in London illustrates, the bereaved demanded participation in the public ceremonies of remembrance to mourn their personal loss. During this period, and beginning a tradition that endures today, large numbers of families, ex-servicemen and tourists travelled to the battlefield and memorial sites in acts of remembrance (Lloyd, 1998).

Ground Zero, in the United States is a relatively new 'place', where informal commemorative activity by the citizens of the city and tourists began immediately after the attack. In the tradition that had recent high visibility, following the death of Princess Diana in 1997, members of the public created shrines through placement of thousands of flowers and small tributes at the site (Gough, 2006; Greenspan, 2005; Otto, 2014). Greenspan (2005) conducted an intensive two-year ethnographic study of visitors at the site beginning in the first year after the attack. She observed how the many small and individual acts of remembrance served to commemorate different types of victims, simultaneously contributing towards a collective and global experience of the place. She argues that visitors "both articulate meaning to the site, and mediate others' experience of it" (Greenspan, 2005, p. 373).

The second phase of memory creation involves ritualising remembrance through regular commemorative activities. The nations that fought the Great War, have developed, refined and experienced their commemorative practice for a century, through a range of behaviours enacted in the home countries and on the battlefields (Winter, 1995, 2006). At Ground Zero the official memorial building phase concluded in 2011 when the National September 11 Memorial opened. Winter's (1995) third phase is illustrated through the centenary of the Great War which has initiated discussions about how, if at all, memories ought to be transformed or changed for future generations (Jansen-Verbeke & George, 2015; Vanneste & Foote, 2013).

5. Tourism

Tourists are now one of the largest groups to visit war memorials, museums and cemeteries (Smith, 1998). On the Somme, the very large Franco-British memorial at Thiepval, which names over 72,000 of men missing from the campaign, attracts over 200,000 visitors annually. In New York, the 9/11 Memorial Museum opened to the general public on 21 May 2014, and in its first year of operation, attracted 2.7 million visitors from over 150 countries (Pachucki, 2015). The development of tourism on the Western Front added a layer of interpretation to the battlefields, as what can be termed a touristscape. Today tourism has a strong presence in the form of a large well developed industry, providing tours, information, hospitality and accommodation services and based on museums and large visitor centres. As Hertzog (2012, p. 1) found, there has been increasing development of tourism on the Somme, which involves the creation of "Picardy as a touristic destination 'of memory'", including not only the battlefields and memorials, but also the local villages, the people and their culture. Tourists began to visit Ground Zero within three months of the attack, initially creating some tension with other groups, when it was thought their motivations were disrespectful. As researchers found however, tourists also regarded the site as sacred and exhibited mourning behaviours in their desire to commemorate those who had lost their lives (Lisle, 2004; Sturken, 2004).

6. Landscape as a palimpsest

It is worth repeating that while social memory is by definition dominant, other memories continue to exist, including those embedded as landscapes. Some landscapes are highly visible while others are perceptible only to those with certain skills to identify them. War sites then, are as Saunders (2001) observed, palimpsests, reflecting Crang's (1998, p. 14) broader notion of a palimpsest as a way to "bring together the development of landscapes through time and the spatial diffusion of culture – the spread of ideas, practices and techniques". In his analysis of the restoration of the Western Front battlefields in France, Osborne (2001b, p. 61) describes the layering of the landscapes for the periods before and after the war, from a rural "bucolic landscape", to "a dystopian warscape", and then very quickly afterwards, a return to a rural landscape. In the concern to restore the rural landscape, the post war work destroyed almost all of the warscape, by clearing the almost all of the evidence of the events that had occurred there. For nations, families and veterans, and certainly for today's historians and archaeologists, this evidence, much of which was horrific, represented the events that had caused so much pain and grief. This absence was somewhat transformed when the memorials and cemeteries to the war were constructed, in an effort to replace the trauma with uplifting images of heroic sacrifice and worthy death. Thus it can be suggested that a memoryscape was created, that layered a strong image over the warscape and the rural landscape. Photo 1 shows part of the memoryscape on the Somme, layered within a rural landscape, and Photo 2 shows the rural landscape again, with a remnant of the warscape.

Tourism also plays a role along with other institutions, in which it "makes explicit that which is implicit in the local landscape" (Azaryahu & Foote, 2008, p. 179). That is, to help provide the markers in the landscape by which tourists can interpret the layers of the palimpsest. Photo 3 shows a representation of some of the landscapes that have formed in the village of Pozières on the Somme, beginning with a touristscape, evidenced by the "Poppy Trail" sign. The memoryscape is indicated by the Commonwealth War Graves Commission sign to the military memorial, as well as the French war memorial in the background. Local village culture is represented by the Church.

The groups that uphold the different landscapes within a geographic area can exist with varying degrees of tension, and tourists can sometimes be the focus of concern. On the Great War battlefields today, it is difficult to distinguish tourists from pilgrims and the same person may adopt both identities during a single trip (Winter, 2011). It was not always the case however, and in the early post war years, tourists were often negatively regarded on the battlefields, especially in the presence of relatives seeking graves of their family (Mosse, 1990). While tourism created some tension at Ground Zero Sturken (2004, p. 315) found that perhaps the most difficult and complex situation has been created between residents, commercial interests and the creation of the site as sacred ground. That is, "notions of Ground Zero as sacred ground are antithetical to the stakes held by residents of lower Manhattan in their neighbourhood and have been

a constant source of concern for them” (Sturken, 2004, p. 315). That is, here is a deep contradiction between the mundane events of everyday life and the special nature of the sacred.

Sturken (2004, p. 316) describes how the ruins of warscapes are used to “evoke a sense of the destructive forces that change the meaning of those places”, giving examples of the Hiroshima Peace Memorial Park in Japan, and Coventry Cathedral in the United Kingdom. van Toor and Hanneke (2015) argue that prior landscapes at Ground Zero had twice been completely razed, first in the 1960s and 1970s when the World Trade Center was built, and again in 2001, in the process of clearing the site after the attack. According to Sturken (2004, p. 318), however, the notion of the building’s ‘footprint’ was used to evoke the “concrete materiality of ruins”, giving a sense of continuity with the past.

It is inherent in the selective nature of memory, that some people and events are forgotten (Halbwachs, 1992), and so too in the Great War battlefields, the layers of meaning have been differentially restored and remembered. Irimiás (2014) for example, has shown how, despite the very difficult conditions and large loss of life, the battlefields in northern Italy have generated less interest than the Western Front areas of France and Belgium. Many villages in the area around Verdun have been only partially rebuilt, and some not at all (Blair, Balthrop and Michel, 2013; Fillippucci, 2012). In particular, what appears to have been inadequately memorialised, is the loss and trauma experienced by civilians (Filippucci, 2012; Osborne, 2001b).



Photo 1: Memoryscape on the Somme, Canadian Sunken road cemeteries
(Source: Author, 2015)



Photo 2: Remains of warscape, a German bunker, Somme
(Source: Author, 2014)



Photo 3: Evidence of landscape palimpsest, Pozières village
(Source: Author, 2013)

7. Visitor studies at Ground Zero

Several studies have been conducted at Ground Zero, and they provide a record of visitor experiences and behaviours at the site from 2001 (Greenspan, 2005; Lisle, 2004; Sturken, 2004). In particular, Greenspan (2004) spent two years studying visitor patterns at the site, using ethnographic methods, photography, field notes, interviews and observation. The site attracted many tourists, and in particular, the viewing platform constructed in 2001 created some conflict between bereaved families and tourists, in what Lisle (2004, p. 18) describes as “a complex conjunction of tourism, voyeurism and spectacle”. At the same time, Lisle (2004, p. 19) considered that tourists were not necessarily negative in their behaviours, but perhaps may be “willing to be confronted with irresolvable questions of politics, ethics and violence”. Sturken (2004) also found that the perceptions of the site as a place for tourism and as sacred ground were not necessarily in conflict, but more like places of pilgrimage.

More recently in 2009, Stone (2012) studied visitors in the WTC Visitor Center using various techniques including content analysis of 50 comment cards, 16 short interviews and participant observation. His findings support Sturken (2004) in that the space is considered, sacred but that it remains contested, with disparate groups intermingled within the confines of a relatively small area. Stone (2012, p. 78) found that visitors themselves wanted to develop their own meanings and to “triangulate their experiences between what they had previously heard, seen or read through media narratives of 9/11 with that felt for the place”. There was also a sense that the space contributed towards the notions of “spatial awareness and locational authenticity” (Gough, 2006; Stone, 2012, p. 80). Stone (2012) regards the Ground Zero site as a traumascape, but that as a dark tourism site, “it is not only a space *of* death but also a place *for* the living” (Stone, 2012, p. 78).

8. Tourists' interpretation of The Somme

This section offers an insight to how visitors to the Somme understand the geography of the battlefield. The researcher conducted 32 brief (10-15 minute) interviews with 51 individual visitors at two museums located in small villages on the Somme battlefields (the Musée Somme 1916, in the village of Albert, and the Franco-Australian Museum at Villers-Bretonneux) during September 2014. These museums attract large numbers of tourists from many countries, and because of their location, they tend to offer information and an introduction to a battlefield experience. They also provide facilities that assist in approaching and interviewing visitors, without disrupting their experience at a more sensitive site such as a cemetery. Visitors were approached as they exited the museum. A semi-structured question format was used, and only English speaking visitors were interviewed because of the language limitations of the researcher. The main aim of the study was to ask visitors about some of the new memorials being proposed for the Somme area, and the kinds of experiences that visitors found most meaningful. The comments reported here represent a theme that emerged from the

study, rather than being an initial research objective. The respondents were similar in several respects: most were making their first visit to the Western Front, and several UK visitors had been motivated by television programs about the centenary. For many but not all of the visitors, their family had served in the Great War. The majority were Free Independent Travellers (not on tours), were either British or Australian (with one person from the USA and one from the Netherlands) and most were in the 40-59 year age range. The sample was therefore a mix of pilgrims and tourists, although it is known that it is very difficult to distinguish one from the other, and that the same person may play both roles within the same trip (Winter, 2011).

A sense of the past: as it is, as it was, being back there

Visitors were concerned to know about the landscape, “as it was”, when the men were there. There was also some concern for the young soldiers, and one person wanted “to sit in the dirt – to see how they lived – what they ate, how they slept, the latrines. Personal things are memorable” (#6).

One person summed up the link between time and space and said “Being here is like being back there” (#23).

A sense of place: Being in it

The geography of the area, and the physical experience of being on the site at which the battles had been fought, was regarded as being very important in promoting a deeper understanding of the war, and that this kind of experience was not possible at home. A visitor explained it, “Knowing you’re in that space – you don’t get the enormity without being here” (#23), while another said simply, “You need to come here” (#27).

One person commented that “We have seen three museums – that is enough - so now we need to go outside and look” (#13).

There were frequent comments about the importance of the sites at which events had taken place, as Dunkley, Morgan and Westwood (2010) found. Visiting trenches, or the places trenches had been, and where the fighting had actually taken place, was mentioned by several visitors as being particularly salient. In other words as Gough (2006) states, the site has ‘authenticity’ and ‘authority’.

People also wanted to know the location of other battle sites and towns they had heard about. As Stone (2012) found, visitors were comparing their knowledge with the actuality of the site. Several visitors said that they like time to experience the battlefields in a quiet way. For some this meant having time to wander around, finding things for themselves.

Visitors said it is difficult to engage with the war history, but seeing trenches, craters and other “evidence” helps them to imagine how it was. As one person so aptly put it, in the absence of evidence about the war, “Now it’s just a field” (#16). In other words, the layer of the warscape is very faint, unless a visitor has sufficient knowledge that enables them to read the landscape. One person said that, “I like ruins because you can use your imagination. Something speaks to you” (#25).

There was a wide range of views about the level, type and frequency of information that should be provided on the battlefields. Some visitors, who have accumulated a high level of knowledge about the battlefields through extensive reading and visitation experience, are referred to as “buffs”. It is they who have the knowledge and skills to interpret the geography, that is, to read the warscape in the absence of overt interpretation. Many visitors recognised that too much information can negatively influence the ambiance of a site, and some people even preferred to have no interpretation at all. Some researchers have observed that increasing familiarity with a place provides for easier reading of the landscape (Iles, 2012). One visitor commented that “You need knowledge to visualise” (#18), and another added that “you see different things according to your understanding” (#21). Participants’ knowledge had come from several sources, including documentaries on television, history lessons at school, information from friends and prior visits.

Conclusions

The paper has illustrated some of the commonalities in the practices of remembrance at two sites that are vastly different. The Somme battles of the Great War were fought a century ago in Europe, by large armies, comprised mainly of young citizen-soldiers. Ground Zero was the beginning of the “War against Terror” in the current age, an attack on civilians in one of the largest metropolitan areas of the globe.

Studies at both sites indicate that the authenticity and authority of the physical place (Gough, 2006; Stone, 2012) is a very real imperative in motivating visitation. This authority is also derived from the fact that they are the places at which those who were killed were last alive, and as such, the ground is regarded by many as a sacred place at which mourning can occur (Greenspan, 2005; Laqueur, 1994; Lisle, 2004; Pivnik, 2011; Sturken, 2004).

A palimpsest exists at both sites, made up of layers that are, at the most basic - before and after the war/attack, and it is here that different perspectives between groups manifest. Ground Zero continues to be a contested space with tension existing between different tourists, commercial interests and local residents (Stone, 2012; Sturken, 2004). It is clearly a complex site with meanings in continuous change as different groups continue to negotiate its meaning at many levels. The Somme is less so, perhaps because it is an old battlefield and many conflicts relating to remembrance were negotiated many years ago. All the same, the study reported here was not designed to explore this aspect, and the sample comprised people who held relatively

similar characteristics. Other sections of the Western Front may reflect different perspectives (Filippucci, 2012; Irimiás, 2014).

Tourism adds its own layer to the landscape, consisting of (in part) museums, visitor centres and hospitality offerings. Most importantly, tourism accommodates people from outside the immediate geographically based remembering community, in what J. Winter (1995) refers to as “fictive kinship”. Tourists also wish to know about the events of the past, the people involved in them, and to participate in commemorative activities.

Visitors on the Somme expressed an understanding and appreciation of the notions of memory and landscape, with many wanting to experience, or to imagine the landscape “as it was” in the past. Some reflected Osborne’s (2001a) comment that without knowledge or markers, geography is benign, and some kind of “evidence” helps to imagine or to visualise the place and its meaning. In this respect, “ruins” have proven very useful at many touristic sites, but on the Somme and at Ground Zero, the warscape is very faint. Van Toor and Hanneke (2015) argue, that the prior landscapes at Ground Zero have now been completely razed, while Sturken (2004) considers the footprints of the towers have been used to help evoke the site’s former meanings. Ultimately, memory and landscapes are created by the living, and the practices in which they engage, as members of remembering communities, helps to ensure the persistence of the site’s underlying meanings (Halbwachs 1992; Schama, 1995). These needs are not always an easy fit: local people need to be able to pursue their daily lives through mundane activities, while the bereaved require consolation and peace and a sense of the sacred. The notion of *lieux de memoire* depends upon the continued existence of geographic places in the minds of memory makers, but in this respect, the evidence for this can be provided very often, by tourists who act as witnesses and participate in commemorative practice.

References

Azaryahu, M. and Foote, K.E. (2008). Historical space as narrative medium: On the configuration of spatial narratives of time at historical sites. *GeoJournal*, 73, 179-194.

Blair, C., Balthrop, V. W. and Michel, N. (2013). Mood of the material: War memory and imagining otherwise. *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, 13(1), 6-20.

CNN.com (Cable News Network) (2008). *Ceremony closes 'Ground Zero' cleanup*. Retrieved from ><http://edition.cnn.com/2002/US/05/30/rec.wtc.cleanup/><

Crang, M. (1998). *Cultural geography*. London: Routledge.

Dunkley, R., Morgan, N., and Westwood, S. (2011). Visiting the trenches: Exploring meanings and motivations in battlefield tourism. *Tourism Management*, 32, 860-868.

Filippucci, P. (2012). In a ruined country: Place and the memory of war destruction in Argonne (France). In: Argenti, N. and Schramm, K. (eds.), *Remembering violence: Anthropological perspectives on intergenerational transmission*. New York: Berghahn. pp. 165-189

Foote, K.E., and Azaryahu, M. (2007). Toward a geography of memory: Geographical dimensions of public memory and commemoration. *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 35(1), 125-144.

Gerritsen, T. (2009). *Mystery remains on who built Victoria's Great Ocean Road*. ABC. Retrieved from ><http://www.abc.net.au/local/stories/2009/06/23/2605824.htm><

Gough, P. (2000). From Heroes' Groves to Parks of Peace: Landscapes of remembrance, protest and peace. *Landscape Research*, 25(2), 213-228.

Gough, P. (2004) Sites in the imagination: The Beaumont Hamel Newfoundland Memorial on the Somme. *Cultural Geographies*, 11(3), 235-258.

Gough, P. (2006). Fault lines: Four short observations on places of peace, trauma and contested remembrance. *Journal of Visual Art Practice*, 5(1-2), 39-48.

Greenspan, E. (2005). A global site of heritage? Constructing spaces of memory at the World Trade Center Site. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 11(5), 371-384.

Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hertzog, A. (2012). War, battlefields, tourism and imagination. *Via@ - Tourist imaginaries*, 1 (1-13). Retrieved from >http://www.viatourismreview.net/Article6_EN.php<

Iles, J. (2006). Recalling the ghosts of war: Performing tourism on the battlefields of the Western Front. *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 26(2), 162–80.

Iles, J. (2012). Exploring landscapes after battle: Tourists at home on the old front lines. In: Skinner, J. (eds.) *Writing the dark side of travel*. New York: Berghahn Books, pp. 182-202.

Irimiás, A. (2014). The Great War heritage site management in Trentino, northern Italy. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(4), 317-331.

Jansen-Verbeke, M. and George, W. (2015). Memoryscapes of the Great War (1914-1918): A paradigm shift in tourism research on war heritage. *Via@Tourism Review*, 2(8), 2-26.

Retrieved from <http://viatourismreview.com/en/2015/11/varia-art4/>

Kerr, R. (2013). Landscapes of memory and forgetting: Memorialisation, emotion and tourism along Australia's Great Ocean Road. *AlmaTourism*, 8,78-94.

Laqueur, T. (1994). Memory and naming in the Great War. In: Gillis, J.R. (eds.), *Commemorations: The politics of national identity*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press. pp. 150-167.

Lisle, D. (2004). Gazing at Ground Zero: Tourism, voyeurism and spectacle. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 8(1), 1-21.

Lloyd, D. (1998). *Pilgrimage and the commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia and Canada, 1919-1939*. New York: Berg.

Longworth, P. (2003). *The unending vigil: The history of the Commonwealth War Graves Commission*. Barnsley, United Kingdom: Pen and Sword.

Miles, S. (2014). Battlefield sites as dark tourism attractions: An analysis of experience. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 9(2), 134-147.

Mosse, G. (1990). *Fallen soldiers: Reshaping the memory of the World Wars*. New York: Oxford University Press.

National September Memorial & Museum (2015). *About the memorial*. Retrieved from ><https://www.911memorial.org/about-memorial><

Nora, P. (1989). Between memory and history: *Les lieux de mémoire*. *Representations*, 26, Spring, 7-24.

Osborne, B. (2001a). Landscapes, memory, monuments, and commemoration: Putting identity in its place. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 33(3), 39-78.

Osborne, B. (2001b). In the shadows of monuments: The British League for the Reconstruction of the Devastated Areas of France. *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 7 (1), 59-82.

Otto, S. (2014). A garden from ashes: The post-9/11 Manhattan City-Shrine, the Triangle Fire Memorial March, and the educative value of mourning. *Journal of Social History*, 47(3), 573-592.

Otto, S. (2010). Collective outcry: The educative meaning and value of spontaneously-created shrines. *Journal of Philosophy and History of Education*, 60, 267-271.

Pachucki, J. (2015). Museum marks first year with 2.7 million visitors. Retrieved from > <http://www.911memorial.org/blog/museum-marks-first-year-27-million-visitors><. National September 11 Memorial & Museum. New York.

Pivnik, B. A. (2011). Enacting remembrance: Turning toward memorializing September 11th. *Journal of Religious Health*, 50, 499-515.

Poria, Y., Biran, A. and Reichel, A. (2009). Visitors' preferences for interpretation at heritage sites. *Journal of Travel Research*, 48(1), 92-105.

Prior, R. and Wilson, T. (2005) *The Somme*. Sydney: UNSW Press.

Saunders, N. (2001). Matter and memory in the landscapes of conflict: The Western Front 1914-1919. In: Bender, B. and Winer, M. (eds.), *Contested landscapes: Movement, exile and place*. Oxford: Berg. pp. 37-53.

Saunders, N. (2005). Culture, conflict, and materiality: The social lives of Great War Objects. In: Finn, B. and Hacker, B. (eds.) *Materializing the military*. London: Science Museum. pp. 77-94.

Schama, S. (1995). *Landscape and memory*. Bath: HarperCollins.

Schein, R.H. (1997). The place of landscape: A conceptual framework for interpreting an American scene. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 87 (4), 660-680.

Seaton, A.V. (2000). Another weekend away looking for dead bodies: Battlefield tourism on the Somme and in Flanders. *Tourism Recreation Research*, 25(3), 63-77.

Smith, V. (1998). War and tourism: An American ethnography. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 25(1), 202-227.

Stone, P. (2012). *Dark tourism as 'mortality capital': the case of Ground Zero and the significant other dead*. (pp. 71-94). Retrieved from Selected Works, >http://works.bepress.com/philip_stone/37/<

Sturken, M. (2004). The aesthetics of absence: Rebuilding Ground Zero. *American Ethnologist*, 31(3), 311-325.

Sumatojo, S. (2009). Britishness in Trafalgar Square: Urban place and the construction of national identity. *Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism*, 9 (3), 410-428.

Tumarkin, M. (2005). *Traumascapes, the power and fate of places transformed by tragedy*. Carlton, Australia: Melbourne University Press.

Vanneste, D. and Foote, K. (2013). War, heritage, tourism, and the centenary of the Great War in Flanders and Belgium. In: Butler, R. and Suntikul, W. (eds.), *Tourism and war*. London: Routledge, pp. 254-272.

Van Toor, B. and Hanneke, R. (2015). Reflecting absence, on How Ground Zero was purged of its material history (2001–2010). *International Journal of Cultural Property*, 22(1), 85-110.

Viol, M., Theodoraki, E., Anastasiadou, C. and Todd, L. (2014). Researching narratives of collective memory and identity: The case of the commemorative events of the fall of the Berlin Wall. In: Ahmad, R., Hertzog, A. and Knafou, H. (Eds.), Conference paper presented at *Remembering in a globalizing world: The play and interplay of tourism memory and places*, Le Chambon sur Lignon, France 8-10 September.

Weaver, D. (2000). The exploratory war-distorted destination life cycle. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 2, 151-161.

Winter, C. (2011). Battlefield Visitor Motivations: Explorations in the Great War Town of Ieper, Belgium. *International Journal of Tourism Research* 13(2), 164-176.

Winter, J. (1995). *Sites of memory, sites of mourning: The Great War in European cultural history*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Winter, J. (2006). *Remembering war: The Great War between memory and history in the twentieth century*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Woodward, R. (2014). Military landscapes: Agendas and approaches for future research. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(1), 40-61.

Ziino, B. (2007). *A Distant Grief: Australians, War Graves and the Great War*. Crawley, Australia: University of Western Australia Press.