

COMMUNITY PERSPECTIVES:
RECONCILING THE GUELPH CENOTAPH

MADR 598 MASTER'S PROJECT

Prepared For:

Tammy Adkin, Colleen Clack
Guelph Civic Museum & Culture and Tourism, City of Guelph

Prepared By:

Sonia Preisler
MADR Candidate
School of Public Administration
University of Victoria

Supervisor: Dr. Thea Vakil, School of Public Administration

Executive Summary

Introduction

The creation of memorials for the purpose of commemoration is an important social and cultural act of marking death, loss and narrating the past. Acts of memorialization and commemoration are performed in a wide spectrum of occasions, from nationwide practices to the individual necessities of a larger process of grief. These traditions offer social discourse and narrative on the historical past. As communities share their urban landscapes with these historical earmarks, understanding these spaces in their context, while making them relevant to the day-to-day lives of the citizens becomes an important endeavour.

In 2014, the City of Guelph identified missing names from the Guelph cenotaph, raising the question as to who, why and how people were recognized and honoured on plaques in the past. The City created a policy to address how best to decide what names should be added to the cenotaph that have been previously omitted and developed protocols that will guide decisions about future inclusion of names on the Guelph cenotaph plaques.

The purpose of this project is to collect community members' perspectives regarding the Guelph cenotaph, examine the role the Guelph cenotaph plays in providing a space for collective memory and grief in the 21st century context and how it can contribute to building peace culture in a socially inclusive way. Specifically, the research questions explore:

What are the community perspectives pertaining to the changes and what further protocols need to be created in order to engage the citizens of Guelph in this process of righting the wrongs?

The sub-questions include:

What does the cenotaph mean to the citizens of Guelph?

How do citizens of Guelph identify with the cenotaph and the space that it exists in?

The client for this Masters of Dispute Resolution project is the Department of Culture and Tourism at the City of Guelph.

Background

The creation of cenotaphs across Canada stemmed from the need of communities to honour those who died in active duty overseas, and whose bodies did not make it back to Canadian soil. The creation of cenotaphs manifested through the efforts of community groups, provincial governments, private sponsors, regimental associations and veterans'

organizations. Names for inclusion on the cenotaph were provided by community members, facilitating a means of identification with fallen soldiers, justifying their sacrifices, and allowing participants in memorial ceremonies to gather and collectively grieve.

Guelph's cenotaph is a memorial wall, located in Trafalgar Square at the junction of Wyndham Street, Eramosa Road and Woolwich Street. The Guelph cenotaph plaques host 220 names of individuals with a connection to Guelph who died during the First World War, the Second World War and the Korean War. When concerns were raised over excluded names on the plaques, the City of Guelph realized there was an absence of policy and processes to aid in determining whether missing names needed to be added and what the policy would be moving forward.

While conducting preliminary research, the City of Guelph reached out to 10 comparator municipalities with the objective of finding out if other communities have policies regarding their own cenotaphs. Ten municipalities were contacted including: Kitchener, Burlington, Windsor, Kingston, Brantford, Ajax, Whitby, Waterloo, Hamilton and Ottawa. The comparators were selected by geography, population and higher veteran demographic. The City also connected with Veteran's Affairs, Department of National Defence and the Royal Canadian Legion. The City observed that a majority of municipalities contacted were not aware of who made decisions related to their own cenotaph(s). Two municipal comparators knew who their decision makers were and that they were associated with Culture and Tourism departments. However, no formal policies regarding the cenotaph existed in their respective municipalities.

In 2015, the City of Guelph created a policy to address how best to decide what names should be added to the cenotaph. The following policy will be used as criteria for adding names to Guelph's cenotaph:

“The names of any members of the Canadian Forces from Guelph, who have died as a result of their military service, will be added to the Guelph Cenotaph in honour of their service”.

Through this policy, the City of Guelph discerned the inclusion of those who participated in peacekeeping or other NATO activities, in addition to those who served during a declared war or conflict. Furthermore, in an attempt to exhaust all avenues to determine what names may have been missed, a process was undertaken to reach out to community members to ensure family members who wished to have the names of loved ones added to the cenotaph. Names have yet to be added as the City continues to exhaust possibilities of finding names still missing.

Literature Review

The review focused on three main themes present in the scope of academic work on commemoration and memorialization, which were: space, memory and narrative. The themes encompass the social discourse around memorialization, the fundamental need for commemoration on an individual and collective basis, and the cultural and social perspectives of memorialization and commemoration. The themes also acknowledge the intersection of history and memory, social trauma, social narrative and discourse, collective memory, grief and how public space is used for memorialization and commemoration of conflict.

The intention and purpose of the creation of memorials vary by political, symbolic or the psychological needs of mourning. Societies have diversified the events or people that need to be commemorated, shifting away from the commemoration of soldiers to the memorialization of victims and civilians. Commemorative practices are starting to call on art as a medium for different ways of interacting and engaging with space and memory and the audience.

Monuments hold metaphorical and physical space for strong narratives. Through the commemoration of individuals involved in historical events, certain discourse is centered to create an official record. As time intersects with changing social, political, economic and historical dynamics, the distance between the current population and the events that needed commemoration is experienced. This creates a tension between whose history is being officiated, what narrative is missing and how does it fit into the greater story of the community today.

Methodology

This project utilizes a qualitative research approach, focused on text-based data collection and through participant semi-structured in-depth interviews. The target populations for this research project were Guelph citizens and various stakeholders of the Guelph cenotaph. Both purposive sampling and snowball sampling were used for recruitment. A total of 12 participants were interviewed. Each interview was held in person in Guelph, at a time and location convenient for the participant. The interviews took between 45 and 90 minutes. Interview questions were developed to enhance and contribute to the primary research questions, and better understand the diversity of perspectives and narratives associated with the space. Thematic analysis was used to identify themes and develop recommendations.

Findings

The interview findings are sorted into three major topic areas, purpose and meaning of Guelph cenotaph and plaque, memorialization as a cultural practice and cenotaph policy.

The findings were then organized into subcategories of recurring themes and meaningful concepts that emerged from the data.

Within the first theme, participants revealed that the purpose of the cenotaph was remembrance of loss, debt owed and sacrifices of the First and Second World Wars. Participants stated the plaque names invoked memory of soldiers who lost their lives, the sentiment of wasted lives and deep community loss. Participants also reported the cenotaph represented the glorification of war and violence and were critical of the narrative it portrayed and maintained. Images of poppies from Flanders Fields and the connection of the poppy to the City of Guelph was also mentioned. Participants also reported the issue of inclusion of others in the poppy community narrative.

Within the theme of memorialization, participants spoke about connecting to family and family tradition through memorials, as well as the lost opportunity to reflect with family over what happened. The research data revealed there was a diversity of ways to memorialize those who have died, and how one wants to be memorialized is a personal decision. Further, there was general acknowledgment that something is missing in public grieving and public memorialization. Participants reported that technology could aid in encouraging interaction with the cenotaph by personalizing the experience, and making the information more accessible. They also felt commemorative spaces required a pedestrian heavy area, green open space, a place designed for people to gather, and in incorporation of the space into other aspects of the city's life.

Data collected about the Guelph cenotaph policy revealed that participants wanted missing names to be added to the cenotaph. Participants shared that they felt there were challenges of representation and inclusion on plaques, including frustration over who deserves to be recognized, and difficulty in knowing where to draw the line for future inclusion. Participants expressed interest in honouring greater scope of people who contributed to the war effort that were traditionally overlooked based on social and cultural constructs of the time. Participants felt torn over adding future soldiers' names.

Discussion

An interpretation of the project findings and the literature review provided insight into the relationship of commemorative spaces in physical form, spatiality, location, and connection to community and greater scope of the city. Key considerations and action implications emerged related to maintaining relevance, and sacredness of space, a shift from passive public commemoration of traditional cenotaphs to more collaborative and engaging forms of commemoration based on human interaction was necessary. The consideration for furthering examining what is needed in public grieving and public memorialization. As well as the need for inclusive spaces of dialogue around spaces of healing across a broader

spectrum of experiences, and addressing how stories are told and explore what society deems as worthy of commemoration, and how the narrative of commemoration is upheld.

Recommendations

This study resulted in five recommendations to the City of Guelph:

1. Adapt the current changes needed for the Roll of Honour plaques,
2. Create a sub-advisory committee for the inclusion of names to the cenotaph,
3. Utilize technology to create more interactive spaces,
4. Provide accessible civic education,
5. The creation of a public community art space with the mandate of building peace.

Conclusion

The project findings regarding the space showed that participants find value in practices of commemoration and choose for themselves what rituals fulfill that need. The inclusion of names once omitted from the Guelph cenotaph plaques was an important part of rectifying history but also sparking a greater discussion over what is needed in public grieving and public memorialization, and mindfulness to narrative and the stories told. Memorials hold power of official discourse. This project created an opportunity for dialogue regarding the need for more inclusive spaces of dialogue and narrative, as well as exploration as to what society deems as worth of commemoration, and critically thinking about the systematic and historical issues for what is deemed not worthy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
	Client and Project Objectives.....	2
	Research Questions.....	2
	Rationale.....	2
	Organization of Report.....	3
2.0	BACKGROUND	4
	Discrepancies in the Names.....	7
	Guelph Cenotaph Policy.....	9
3.0	LITERATURE REVIEW	10
	Memorials Defined.....	10
	Places of Remembrance.....	11
	The Place and a Space.....	13
	Memory and Collective Memory.....	15
	Narrative—Identity/Meaning-Making.....	17
	Intergenerational Spaces.....	18
	Protest and Exclusion.....	19
4.0	METHODOLOGY	22
	Sampling.....	22
	Recruitment.....	22
	Interviews.....	23
	Data Collection and Analysis.....	24
	Limitations.....	25
5.0	FINDINGS	26
	Purpose and Meaning of the Guelph Cenotaph and Cenotaph Plaques.....	26
	Memorialization.....	32
	Guelph Cenotaph Policy.....	34
6.0	DISCUSSION	39
	Civic Space and the Historical Landmark.....	39
	Social Ritual and Ceremony.....	40
	Story and Narrative.....	41
	Representation.....	43
	Summary.....	44
7.0	RECOMMENDATIONS	46
8.	CONCLUSION	46
	References.....	51
	Appendices.....	55
	Appendix A- Interview Questions.....	55

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Acts of commemoration interwoven with strong commitment to remember the past are common practices for bringing the historical past into current day narratives. The processes greatly vary, pending the purpose they are trying to achieve, as well as cultural, political, and social norms of the community. Remembrance and commemoration are performed in a wide spectrum of occasions, from nationwide acts to the individual necessities of a larger process of grief. To mark the social wounds afflicted by war, memorials and cenotaphs were created in commitment to remember and acknowledge the damage done, activate national pride, become the venue for shaping collective identity, as well as act in bringing people together to grieve the bodies of lost ones who did not make it back.

Historically, for communities who participated in conflict by sending their young people to fight in wars overseas, a sense of detachment from the realities of combat and violence existed. Physical debris, damaged buildings, wounded landscapes, and the displacement of families and communities did not mark these communities' day-to-day reality. Conflict was felt in a different way, observed through the changing demography of young men who did not come home, or by the shift in gender roles in the workplace, as women joined the war efforts by taking jobs in factories. Further, the difficult places to see the devastation of conflict for these communities was on the individual level, the internal process of grief and loss; the way in which people gathered themselves to digest what happened in order to shift into peaceful versions of their war-torn selves.

Presently, as urban landscapes across the world are significantly changing and land is a valuable commodity, one wonders how people share space with these historical earmarks, how communities utilize these highly sought after spaces for the sake of remembrance and commemoration and how they harness the longevity of these spaces. Other questions relate to the needs of the current community and to what extent such needs might be honoured and reflected through a memorial/cenotaph.

This project will consider the case of the cenotaph in Guelph, Ontario. In 2014, the City of Guelph identified omissions in who, why, and how people were recognized and honoured on plaques at Guelph's cenotaph (O'Flanagan, 2014). A concerned citizen first identified the omissions and brought them to the attention of the Culture and Tourism Department at the City of Guelph. While conducting research on the names listed on the cenotaph, the citizen had found four names of deceased individuals who were honoured at the Commonwealth War Graves Commission in Ottawa, but were missing from the Guelph cenotaph. It appeared that the excluded names may have been omitted at the time due to discrimination based on gender, race, and socio-economic status. The City has created a

policy to address how best to decide what names should be added to the cenotaph that have been previously omitted and developed protocols that will guide decisions about future inclusion of names on the Guelph cenotaph.

Client and Project Objectives

The client is the Department of Culture and Tourism at the City of Guelph. The Department offers a wide range of resources, exhibits, programs, workshops, and special events to support arts and culture in the Guelph community (City of Guelph, 2015). Part of the department's responsibility is to maintain and support Guelph heritage and it implemented a policy to determine how names will be added to the Guelph cenotaph. The client is represented by Colleen Clack, General Manager of Culture and Tourism, and Tammy Adkin, Manager of Guelph Museums.

The project has two major objectives. The first is to collect community members' perspectives regarding the Guelph cenotaph. The second is to examine the role the Guelph cenotaph plays in providing a space for collective memory and grief in the 21st century setting and how it can contribute to building peace culture in a socially inclusive way.

Research Questions

The primary research question flows from the policy created by the City of Guelph to address the inconsistencies of the Guelph Cenotaph and prevent them from happening in the future:

What are the community perspectives pertaining to the changes and what further protocols need to be created in order to engage the citizens of Guelph in this process of righting the wrongs?

The sub-questions that will be explored are:

What does the cenotaph mean to the citizens of Guelph?

How do citizens of Guelph identify with the cenotaph and the space that it exists in?

Rationale

In addition to managing the perspectives of multiple stakeholders, this project presents an opportunity for documenting the current dialogue regarding the cenotaph in the Guelph community. The project is also expected to contribute to the broader effort of building a peace culture, while examining community perspectives on public spaces of commemoration and remembrance. Furthermore, it will identify and leverage the knowledge and assets of the various groups to promote dialogue and to understand the purpose of the space in the present time.

Organization of Report

Following this Introduction, Chapter 2 provides the background information on the Guelph cenotaph, exploring the purpose and intention of large-scale memorialization and commemoration. It also discusses the City of Guelph and its relationship to the poppy, as well as the discrepancy of cenotaph plaque names. Chapter 3 presents the literature review, exploring public space, memory, narrative, and identity in regards to memorialization and commemoration. Chapter 4 outlines the methods utilized for this research project. Chapter 5 provides a summary of the findings of the in-depth interviews conducted, including the major themes that arose. Chapter 6 provides a discussion of the project findings as they relate to the research questions, particularly focusing on the intersection of findings and relevant literature. Chapter 7 lists recommendations for the City of Guelph, with respect to the established Cenotaph Policy, and future commemorative spaces. Chapter 8 is the conclusion followed by appendices, including questions used to guide participant interviews.

3.0 BACKGROUND

First World War marked the introduction of large-scale memorialization and commemoration that has continued into the present day (Hunt, 2010, p.176). Though war commemoration was not a new phenomenon, the sheer scale of deaths over a few short years, caused by the introduction of machine guns during WWI, heightened the need for communities to take on new traditions of commemoration, including commemorative services, and war memorials.

The first cenotaph was commissioned by the British Government and was erected in 1920 in London. It was built and designed by Sir Edwin Lutyens, a prominent architect at the time who gave it the name ‘cenotaph’, derived from the Greek words ‘kenos’ (empty) and ‘taphos’ (tomb) Lutyens drew inspiration from the Greek practice of burying the dead, even if there was no body (Shipley, 1987; Hunts, 2010, p. 176). With the conclusion of the WWI, the British Government wanted to commemorate the signing of the Treaty of Versailles by marking a day of celebration. The British Government was concerned about social cohesion, specifically in regard to the attitudes of returning soldiers, who were trying to integrate back into society; shell shocked, and unemployed. A military parade commonly referred to as the Victory Parade was created in London, England, to facilitate nation building, bringing soldiers and the public to celebrate victory and the end of WWI.

The Whitehall cenotaph was built as a temporary memorial to be used during victory celebrations, as a part of the parade, in which soldiers could symbolically salute fellow fallen comrades, as they walked past the catafalque (Hunt, 2010, p. 177). To be removed after the parades. However, the public sought for a more permanent memorial. The request from the public for a permanent memorial was met with contestation over appropriate sites. Through public pressure, the cenotaph was placed in Whitehall, which was where the temporary structure was first erected.

Initially, the only writing or symbols that adorned the Whitehall Cenotaph were the words: “The Glorious Dead” and the dates of the war (Hunt, 2010, p. 176). Religious symbolism was avoided in order to commemorate all creeds and none. On November 11, 1920, the cenotaph was unveiled, carefully planned to complement the funeral of the Unknown Warrior in Westminster Abbey, held on the same day.

Building Cenotaphs

In Canada, the standardizing of memorials, and how the government involved should be represented was a national conversation post-WWI (Shipley, 1987, p. 65). The creation of Canadian cenotaphs stemmed from the need of communities to honour those who died in active duty and whose bodies did not make it back to Canadian soil. Most Canadian

cenotaphs were built through the efforts of community groups, provincial governments, private sponsors, regimental associations, and veterans' organizations (Royal Canadian Legion, 2015).

In most cases, the government felt it advisable to leave the matter to the discretion of the community. Had memorials been instigated through federal government initiatives, they could have been interpreted as propaganda. Further, federal and provincial governments were often unable to finance memorials, due to the aftermath of war debt, thus leaving the memorials to be funded by the community (Shipley, 1987, p. 63). Community memorials facilitated a means of identification with fallen soldiers, as well as justifying their sacrifices, and allowing participants in memorial ceremonies to gather and collectively grieve.

At the end of WWI, community members gathered to create memorial committees that would support and instruct the creation of cenotaphs in their communities. Committee members often included a wide variety of occupations and stakeholders. The instigation often came from established clubs and organizations able to take the first steps towards erecting memorials. In a large number of communities, the initiative came from women's groups (Shipley, 1987, p. 56). This prominence of women in memorial movements after the First World War signaled a shift in women's greater involvement in all aspects of society (Shipley, 1987, p. 57).

Names were provided by community members, drawing information from news as it was received from the frontlines. The inclusion of individual names on the cenotaph was an important component of honouring the dead. With no physical bodies, citing names on memorials allowed families to recall individuals and humanize their loss. "To engrave the names, to read them, sometimes to physically touch them, was a way to individualize the dead as opposed to the anonymous unreality of mass slaughter" (Becker, 2006, p. 2697). People would touch the names with their fingertips as if invoking the memory of their lost relatives and connecting with the last physical remains of their lost soldier were their name was inscribed (Becker, 2006, p. 2697).

When cenotaphs were finally complete, the names were arranged alphabetically by last name as it reinforced the uniformity found in military cemeteries. Rank was often omitted in order to symbolically acknowledge equality in death. Along with names of fallen soldiers, sculptures were also present on war memorials and cenotaphs, often depicting the tragedy of death. Motifs of uniforms and weapons were sculpted to represent the nationality of the soldiers. The language on memorials drew from religious influences, or from romantic or classical notions. Although memorials were meant to glorify and romanticize

the act of going to war, they were first of all repositories of sorrow, grief, and public recognition of sacrifice on a monumental scale (Shipley, 1987).

Guelph, the Poppy City

Guelph is a city of over 120,000 people situated in southwestern Ontario (StatsCan, 2011). The vibrant community is the birthplace and hometown of Canadian poet, physician, and soldier during World War 1, Lieutenant Colonel John McCrae. John McCrae wrote “In Flanders Fields” in 1915, as a reflection of his experiences in the trench warfare around Ypres, Belgium. The poem inspired the use of the poppy as a symbol of remembrance, evident by the ritual of wearing the poppy for those wishing to remember the sacrifices of those in uniform in past wars, adopted by the American, British, and Canadian Legion (Nash-Chambers, 2015, p. 363).

The longstanding association and pride for McCrae, is evident in Guelph’s unique passion for the poppy. This is underscored by the way Guelphites use the poppies to adorn shop fronts accompanied by photos of their families who served in past wars; the city banners which were specially designed for the commemoration; the availability of poppy seeds as a means to beautify the city; the memorialization of McCrae’s house as a civic museum, as well as the new John McCrae statue that has been built and placed in a central place in the city.

Each November, remembrance services are held across the city, each facilitating ceremonies and rituals in their own right. The City hosts and supports the Legion’s annual ceremony at John McCrae House, the Remembrance Day ceremony at the Sleeman Centre, which invite students, veterans, members of Guelph’s Legion, military cadets, civic officials, and the general public to participate in Remembrance Day rituals. The events conclude with the Remembrance Day Parade, which marches through the downtown core to the city’s cenotaph for the laying of the wreaths.

The year 2015 marked the 100th anniversary of the writing and publishing of McCrae’s poem. A civic task force made up of local historians, city staffers, and several members of the Guelph Civic Museums’ Advisory committee, was responsible for planning the commemorative events. The task force main initiative is to “heighten the awareness of and appreciation of John McCrae and his Guelph roots” (Nash-Chambers, 2015, p. 374).

One of the projects initiated by the City to mark the anniversary was the “100 Portraits/100 Poppies- Sitting in Remembrance”, a suite of 100 portrait paintings by Artist in Residence, Greg Denton (City of Guelph, 2015). The series depicts living military cadets, veterans from the Guelph area, and community members impacted by conflict.



Portraits by Greg Denton, 100 Portraits/100 Poppies- Sitting in Remembrance

Discrepancies in the Names

Guelph's Cenotaph is a memorial wall, located in Trafalgar Square at the junction of Wyndham Street, Eramosa Road and Woolwich Street, on which are listed the names of many individuals connected to Guelph who died during the First World War, the Second World War and the Korean War. Currently, the cenotaph includes 220 names. The memorial wall is situated next to the War Memorial, sculpted by artist Alfred Howell. Howell claimed his inspiration for the monument came to him in a dream. He had already designed a pylon with a soldier on it, but in his vision he saw a spirit in the form of a female figure rising behind the boy in uniform (Shipley, 1987, p. 130). The figure of the soldier seems to be ascending with the help of an angel.



*Guelph Cenotaph, Guelph
Photograph by the author*



*Remembrance Day Parade, Guelph
Photograph by the author*

In 1921, the Guelph War Memorial Association was formed for the sole purpose of facilitating the building of a memorial in the City of Guelph in honour of those who were killed during the War of 1914-1918. The choices among three potential locations were put on the ballot during the municipal election of 1921 (Shiple, 1987, p. 92). The initial location of the cenotaph was next to the train station, later to be moved to its current location at the intersection of Wyndham Street, Eramosa Road and Woolwich Street, after the World War II.

The Commonwealth War Graves Commission (CWGC) was established in 1917 during the First World War, to archive and track the deaths of those lost at war. With the necessity to track the scale of death, the CWGC sought to commemorate the 1,700,000 people of the Commonwealth forces who died in war by recording and caring for all graves in which soldiers were buried. By 1918, some 587,000 graves had been identified and a further 550,000 casualties were registered as having no known grave (CWGC, 2015).

Currently, the CWGC has around 1,500 cemeteries in 150 countries in the world. Most importantly, the CWGC continues to keep records of all the dead, and has compiled all the information into an accessible database where relatives of those who have died or those with a keen interest can find details about the dead, including place of burial (Hunt, 2010, p. 176). This is how a concerned Guelph citizen was first able to identify the discrepancy between names listed under the CWGC for Guelph, and the current list of names on the cenotaph. The initial names discovered to be missing from the Guelph cenotaph included: Sarah Josephine Foran of the Royal Canadian Air Force (Women's Division) who died on the 30th of June, 1943 at the age of 22; James Ivan McIntyre of the Royal Canadian Air Force who died on the 23rd of September, 1942 at the age of 24; as well as Archibald Blair McIntyre of the Canadian Air Force who died on the 21st of April, 1944 at the age of 27. The list of names missing has since expanded.

During the preliminary research conducted by the City of Guelph, the city reached out to ten comparator municipalities with the objective of finding out if other communities have policies regarding their own cenotaphs. Ten municipalities were contacted, including: Kitchener, Burlington, Windsor, Kingston, Brantford, Ajax, Whitby, Waterloo, Hamilton, and Ottawa. The comparators were selected by geography, population, higher veteran demographic. The City also connected with Veteran's Affairs; Department of National Defence; Royal Canadian Legion, Waterloo branch Bob Berg, Cenotaph Chair who governs local legions including Guelph. The City observed that a majority of municipalities contacted were not aware of who made decisions related to their own cenotaph(s). Further, two municipal comparators knew who their decision makers were and that they were associated with Culture and Tourism departments. No formal policies regarding the cenotaph existed in their respective municipalities.

Final recommendations based on the City’s preliminary research (2014) suggested the policy denoted the following: to identify the City of Guelph Department to be responsible for administering the policy and associated decision making; to deem the structure with no names as the “cenotaph” and the other as a tribute/memorial wall; to not add any names to the cenotaph; or to create a set of guidelines for the tribute/memorial wall, however refraining from adding more names, but rather keeping as is for historical reasons.

Guelph Cenotaph Policy

In 2015, the City of Guelph created a policy to address how best to decide what names should be added to the cenotaph. The following policy will be used as criteria for adding names to Guelph’s cenotaph:

“The names of any members of the Canadian Forces from Guelph, who have died as a result of their military service, will be added to the Guelph Cenotaph in honour of their service”.

Through this policy, the City of Guelph discerned the inclusion of those who participated in peacekeeping or other NATO activities, in addition to those who served during a declared war or conflict. Furthermore, in an attempt to exhaust all avenues to determine what names may have been missed, a process was undertaken to reach out to community members to ensure family members who wished to have the names of loved ones added to the cenotaph. Names have yet to be added, as the City continues to exhaust possibilities of finding names still missing.

3.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will inform the research project by exploring pioneering and emergent academic work on the topic of commemoration and memorialization by focusing on three main themes: space, memory, and narrative. These themes encompass the social discourse around memorialization, the fundamental need for commemoration on an individual and collective basis, and the cultural and social perspectives of memorialization and commemoration. Further, exploring how commemorative practices, particularly the commemoration of those who die in conflict, shape public spaces.

For the purpose of this academic literature review, I accessed peer-reviewed publications through the University of Victoria library databases concerning cenotaphs, memorials, practices of grief, and public monuments. Due to the prominence of memorials as topic of memory studies, I used strategic keywords, which included: collective memory, narrative, collective identity, collective grief, acts of remembrance, and reconciliation. Though I tried to broaden my research beyond peer-reviewed articles to include research conducted by non-governmental organizations, I found there was a lack of research conducted on this topic through those avenues.

Commemoration and the creation of memorials is an important social and cultural act of marking death, loss, and narrating the past. The commemoration of the deceased is a practice observed across contemporary societies and closely linked to the rituals of the ancient world (Low & Oliver, 2012, p. 4). Research on this phenomenon exists across a wide spectrum of academic disciplines, exploring memorials and commemoration from the spatial and physical qualities, to the sociological, fine art, and historical realms. Typically, war memorials and commemoration have been studied through two main paradigms. The first is political, encompassing rituals and symbolism of nation building and configuring collective identity. The second is psychological, examining an individual's need to mourn as response to death and suffering caused by war (Ashplant, Dawson, & Roper, 2000, p. 7). Existing research on memorials happen in spaces between history and memory, affect and identity, between past, present, and future (Viejo-Rose, 2011, p. 466).

Memorials Defined

Memorials are established with the intention to preserve or commemorate a person or event. They can be monuments, preserved ruins, do-it-yourself road memorials or incorporated into rituals, ceremonies, commemorative days, songs, poetry, music, theatre, or the naming of streets (Viejo-Rose, 2011). They can be created through the will of a family, a community or formally through a state-led or government endeavor (Low & Oliver, 2012, p. 9). Memorials can present an opportunity for community or be the cause of alienation and conflict, further perpetuating potential social divisions (Bold, Knowles, & Leach, 2012, p. 126).

Memorials can also be gateways into further understanding social discourse around memory and grief, or a glimpse into the social narratives propagated during conflict and post-conflict eras. “In its oldest and most original sense, a monument is a created and erected for the specific purpose of keeping single human deeds or events alive in the mind of future generations” (Riegl, 1928, p. 69). Though memorials appear static, possibly archaic, they are constantly in a state of change, shaped and understood in context of time and place, meaning and contingent on evolving collective identities (Viejo-Rose, 2011, p. 472).

Border (2009) states that as events and circumstances reveal themselves in the present, a memorial’s purpose is to recall the past and provide conditions for new responses in the future. Border believes memorials should engage critical consciousness, and enable the possibility of engaging with the world through transformative practices (p. 62). A monument can be one of the means by which individuals transform themselves into a community that feel bound together by a common experience and a common historical framework. Not everyone in the community will derive the same experience, or will have the same emotions or thoughts on any monument. Pending different backgrounds and various ranges of experiences, each individual will have a different response to the memorial (Tritle, 2012, p. 166).

Memorials also host space for the intersection of individual and collective memory, and the adversarial relationship between memory and history (Fournier, Loughridge, MacDonald, Sperduti, Tsimicalis, & Taber, 2012; Hunt, 2010; Johnson, 2002; Worthy, 2004). Winter and Sivan (1999) state the intersection of individual memories creates collective memory and maintains its continuity. It is through the act of remembrance that human societies configure their identity. By giving to the collective memory, individual narratives and memories continue into the future (p. 26).

Places of Remembrance

In Western societies, the creation of cenotaphs was first introduced after the First World War to provide a space in which people could reflect on the sacrifice of others (Stephans, 2007, p. 245). With the twenty million deaths that occurred during the First World War, communities across Europe pursued the construction of war memorials to transform and reshape the private grief of individuals into public statements of community sorrow and loss (Hutchison, 2009, p.413).

Not only did mourning rituals and commemorative practices of the time seem inadequate to accommodate the sheer scale of loss, but policies in Britain and other commonwealth countries forbade the return of the remains of soldiers to their homeland, due to issues of identifying and returning bodies to the bereaved. The bodies of soldiers were often buried

where they were found or gathered together in the nearest graveyards, often quite removed from a relative to ever visit. This particular circumstance was a catalyst for new commemorative practices for the war dead, which shifted away from commemoration only being used by members of the ruling elite or the individual commemoration of a soldier by their family, to a more collective process of grief (Hutchison, 2009, p. 413).

Communities and nations mourned and supported permanent memorials to the war dead, brought together by the commonality of trauma. Commemorating such loss with large public memorials was an expression of hope that their experiences would not be forgotten nor would the same fate be bestowed on the next generation (Stephans, 2007, p. 245). Through the creation of a memorial, a healing process could be facilitated that would enable people to comprehend the catastrophes of war and move on with their lives. The intention was not limited to mourning, but rather to remembrance, thereby outliving the memory of whom it was for and the people who built it. Though the community gesture of erecting memorials was initially appreciated by the bereaved through public and official acknowledgment of their sacrifice, family members of lost ones soon felt ignored in commemoration. The particular use of language such as *glory and honour* caused people to feel as though their pain was being denied (Hutchison, 2009, p. 413).

War memorials and cenotaphs prioritize the need to celebrate and honour the soldiers above all, while excluding the experiences of noncombatants, prisoners of war, and of occupied populations. Within the language of commemoration, only the heroes are remembered. Defining what qualities and actions a hero upholds is a subjective task. Thereby, often true costs of war are omitted in memorial making practice, with a lack of acknowledgement of innocent civilians forced to endure: hunger, the cold, forced labour, rape, and being taken hostage (Becker, 2006, p. 2698).

Since the inception of the first cenotaphs and war memorials, societies have diversified the events or people that needed to be commemorated. The need to commemorate and remember victims marked a shift from the commemoration of soldiers to the memorialization of victims and civilians. An example is Peter Eisenman's Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe, located in the heart of Berlin. The Wall that Heals—Vietnam War Memorial in Washington, DC, by Maya Lin, was another memorial that caused introspection over who, what or how to remember. Controversy surrounded the site, the design, and the iconographic effect of the memorial itself (Johnson, 2002, p. 296). The memorial commemorated United States Armed Forces service members who fought in the Vietnam War. Lin deviated from traditional heroic notions of war, and instead focused on the encapsulating the consequences of war (Beaty, 2009, p. 120).

Oschsner (1997) argues that the Vietnam Veterans Memorial is essentially incomplete without human interaction. By moving away from a traditional cenotaph, Lin created a memorial wall that mirrored visitors' reflection among the names listed of the deceased soldiers as they looked upon them, thereby creating an opportunity for visitors to connect with the memorial (p. 156).

The role of art as it intersects with remembrance has increasingly been used to offer a different way of contributing to the collective memory. Artists have reopened the traditional forms of passive public commemoration to invigorate collaboration and engagement with monumental art by the viewer (Bjorgvinsson & Hansen, 2011, p. 4). Initiatives can be spontaneous unauthorized initiatives in public spaces to more organized and funded sculptures. Examples of the one of these unauthorized, spontaneous initiatives are the Sarajevo Roses, unofficial memorials created from mortar scars on the pavement of the city that have been filled in with red resin by citizens, as an intention to never again get the violence that happened in their neighborhoods (James, 2013, p. 975).

Increasingly, the creation of memorial spaces for individuals who died in road accidents have particularly shifted into the public domain. This is evident with the growth of roadside memorials constructed on private and public land in non-designated mourning spaces (Clark & Franzmann, 2006, p. 581). Families and friends affected by tragedy, assume authority to express their grief in ways that transform the roadside into their own sacred space (p. 579). This practice is contested, as stakeholders involved struggle with how long it should be there, and whether or not it has a right to be there (especially if it is occupying private property) (p. 582).

The Place and a Space

People identify closely with the places they live in or have travelled to, thereby attaching meaning to their existence. The spatiality of public monuments has been increasingly examined, as not merely the material backdrop from which a story is told, but how the spaces themselves constitute the meaning by becoming both a physical location and sight line of interpretation (Johnson, 2002, p. 293). When ideals are transformed into space, new meanings are created (Mayo, 1988, p. 62). Places and landscapes do not simply act as memory containers but shape and are shaped by the ways in which violence and conflict are experienced and remembered (Schramm, 2011, p. 6).

Halbwachs (1992) emphasized the significance of space in the creation, maintenance, and stimulation of collective memory, and in turn, how space is made meaningful by memory and commemorative practices. Thus, every collective memory unfolds within a spatial framework (p. 204). Furthering this perspective, Nora (1990) states that memory remains in permanent state of change, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting, vulnerable

to manipulation and appropriation, and susceptible to being dormant, until it is revived again (p. 285).

Through the externalization of memory in the form of monuments, memorials, or a commemorative performance, Nora (1990) created the idea of '*lieux de memorie*' or sites of memory (p. 284). As societies deliberately create archives, maintain anniversaries, organize celebrations, pronounce eulogies, and notarize bills, activities of remembrance no longer occur naturally. Sites of memory become the landmarks of a remembered geography and history, forming the intersection between official and vernacular culture. As shared remembrance of wartime continue to evolve and change, new sites of memory appear. All of which are working to fulfill and maintain certain constructions of national identity, and collective memory.

Further, Nora (1990) saw the preservation of the past as a highly problematic attempt to represent the past in a particular static way. While sites of memory privilege particular memories over others, spaces become confined to the narratives of that place, unable to remove themselves from the one-dimensional perspectives. Nora (1990) encompasses museums, archives, cemeteries, festivals, anniversaries, treaties, depositions, monuments, sanctuaries, and fraternal orders as these sites (p. 289).

Furthering the idea of sites of memory, Osborne (2001) reflects on the significance of landscapes in shaping identity by exploring how monuments are made meaningful through their anchoring and locating in place and their invocation of share public memory. Articulating a more fluid relationship between memory and place, by exploring the essence of place as a geographical space defined by meanings, sentiments and stories rather than by a set of co-ordinates (Landscapes and Inscapes section, para. 6).

Johnson (2002) explains that attention has been focused on the role of public statues and the spaces they inhabit in the articulation of collective memory, further attention needs to be paid to connecting public symbols to gender, class, religious, national and ethnic identities (p. 297). Opp & Walsh (2010) state that memory is itself embedded, inscribed, and shaped by landscapes, topographies, and environment. Place does not simply carry a collective memory, but rather the tensions of places are themselves manifested in the spatialization of memory, and ultimately "every memory is, in a fundamental way, the memory of a place" (p. 5).

In conjunction with the continual production of memorials in contemporary societies across the globe, Bauman (2010); Winter (2010); Doss (2011, p. 465) stated that commemorations do not heal, and that memorials are not about reconciliation. They argue that memorials can deepen the gauge of conflict and animosity by perpetuating divisions of us versus them, and

perpetrator and victim. Further, if memory is everywhere and not localizable, it begins to decay when fixed to an object. When memorials blend into the landscape, they are at risk of people not seeing them, or being moved by them, thereby losing their ability to trigger memories or emotions (p. 471).

Memory and Collective Memory

Collective memory refers to the intersection of community memories held about the past, specifically over multiple generations. Within the discussion of collective memory lays the intersection of the individual in collective memory (Szpunar, 2010; Hunt, 2010, p. 97). History, memory, and identity are constantly being re-negotiated to cultivate people's narrative and stories. Halbwachs (1992) emphasized that individual thought is capable of the act of recollection only insofar as one places oneself within the social frameworks of memory (p. 38).

Within the same framework, Hutton (1993) builds on the definition of collective memory to encompass the complex network of social values, and ideals that mark out the dimension of our imaginations according to the attitudes of the social group to which we relate (p. 314). We learn about ourselves through social discourse. Therefore, in order to hold collective memory, an individual does not need to have experienced the event but rather due to the high degree of reverence created around the event, it is thought of as memory rather than as a historical term. Individual and family memories are then drawn together and become public collective acts of commemoration (Noakes, 2009, p. 136).

Collective memory exists in the tension between memory and history (Halbwachs, 1992; Nora, 1996; Gillis, 1994; Szpunar, 2010; Hunt, 2010). Hunt (2010) dates the rift between memory and history to the nineteenth century marked by a change in the role of history as an aid in the construction of national consciousness. Politicians believed that social cohesion was built through hegemonic experiences, thus called on historians to create a same past for everyone in a society, where memory of the collective is valued above the individual, especially if it does not fit the historical discourse outlined by historians (p. 99).

The impact of the shift from oral to the literary tradition and the development of subsequent technologies regarding changing conceptions of memory was another influential component of the distinction of memory and history. In traditional societies, it was the role of the elders to remember detailed accounts of the past and pass them on to future generations. The practice of oral history played a crucial role in the transfer of knowledge and social narratives in the past. With the introduction of written word, oral history was devalued, thereby reframing perceptions of what constitutes true history (Hunt, 2010, p. 100).

Halbwachs (1992) acknowledges memory and history as two distinct and contrasting ways of dealing with the past. According to Halbwachs, history begins where social or collective memory stops operating. Thus, assuming a traditional perspective of history, as an attempt at developing objective and impartial accounts of the past. For Halbwachs, collective memories are confined to lifetime of the people in the society, and therefore only valid within that context (p. 43).

Nora (1996) states that where there is no remembered past there is no present, because the present cannot be interpreted without knowledge of the past (p. 293). Therefore, without memory we do not exist. But, without history, a society does not exist; history is intimately linked to the social and cultural world of which we are all a part and which has made us the people we are. For Nora (1996), memory is embodied in living societies and therefore contingent on the fluidity of remembering and forgetting (285). History is prone to a static or official representation of reconstruction of the past that is always incomplete. Sturken (1998) shifts away from this binary and approaches history and memory as deeply entangled entities where one must ask which memory, who's history, and who remembers (p.117).

Within the unkempt web of who's memory and which history is the concept of official memory. Paul Connerton (1989) speaks of official memory as rooted in societal political structures of power responsible for curating events to uphold particular social discourse (p. 70). Historical moments that fail to uphold a specific narrative are inevitably excluded and intentionally forgotten. In this way, commemorative ceremonies constitute what Connerton (1989) calls *theatre of memory* whose performances remind a community of its identity through the official narrative that engenders the sense of a collective identity (p. 70).

We wear generational trauma, if we do not wear it, it seeps into the landscape, an earmark of commemoration of those who lives were lost, and communities who experienced that loss. Traumatic memories have a very long life, affecting not just the survivors but also their children and grandchildren, through identification of the latter with the suffering off their parents, as is so evident in the descendants of Holocaust victims (Hutchinson, 2009, p. 415).

The exchange of memory from generation to generation is the essence of Marianne Hirsch's work, in which she explores the ongoing impact of the Holocaust on survivors and their descendants. Hirsch (2008) developed the term *postmemory* to name the way knowledge of powerful and traumatic experiences are transferred to second generations, often referred to as the hinge generation, of which said events preceded their birth. The hinge generation witness cultural or collective trauma only by the means of the stories,

images, and behaviours among which they grew up with. Memories were transmitted so deeply and affectively as to seem to constitute memories in their own right (p.103).

Further, Hirsch (2008) adds that to grow up with such overwhelming inherited memories, to be dominated by narratives that preceded one's birth and one's consciousness, is to risk having one's own birth or one's own stories and experiences displaced, even evacuated, by those of previous generations (p. 106).

Narrative—Identity/Meaning-Making

An exploration of memory would be incomplete without addressing the role of narrative. Narrative is defined as the way in which we make sense of the world around us. As social creatures, our individual narratives are determined not only by how we think or our own memories of lived experience, but also by others, and the social discourses that inform the way we live in society (Hunt, 2010, p. 97). Social discourses dictate the interaction between people, and the beliefs that people hold. These ways of thinking are taught through the media, educational systems, family units, and general social interactions. Though they can be contested, most people generally accept them, both explicitly and/or implicitly.

Ashplant, Dawson, and Roper (2000) discuss how narratives are shared formulations through which memories are articulated and organized, and can range from individual, through locally shared, to hegemonic, official narratives. The shift from individual remembering to state commemoration is a transition from direct personal to cultural memory, in which both modes of memory are related. However, cultural memory can only retain its political effectiveness, if it continues to engage with individual memory. Meanwhile, personal memories continue to be shaped in part by pre-existing national and local cultural narratives (p. 18). However, it is when individuals can express and compare their memories with the experience of contemporaries, can begin to formulate a shared language and identify common themes, that stimulate common and shared memories emerge, and therefore creating a shared narrative (p. 18).

Collective memory, national identity, and social cohesion all require a symbolically loaded and shared narrative. Nigel Hunt (2010) discusses vital need within people to have ritual, a series of fixed behaviours that are agreed by people in society and that represent, in terms of commemoration, a formal way in which we remember something of the past (Hunt, 2010, p. 173). Further, Thelen (1990) argues, memory exists along a continuum of experiences, with one end being the individual and private memories, kept alive in part by the development of individual narratives, and the other end being the collective cultural and public memoirs, which are kept alive at least in part through memorialization (p. 1117).

Many critical and complex dynamics exist around the creation and existence of memorials. Erika Doss (2008) examines the phenomenon of memorial mania, where contemporary

societies are engaged in a national obsession to secure memory and history into public commemorations, linking this behaviour to the function of memorials in contemporary society in shaping public understandings of social order and civic unity. Doss (2008) also acknowledges how the spaces have come to be used whether it is through an obligatory school outing or while on a family vacation, the purpose of visiting the site is to learn about, become a part, that particular identity (p. 229).

Monuments can contain strong narratives, identity-forming, commemorating historical events that necessitate the centering of certain memories and the marginalization of others (Worthy, 2004; Fournier et al., 2012). Remembrance can offer a single and very specific narrative that does not allow for conversation and encourages exclusion (Bold et al., 2002). Despite the events receding further into the distant past with that generation's passing, the events continue to have a lingering and vivid legacy, in which later generations have acquired a learned historical memory informed by successive narratives. Remembering World War II requires no immediate experience of those years (Eley, 2014, p. xii). Thus, Viego-Rose (2011) asks, "what kind of chains might we be contriving for ourselves with memorials?" (p. 466).

Further, memories are only shared, if the environment is conducive for them to be shared. Common memories may be suppressed with the partial collusion of those most directly involved, through a personal and community sense of shame, and through fear of the political repercussions of bringing them into public debate (Ashplant, et al., 2000, p. 20). Class, gender, age, race, religion, are all factors that affect inclusion in particular dominant social discourse and narrative. In all societies, different social groups have differential power to make their meanings and memories central and defined. Differential access to power affects one's ability to influence prevailing narratives or project one's own narratives into wider areas (Ashplant, et. al., 2000, p. 21).

Intergenerational Spaces

Nigel Hunt (2010) examines how the intersection of memory, narratives, social discourse and history are not only linked by the remembrance of war, and but rather by the psychological need and a social duty people feel, to remember those who died in past wars (p. 172). As previously discussed, a huge factor for the creation of cenotaphs and war memorials was the necessity of public space devoted to grief for the communities affected. Noakes (2009) states that for many who lived through war, it remains a significant part of their life story' a period of historical consequences which they experienced and to which they contributed. Many families have wartime stories of both civilian and military life, which are told and retold, passed on through generations (p. 136).

In the post-conflict setting, recent studies explore how war commemoration enables older veterans to benefit from a feeling of integration and belonging gained from both

comradeship and acknowledgment from wider society (Barron, Davis & Wiggins, 2008, p. 509). Barron, Davis, and Wiggins (2008) found that veterans who received a sense of solidarity and support from wider society both at the end of the war and in later years seem to cope better with their traumatic wartime experiences (p. 510). It was also found that despite this external affirmation and recognition of their values and contribution, veterans did not feel able to discuss their experiences with their families until prompted by commemoration some twenty years later (p. 510). Thus, veterans felt that when acknowledged and supported by society, they felt able to face their traumatic experiences and talk or think about them perhaps for the first time (p. 514).

During the study, Barron, Davis, and Wiggins (2008) also explored how veterans recalled Remembrance Day services at the Cenotaph, in which they found that male veterans recalled that it reminded them of the comradeship they had experienced during the war (p. 511). Veterans also expressed a strong desire to support one another by taking part in or marking commemorations—power in belonging to a collective. This is also experienced from the support experienced from the public who also gather to pay their respects during these services. Veterans also spoke of the need to engage younger generations and to teach them about the horror of war. This study found that not all veterans experienced inclusivity and comradeship.

Female World War II and Korean War veterans discussed being forgotten by society and highlighted the lack of memorials to commemorate them (p. 512). Most female veterans, who attended commemorations such as the Cenotaph Service, felt as though the services were more so for the men present. Thus not feeling as socially integrated as men in the process of collective commemoration.

Protest and Exclusion

The growth of new museum practices and pedagogies; the commemorative excess of the First and Second World War anniversaries; the growth of the tourism, culture and heritage industries and the proliferating of historical sites; as well as the variety of nostalgia in entertainment and consumer culture, have signaled the emergence of a different practices of remembering (Eley, 2014, p. xi). Further, the use of arts, education, public policy and popular culture has contributed to a continuation of official memory, with counter memory difficult to produce (Doss, 2008, p. 229).

Within the Canadian context, politics of collective memory are most visible during official memorial ceremonies (Fournier, et al., 2012, p. 41). In Ontario, the educational system plays an integral role in teaching citizens how to remember past and current wars. Fournier et al. (2012) discuss how students who enter the system with a culture and language uncharacteristic of the 'Canadian' identity may be pressured to engage in the collective memory of their new country by being forced to choose between maintaining their own

cultural diversity or engaging in the collective memory of Remembrance Day (p. 42). Further, Fournier et al., (2012) argue that war remembrance is militarized and masculinized to exclude those who do not fit into a specific Canadian ideal, despite the presence of alternatives. This is often perceived as a single narrative and very specific, stereotyped version of history, one that is dominated by white masculinity (p. 42).

Stanley (2000) found that veterans remain divided as to whether public commemoration is needed. Many veterans found commemoration difficult, because the public knowledge of an event was often very different to what they know really experienced. This is further complicated by the social discourse surrounding official commemorative events remain uncritical of war and focusing on bravado heroism (p. 250).

Summary

The exploration of public space, memory, narrative, and identity in regards to memorialization and commemoration remains an evolving subject matter in academia. Acknowledging the intersection of history and memory, social trauma, collective memory and grief and how public space is used for memorialization and commemoration of conflict.

Memorials vary pending their purpose and intention, shifting between individual, community based, or national monuments. Intention and purpose varies from political, symbolic to the psychological needs of mourning and grief, thereby engaging critical consciousness, and enabling the possibility of engaging with the world through transformative practices.

The practice of commemoration begins with the concept of space. Space is the metaphorical and symbolic notation that hosts the unwrapping of collective memory or the physical location. Further, a fluid relationship between memory and place exists that is defined by meanings, sentiments and stories rather than by a set of co-ordinates. Place does not simply carry a collective memory, but rather the tensions of places are themselves manifested in the spatialization of memory.

Memory is deconstructed as official, individual, collective, and post-memory, stimulating the continuity of social discourse and narrative around how the event of person will be remembered. Monuments can contain strong narratives, identity-forming, commemorating historical events that necessitate the centering of certain memories and the exclusion of others. Thus, containing the power to create spaces of inclusion as well as isolation. As time intersects with changing social, political, economic, historical dynamics, distance between the current population and the events that needed commemoration are experienced. The decisions as to whom or what should be memorialized becomes a contested topic.

Further research calls for a more critical examination as to who is excluded, whose history is being officiated, whom does it serve, and what is it good for. Within the given emergent political climate necessitating conflict resolution, how practicing the processes of collective memory is worth exploring in relation to it enabling or hindering social transformation.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

This project utilizes a qualitative research approach, focused on text-based data collected through participant semi-structured in-depth interviews. Interviews were the primary research method due to their potential of yielding rich descriptions of a phenomenon, by stimulating thoughts, impressions, observations from the participants, (Dicicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006, p. 314). The research project is also guided by an interpretivist framework. This theory is well suited for this project as it emphasizes that reality is socially constructed, a product of human action and the interactions of the meanings that social actors attach to their experiences (Neuman, 1997, p. 82).

Ethics approval to interview human subjects for this report was received from the University of Victoria Human Research Ethics Board.

Sampling

The target populations for this research project were Guelph citizens, by tapping into various stakeholders' voices and perspectives regarding the Guelph Cenotaph. With this intention, both purposive sampling and snowball sampling were used. Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to choose the sample based on who had expert knowledge or experience with the topic, in order to ensure that certain types of individuals were included in the study (Berg & Lune, 2012, p. 52). The researcher also used snowball sampling, in which participants are encouraged to refer the study to people who would be interested in participating (p. 52). The study was open to anyone who wanted to make a contribution to the research, so long as they resided in Guelph and able to consent to participation.

The researcher reached out to various groups around the community including the local Royal Canadian Legion, the Army Navy Air Force Club, students from the University of Guelph, local business owners, local change-makers, community organizations, and neighbourhood support organizations. Community members who had a particular interest in the subject matter such as local historians, archivists, or people connected to the traditions of the cenotaph (military background) were also encouraged to participate. The purpose of approaching this target population was to receive expert feedback on the policies put in place and the ways in which other communities have reconciled missing names on the Guelph Cenotaph.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited through advertisements, word-of-mouth, and through snowball sampling. Advertisements were posted on community boards in local libraries, coffee shops, and community centres. Posters provided information regarding the study, the purpose, what the participation entails, as well as the researcher's phone number and e-mail address. Expert participants were recruited through a letter of information sent to publicly

available email addresses from websites and business directories. The letter informed the potential participant of the goals of the project, and instructions for those interested in participating.

Interested candidates received an invitation to participate with a further description of the project and short background of the researcher, after which participants were encouraged to ask questions before committing to an interview. Interested participants were emailed the interview questions at least a week in advance to provide them time to reflect on the questions and formulate their responses. Once interest in participation was confirmed, a copy of the interview questions and the consent for participation form were sent to the participant to provide them time to reflect on the questions and formulate their responses.

At the end of the interview session, participants were asked to pass on the study information to other potential secondary participants, with instructions for those interested to contact the researcher directly. Recruitment for participants occurred in July of 2014 through email and phone recruitment scripts. Eighteen invitations to participate were sent out, however only twelve people confirmed their participation. Once recruited, participants were contacted to schedule an appointment for their semi-structured one-one interviews. Data collection began in late July through until September, following the University of Victoria's Human Research Ethics Board (HREB) approval.

Interviews

A total of 12 interviews were conducted. Interviews were held in person in Guelph, at a day, time and location convenient to the participants. Each interview took between 45 and 90 minutes. Upon consent from participants, all interviews were audio recorded, and notes were taken. All of the interviews contained the same semi-structured open ended questions that allowed for further probing, and delving deeper into social and personal matters (Dicicco-Bloom & Crabtree, 2006, p. 315). Interview questions were developed to enhance and contribute to the primary research questions, and better understand the significance of place as a site made meaningful by memory and commemorative practices.

For this research project anonymity was neither desirable nor necessary. Guelph is a smaller community in which key stakeholder contributions to the project will be insightful and helpful. The right to remain anonymous or to be identified laid with the participant. During the consent process, each participant was asked if they would like to maintain their anonymity or if they felt comfortable waiving their right to confidentiality. Each participant was informed that regardless of their choice, their interview would still be included in the project. One participant wanted to be anonymous, all other participants provided approval for the use of their names for this project.

Interviews were conducted from August 6th, 2015 to March 17th, 2016. The interviews were scheduled as follows:

1. Lloyd Longfield, August 6th, 2015
2. Tony Boogs, August 6th, 2015
3. Edward Butts, August 11th, 2015
4. Christine Lafazanios, August 13th, 2015
5. Mark Guzylak-Shergold, August 19th, 2015
6. Kirstie McKinlay, August 25th, 2015
7. Greg Denton, August 26th, 2015
8. Gary Hollett, August 30th, 2015
9. Russ Bateman, September 10th, 2015
10. Laura Mousseau, September 10th, 2015
11. Ilanna Tamari, September 12th, 2015
12. Anonymous, March 17th, 2016.

The complete interview contained 13 questions. The first question determined the age, identified-gender, and how long the participant has lived in Guelph. The next questions explored the Guelph cenotaph, Guelph Remembrance Day services, war memorials more generally, moving into assessing policies around addition of new names to existing plaques. The complete interview instrument used for all interviews is included as Appendix A.

On several occasions, upon receiving letters of information, prospective participants decided against participating because they felt as though they were not knowledgeable enough about the subject matter. Other participants also hesitated because they thought their perspectives were too counter culture because they were critical of the space. Part of overcoming this was to build rapport and encourage participants to partake in the project regardless of their beliefs and individual to share their voices and point of views mattered. Lastly, each participant was asked whether they wanted to maintain their anonymity or if they felt comfortable waiving their right to confidentiality. Had a participant requested to remain anonymous, all measures would have been taken to honour and maintain privacy. The request to waive the right to confidentiality, could have been a limitation for potential participants.

Data Collection and Analysis

Thematic analysis was used to analyze the data collected. The method is useful for identifying, analyzing, and reporting themes within qualitative data (Braun & Clark, 2006, p. 78).

The thematic analysis was conducted in six phases (Braun & Clarke, 2006, p. 87). Phase one consisted of the transcription of verbal data, followed by familiarizing with the data.

Phase two involved organizing the interview responses by interview questions into response sets, and generating an initial code to be used to identify themes. Phase three involved collating codes into potential themes, gathering all data relevant to each potential theme. Once, all the data was coded, codes were collated to potential themes. Phase four involved the reviewing of themes, and generating a thematic map. Phase five refined the themes, and the overall story the analysis tells, generating clear definitions and names for each them. Lastly, phase six involved the selection of vivid, compelling extract examples, relating analysis back to research question and literature (p. 87-89).

Limitations

The scope of the project was first developed by the researcher and the clients, Tammy Adkin, Manager of Guelph, and Colleen Clack of the City of Guelph, in February 2015. Challenges arose over keeping to the tight timeline that the client required. As a result, the direction of the research question shifted from the intention to create a policy to deal with the inconsistencies of names on the Guelph Cenotaph, to exploring community perspectives around the new policy as well as exploring what the space meant to Guelph citizens.

Another limitation was the personal bias of the researcher, as the researcher acted as an interviewer, transcriptionist, and analyst for the project. To minimize impact, efforts were made to ensure that interviews were audio-recorded and the transcriptions were verbatim from the respondent's speech. Further, the researcher practiced critical reflexivity, to be mindful of how one's own social location, diversity of experience can complicate and enrich the analysis (Patton, 2002, p. 39).

5.0 FINDINGS

The following section reports on the thoughts and impressions shared by twelve participants during semi-structured, individual interviews. The interview findings are sorted into three major topic areas, purpose and meaning of Guelph cenotaph and plaque, memorialization as a cultural practice, and cenotaph policy. The findings are then organized into subcategories of recurring themes and meaningful concepts that emerged from the data.

Participants were asked to describe what the cenotaph and cenotaph plaque meant to them, and to share their most recent interaction with the space. Memorialization, in this context, refers to the culturally relevant conceptualization of preserving the memory of people who have died. Participants spoke to various forms of commemoration, and honouring those who have died. Lastly, participants spoke to the current proposed cenotaph policy.

Interviewees are identified by the initials of their name. One individual wanted to remain anonymous and is referred to as AA throughout this chapter.

Purpose and Meaning of the Guelph Cenotaph and Cenotaph Plaques

Remembrance of Loss and Sacrifice

Six participants saw remembrance as one of the major purposes of the cenotaph. The cenotaph was described as a reminder of the soldiers who fought in First World War, Second World War (RB, LL, GH, EB, TB, IT). One participant stated that the cenotaph represents the community trying to desperately enshrine their experience so nobody forgets (TB). Three participants felt that the cenotaph is mostly a space one thinks about at Remembrance Day (LL, GD, KM).

Four participants expressed the view that the cenotaph displayed the cost of war in a community (EB, LM, IT, LL). The cenotaph was described as a representation of loss, sacrifice, and debt that could never be fully paid. One participant noted that it was a reminder that a lot of people did a lot of things to get us to where we are and a lot of them had to give their lives in order to do that (EB). Further, the participant stated that it also represented a loss of stories, all the names listed were real people.

Three participants noted the importance of commemorating one's history. Knowing the past is important because it produces the future (LM, LL, AA). One of these participants shared that it is important for people to feel what this meant. Four participants expanded on

the importance of the cenotaph for connecting future generations to the real stories of the past, especially if youth are disconnected from it within their own families (AA, GH, GD, LL). One of the participants stated the cenotaph was a marker of a time where narratives changed, especially around conflict and war, and thereby important for historical recollection (LL).

One participant said that in this person's experience with peers who served in conflicts overseas, people were susceptible to clamming up, unable to speak about what they had seen or experienced. The participant expanded by saying that a lot of information veterans had, they could not share with other generations. Therefore, having a three dimensional marker that is visible is very helpful for remembrance, by symbolically sharing stories (AA).

Plaques Names

When asked to share impressions of the cenotaph plaque names, six participants stated that the plaques represented predominately Anglo-Saxon white men who died in the First and Second World Wars. The participants expressed the view that names on the plaque invoked the memory of soldiers who lost their lives (TB, EB, CL, IT, LM, GD). Two participants felt that the names on the plaques represented wasted lives, victims of war, and deep community loss (EB, LL). Three participants said the names on the plaque represented local names, people who served from Guelph, or who left from Guelph (CL, EB, LL).

Two participants spoke to the emotional impact of names, stating that it humanized the experience of war and its atrocities by showing a huge list of people who were impacted (CL, IT). One participant stated to have never had that kind of emotional attachment to that part of society or culture, but understands that seeing those names has a very potent personal meaning for some people (MG). Two participants felt that a list of names did not provide the public with any information (MG, GD). Further, six participants stated they had never gone to the cenotaph with the intention of looking at the names (GD, CL, MG, TB, RB, AA).

Value of Names for Family and Community Members

Three participants stated they found themselves always looking at the names on plaques, on the look out for family names, or for other names they might know (KM, LM, IT). One participant acknowledged that if one does not have a child who died in a war, it is easy to say, make it a generality. But if knowing an individual who died, a person would want to see that their name is added to a list (TB). This was confirmed by another participant who stated that the family of a friend who is a current member of the Canadian Armed Forces, would want to see his name recognized to justify their loss (KM).

One participant expressed the view that in the past, a tightly knit community such as Guelph would probably have really appreciated the sentiment of a family member's name on a plaque (MG). Another participant elaborated that when you see real names it becomes a validation of what happened (TB). It meant something at one time to see these names, people wanted to see these names.

Alternative Representation of Cenotaph

One participants expressed the view that the cenotaph acts as a glorification of war and violence in a culture that pretends it wants peace (CL). Two other participants shared a similar perspective, stating that the cenotaph is a conflicting space that glorifies war (MG, GD). War memorials need to be apologies by people in positions of power and privilege, governments admitting they messed up (CL). One participant stated the importance of how narrative is portrayed through a memorial; who is telling the story? (AA)

One participant explained that memorials made it difficult to oppose or be critical of the conflicts they represent. He elaborated that an unwillingness to participate in the observance of common rituals associated with memorials or a lack of reverence to memorials felt disrespectful, even if he believes the conflict was not moral, justifiable or ethical actions for the government to take. Further, he questioned if this practice was part of his civic duty (MG).

One Hundred Portrait Project

One participant conducted the One Hundred Poppy portrait project. This participant felt that the portraits are a memorialization of veterans. He expanded by explaining that the portraits symbolize the intersection of people and the military. The project feels largely about sacrificing who you are to something else. It is about surrendering identity, and the individual's contribution to the whole (GD). This participant also noted that each veteran felt deeply honoured to participate in the project.

Poppy Community

The poppy is considered a source of pride for the city of Guelph. Three participants shared their view that the cenotaph conjured images of Flanders Fields and the poppies that John McCrae wrote about (KM, GH, EB). One participant expressed the view that the cenotaph is inherited knowledge, not lived experience of community members (TB). The initiator of the memorial comes to mind, and the context of the people who elaborated it and memorialized it.

Three participants spoke to the issue of membership and inclusion of others in the poppy community narrative (TB, CL, GD). One participant noted the importance of acknowledging the diversity of concerns that were present in the hearts of citizens of

Guelph, further questioning, how the community of Guelph could respond to the diversity of citizens' experiences of conflict (CL).

Two participants discussed the difficulty of creating a sense of shared experience (TB, MG). One of those participants observed that Canadians become Canadians during their participation in war. The First World War defined Canadians as cohesive group of people (TB). The other participant noted that for ideological reasons, the nation needs to have an identity, what does that look like? Further, how do you share legacy with people from such different experiences and perspectives? (MG)

Family Connection

Six participants felt that the cenotaph conjured a connection to family and family tradition (LM, RB, KM, GH, EB, LL). Participants stated that the cenotaph evoked memories of childhood, in which grandparents or other family members accompanied them to various war memorials in observance of Remembrance Day. One participant expanded on this stating that she was raised knowing that her grandfathers were pilots and grandmothers were nurses (LM). She explained that she heard stories from her grandparents. Some stories were humorous while some were sad, there was a wide spectrum. Some of the stories she heard through her parents, or aunts/uncles, rather than through her grandparents because some of them were difficult to tell. The participant mentioned that her grandfather in particular, had a difficult time talking about some of the stuff he had seen or dealt with while overseas (LM).

One participant stated not having grown up in Guelph, and felt more connected to the Aurora cenotaph where this respondent grew up, as it was there that his grandfather used to take him (RB). Going to the cenotaph became an important family tradition, as the participant was named after his great uncle who served in war. He explained that this made it feel more personal (RB).

Another participant spoke to her experience attending a cenotaph in Glasgow during a Remembrance Day ceremony, which felt more personal and relevant to her because her parents and grandparents were from Glasgow (KM).

One participant felt that the cenotaph reminded him of the lost opportunity for reflection and dialogue with his brother and father upon their return from the war. He elaborated that he resented that his dad never said, 'hey, let's go for a beer and talk about what we've learnt' (AA). Another participant discussed how talking to family members about their experiences felt rude, as the subject matter is sensitive. People do not want to talk about it, they do not want to relive it (IT).

One participant (EB) stated that cenotaphs were created for the purpose of families. The participant shared a story of one soldier who had been honoured on the Guelph cenotaph who emigrated from Scotland. He had never lived in Guelph but his mom did. When he died, his mother wanted his name on the Guelph cenotaph, and so it was added.

Location

The location of the Guelph cenotaph was highlighted by eight participants (CL, TB, LM, RB, MG, KM, IT, GD). The participants described the current location as busy, noisy, and awkward for a commemorative space. Two participants stated that they felt exposed standing there, as the space is exposed (MG, LM). Two other participants noted that narrow width of the sidewalk near the cenotaph made it difficult to conduct public gatherings (KM, CL).

Two participants explained that urban development was a catalyst for the current dissatisfaction with the space (AA, TB). One participant stated that the location was a legitimized urban feature, in a location where you can walk by it and consider it (TB). Another participant noted that when thinking of places that one would want to go to reflect and meditate, the current location is the last place one thinks of going. Even though it is the primary purpose of that space (LM).

When asked to share components for an ideal location for the cenotaph, four participants spoke to the importance of a pedestrian heavy area, green open space, an expensive piece of land, a place designed for people to gather, a space that could host events of remembrance or protest that did not require facilitation by the city, and thereby the incorporation of the cenotaph into other aspects of the city's life (RB, CL, LM, MG). One participant felt that the cenotaph should be in the heart of a community, located in a central place (GH). Another participants clarified that the only way the memorial location made sense in the current location was for the production of the precession (CL).

Visual Representation of Cenotaph

Three participants discussed the symbols adorning the cenotaph. The imagery includes a soldier, caliber, angel, poppies, and the Flanders Field poem (MG, LM, CL). The participants expressed the view that the imagery was exclusionary, due to its religious undertones, making it difficult to relate to.

Space

Four participants described the cenotaph as a sacred, reverent and sad space (EB, GH, LL, IT). One participant stated that when she was a kid, while passing war memorials and cenotaphs, she always felt in awe of the space (IT). One participant discussed how the space presents the names altogether in a public space, a public gravestone of people who

otherwise would not have died so young (LL). Two participants shared an opposing perspective; they stated that the Guelph cenotaph felt like a conflicting space, where the community is trying to memorialize people, but are memorializing war (LM, MG).

When asked to describe day-to-day interactions with the space, seven participants stated they go by the cenotaph frequently, but never intentionally to visit or remember (RB, LL, TB, CL, KM, GD, LM). Three participants stated they often glance over at the space to make sure there is no one there who is trying to cause trouble (KM, RB, GH). Two participants responded that passing the space and seeing the wreaths and flowers that have been put there filled them with joy (LM, GH). Four participants stated they did not identify with the space and felt disconnected from the ritual and symbolism that it represents. One of these participants stated that the cenotaph had value, but failed to arise a connection for him.

Remembrance Day Observance

When asked if participants observe Remembrance Day, five participants stated they regularly attended Remembrance Day services in the city of Guelph (GH, LL, IT, KM, EB). Four participants answered they do not attend Remembrance Day services (GD, MG, AA, CL). Two other participants explained that they would consider attended but that they usually are at work (TB, KM). Two participants who attend regularly said that they take the day off work so that they can observe the day (IT, GH).

One participant noted that she only attends the ceremony at the McCrae house (LM). This participant stated she enjoyed this ceremony because it more personable than the Sleeman Centre, and it showcased a diversity of people of all ages. Two participants specified they only attend the Sleeman Centre ceremony and the march to the cenotaph (EB, GH). One of those participants stated they enjoyed hearing the selected keynote speaker speak (EB). Another participant expressed the feeling of surprise at how many people attend this ceremony. He explained that you can tell the City of Guelph puts a lot of effort into it the ceremony. Further, the participant felt that it was nice that the ceremony was inside, as it made the event more accessible (RB).

Of the participants who do not attend, one stated that he had not observed the day since it became a choice (MG). Further, the participant said he had never attended by choice. A veteran of the Afghanistan war stated that he usually goes back to his old army unit for the ceremony, even though he lives in Guelph (RB)

Identifying with Remembrance Day

As a celebrator in training, with the desire to better understand and observe public ceremonies and rituals, a participant felt like an outsider at the ceremony (CL). While attending the ceremony, the participant wore a white poppy, which she described as feeling bold and risky. Wearing the white poppy was important for her because she wanted to show that she did care, and that by not wearing a red poppy she was not apathetic. The participant mentioned surprise over the religious overtones of the ceremony. Another participant stated they witnessed a member of the community be treated unfairly at the cenotaph, when placing a wreath on behalf of their organization (GH).

Two participants who attend the ceremony regularly stated they feel a great sense of community when they attend (GH, LL). One other participant stated there was much pageantry around the day, but that the cenotaph is focused on the people that gave their lives, which is why it is important (LL).

Memorialization

Permanence of Monuments

Architecture and monuments have permanence; the fact they were created means something (TB). Two participants stated that the cenotaph is one of the most permanent ways to commemorate someone and a concrete space for people to go and honour them (RB, KM). One participant expressed the view that something as huge and out of the ordinary as war needed this sort of public memorialization, because it stood for ongoing experience of what living in conflict was like (CL). The cenotaph was the social and cultural practices of marking occurrences in the twentieth century (LL).

One participant explained that memorials are artifacts, even if there is no current consensus on the meaning of the space, because consensus already happened, therefore it exists and is relevant because it is history (TB). Further, the participant expanded, as part of history, you do not have to agree with it. Two participants stated that the cenotaph reflects changing values, regardless if it is removed from people's situational memory (TB, LL).

Connecting to Family through War Memorials

When asked if participants had any relatives who were honoured on memorials anywhere in the world, eight participants noted they did know of any honoured relatives (GD, IT, AA, MG, LL, EB, TB, CL). Of those eight participants, two participants expressed interest in attending the memorial, if they knew it existed (IT, LL).

Four participants stated they had relatives who were honoured on monuments (RB, GH, LM, KM). Three of the participants had visited the monuments, and felt it was important to

do so (GH, RB, LM). One participant visited the memorials of his family, and said it was an emotional experience (GH). Another participant stated that she had visited the place at a younger age, and it did not mean as much to her then as it would now (LM).

Memorable Experiences with Monuments

One participant discussed the cenotaph once located in the centre of the Canadian Armed Forces army base in Kandahar during the conflict in Afghanistan. The faces of each person that had died from the army base were etched in laser onto the cenotaph. This interviewee explained that the cenotaph served as a reminder to operational staff, that making decision affects real people (RB).

One participant stated that during time of conflict in the United States, little red, gold and silver flags hung in the windows of homes of the lost soldiers overseas. When you walked by a flag, you knew that someone from that household paid the ultimate price (AA).

Diversity of Ways to Memorialize

Three participants expressed the view that how one wants to be memorialized is a personal decision (LL, AA, CL). One participant stated he had discussed with his family where he would like his remains to lay. He also said that people often do not express those wishes when they sign up for service (LL). Another participant stated that despite being an active community member who has lived in Guelph for twenty-one years, he still identifies as a Nova Scotian, and would want to be memorialized there. He further said that though he had a strong connection to the community in Guelph, it was not home.

One participant expressed the view that pending the spiritual/religious perspective, if you have a personal connection to someone, you may not necessary need a physical place to go to because it feels like that person is with you all the time (CL). Another participant stated that the way a memorial or gravestone make you relate to the past is not something that he felt comfortable with. Nor was it a ritual that he identified with (MG). In remembering his deceased father, the participant stated he did not visit his father's grave, for he had other more meaningful ways of remembering him. Further, he explained that he did not think he was unique in that way, perhaps people mourn by distancing themselves from those kinds of objects (MG).

Another participant stated that families may not want to have a family member's name on a cenotaph (AA). They may have medals that they pass down generationally, that are more important to sharing the story of their loved one. Perhaps it would be valuable to grandchildren, and great grandchildren to have the option of submitting a name (KM).

One participant stated that world is different than it was 70/80 years ago, maybe we do not need to chisel things into marble anymore (KM).

Challenge of Appropriate Ways to Honour Someone

Five participants acknowledged that something may be missing in public grieving and public memorialization (CL, LL, LM, MG, TB). Further, the participants asked who gets memorialized in public spaces, and how do we best honour people? Who is left behind that needs it to perform that function and ritual for them? Two participants discussed the merits of public commemoration in comparison to private commemoration (CL, LL). They asked when keeping memories alive is more of a private family based practice, and when is it a government initiative.

Two participants expressed the need to step back and look at what memorials are meant to do (CL, MG). One of the participants explained that there is an opportunity to expand the meaning of the space and explore how it can function better for the segment of the Guelph community who wants it (MG). Another participant asked, whether names were still required in order to commemorate the sacrifice (TB).

Importance of Vietnam War Memorial

Four participants discussed the relevance of the Vietnam War Memorial in understanding memorial plaques for fallen soldiers (RB, GD, TB, MG). Of those participants, one participant stated the Vietnam War Memorial was long overdue. The American people had to re-contextualize history, as they decided that the soldiers who lost their lives in that war could no longer be dismissed because the war was lost (TB). Another participant explained that the Vietnam War needed to be commemorated differently due to the public contention that surrounded it (GD).

Guelph Cenotaph Policy

Reasons for Inconsistencies

Four participants believed that inconsistencies to the list of names on the Guelph cenotaph were caused by poor record maintenance rather than malicious actions of discrimination or exclusion of society at the time (LL, RB, AA, EB). Committees responsible for creating a roster of names relied on the community to provide names (EB). Families may have not been able to add names; that is why the names are missing (LM). One participant added if one could afford to be commemorated or had status in the community, you would be added, and unfortunately the same is true of the opposite (TB).

One participant spoke about Frederick Gilles, an orphaned young man from Guelph who had joined the army and was killed in battle. News of his death was sent by telegram to the Children's Aid Society, where he had resided. Unfortunately, as an orphan, he did not have

any family to make sure his name was added to the list of soldiers lost at war. His name remains missing from the Guelph cenotaph, even though it is present in Ottawa Commonwealth Commission of Names (EB).

One participant discussed an old cartoon he watched created by the Warner Brothers dating back to the 1950s. The cartoon began with a disclaimer informing the audience that racism was present in the story, but that the producers had decided to leave it in. The participant elaborated that to remove the representation would be to pretend racism never existed. Therefore, you cannot change the past, but you acknowledge the problems and make better choices (GD). In terms of the cenotaph, the participant believed it was not enough to say this is how it was, and to leave it. If we know there are names missing, it needs to be corrected.

Challenges of Representation and Inclusion on Plaques

All twelve participants stated names should be added to the cenotaph (AA, CL, GD, GH, EB, IT, KM, LL, LM, MG, RB, TB). Frustration over who deserves to be recognized was expressed by six participants (CL, LM, TB, RB, LL, IT). One participant explained that looking at the names made her sad for everyone missing but also sad for the lens that society uses to decide who gets memorialized and who does not. The same participant stressed the importance of examining who gets forgotten, who gets left out, and who gets erased from history. Further, the participant added that when one erases people from history, they invalidate their experiences and their existence (CL).

Six participants expressed the view that it is difficult to know where to draw the line for the inclusion of names on the cenotaph plaques (MG, RB, IT, TB, KM, LM). One participant asked, what happens to the soldier who lost both of their legs during a conflict (RB). Where and how would this person be recognized? Another participant, wanted to discuss how the policy could affect veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and who have committed suicide as a result of their service (LL). One participant felt that a person is more seen and honoured if they die in war, then if they come back with PTSD, a physical injuries or other disabilities (CL).

Three participants expressed concern over not being able to ensure that all names that need to be added would be recognized (CL, EB, LL). One participant expanded on this stating that there should be no names, as you risk always setting yourself up for failure and further accidental omissions (CL). Another participant expressed concern over how long the process of building a roster of names would take. How do you know that list is complete, and when do you decide to add names to a static medium (MG)?

Cenotaph Narrative

One participant expressed the view that the cenotaph is exclusionary as it only acknowledges those who fought for “our side” (IT). The participant elaborated that perhaps the cenotaph would morph into a space for dialogue around different experiences of conflict. Another participant asked if exploring the inconsistencies would raise up conflicts that have already been resolved (TB). Yet another wondered whether such memorials encourage a dichotomous narrative (IT).

The Value of Honouring Other Roles People Played in Conflict

Five people expressed interest in exploring the addition of other people who contributed to the war effort who traditionally were overlooked from inclusion based on social and culture constructs of the time (CL, LM, TB, KM, MG). Who remains missing of this list of cenotaph names (CL)? The participant stated that all sectors of society contributed to war effort. People rationed food, people gave up their personal possessions. People participated in the war effort by making weapons, bombs, or feeding the population people by farming food (TB).

Another participant spoke to the lack of recognition of survivors. People who are alive do not get represented. People who are traumatized do not get represented (CL). People who are marginalized and alienated will feel as it is a continuation of the marginalization and alienation that they have already experienced (CL). One participant wondered about the possibility of the inclusion of people who lost their lives on the opposing sides, whose families now live in Guelph (MG).

Broadening the criteria for who is added was important to five participants (CL, KM, LM, TB, MG). One participant suggested that it was only appropriate to add everyone’s names who was affected by war, including partners, children, parents, support workers, and physiotherapist (CL). Another participant stated that the names of people who were integral to the war effort, such as planners, politicians, should also be added to war memorials (MG). Two participants discussed the lack of recognition of women who worked in factories, or on the front line (LM, KM). These participants clarified that though exhibits to honour the role these women played were present at the local museum, they questioned why women were not recognized in public spaces.

Adding Future Soldiers’ Names

Four participants stated that the current cenotaph plaques should remain isolated for the commemoration of those soldiers who died in the First World War, Second World War and the Korea War (RB, AA, GH, GD). One participant stated that rather than adding names to the cenotaph, let the cenotaph stand and memorialize a set of conflicts (MG). Another participant stated that by constantly adding names, the memory of what they did and why

becomes diluted (AA). Perhaps, it would be appropriate to memorialize other soldiers in different ways, that were more indicative of our century.

Logistical Challenges

Three participants were concerned about the logistical challenges that the implementation of new policy proposed, in particular the allocation of financial resources (LL, MG, KM). The participants shared concern for the cost of new names, and who will be responsible for funding. Further, who should bear the cost and financial responsibility in the future? Three participants expressed concern regarding availability of space (LL, GH, MG). What kind of space is available for the modification of the cenotaph? What happens when we run out of room?

Criteria

Seven participants stated that all people who served should be equally represented regardless of anything else (LL, KM, IT, LM, EB, TB, AA). This means that all names, past, future, and present are to be included on the same cenotaph, as the individuals honoured, equally contributed with the ultimate sacrifice of their lives (AA). Three participants stated they would like to see age added to the cenotaph, so the observer can see how young some of the soldiers were (AA, RB, IT).

Two participants stated that the date of the deaths should be include (RB, AA). They stated this would give context to the death and conflict. Further, two participants spoke to the importance of including the rank of the individuals, stating that it gave perspective on what their role was (MG, RB). Four participants shared an opposing perspective stating ranks were divisive, and that all soldiers who died should be equal in death (LM, IT, LL, EB). Three participants stated the regiment should be involved in recognizing who should be added to the cenotaph (LL, AA, MG).

When asked to share where a person who died in active duty is to be memorialized and if they could be memorialized more than once, five participants stated the person should be memorialized in as many places as appropriate for the person (CL, LL, EB, MG, GH). One person stated that it did not matter where they grew up or how long they lived in Guelph. If they had a strong connection to Guelph, they should be honoured here (LL). Two participants explained that the person should be honoured in the place that they enlisted (LM, KM). Another participant stated it would depend on who is honouring the person and in what capacity, whether honoured by community or by government (KM).

Interactive Commemoration

Two participants discussed how technology could aid in encouraging interaction by personalizing the experience, and making the information more accessible (CL, IT). One of

those participants elaborated that no names would permanently need to be chiselled but rather people could personalize their experience by selecting their interests and learning personal stories of the people associated with the memorial (CL). Three participants believed that shifting experience of what a memorial looks like, what it is, and how we experience it was important, especially for the changing narrative over peace and conflict (MG, LL, CL). Another participant discussed how commemorative spaces needed to reflect the way people interact with their history, world, and culture (TB).

One participant spoke about membership in subcultures. The participant explained that being a person right now who is aging, he realizes that he does not have the same access to the culture that he lives in now due to his age. When you enter a culture, you participate in it and take certain things for granted. You have a different perspective of what is there, what is possible, as well as what you have access to. Memorializing a sculpture can feel archaic. Many people who belong to the subculture of this form of memorializing are dying off, how do today's youth make this experience their own (GD)? One moves from something that is living memory to something that is abstraction, into something that is more formalized as history (GD).

New Policy Feedback

One participant stated there is a loophole around post-traumatic stress disorder that is not covered in the policy (LL). If a person died as a result of service, the policy does not make clear that the person has to die while in service. This leaves the door open for interpretation. Two participants stated the language of the policy was accessible and easy to understand (EB, AA).

Three people believed the policy was vague (MG, RB, CL). One participant explained that the policy needs to encompass anyone who has ever served, not just anyone who has died during their service (CL). Another participant was critical of the inclusion of peacekeeping and North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) activities (RB). The same participant was also critical of the use of language around "serving during declared conflict", stating it should just say "conflict". He explained that Canada has not declared war in a long time. Further, sixty-thousand Americans died in Iraq, even though it was not a declared war.

Another participant stated that his first impression of the policy was positive, though he did wish there could be inclusion of service people in the community such as police officers firemen and women, or even business owners, who make community better place to live (LL). Two other participants discussed how the policy would be implemented and if a citizen group would be engaged to meet on semi-regular basis to discuss it (LL, IT).

6.0 DISCUSSION

This chapter discusses the project findings in relation to the relevant consulted literature, while integrating and interpreting the information in connection with the research questions and project objective. Key topics will be discussed that are relevant to understanding the current meaning and purpose of the cenotaph for the citizens of Guelph, how citizens of Guelph identify with the space and the engagement of citizens in reconciling plaque names on the cenotaph through the City of Guelph's new policy.

Distilling the purpose of commemorative spaces is one of the recurring themes in the project findings and consulted literature. Both the findings and the literature indicate that there are multiple purposes and meanings attached to commemorative spaces, informed by factors such as age, culture, gender, class, family history and experience of grief. As the literature consulted reveals, everyone generates different responses to a memorial, depending on different backgrounds and a diverse range of experiences (Tritle, 2012, p.166).

This chapter is organized into four primary themes that explore the meaning and purpose of the Guelph cenotaph: civic space for remembrance, social ritual and ceremony, storytelling and narrative, and representation.

Civic Space and the Historical Landmark

The complexity between commemorative spaces in form, location, and relationship to surrounding community and greater scope of the city, surfaced as a major theme within this project. Participants of the study discussed the cenotaph as a designated space for remembrance of loss, sacrifice and a physical representation of the cost of the First and Second World Wars. The space provokes a wide range of emotional responses such as sadness, pride, but also anger and discomfort. In the literature findings, the creation of the cenotaph was for the protraction of memory of the events that affected the community, marking loss, grief, and cost (Stephans, 2007, p. 245). As memorials continue to be shaped and understood in the context of time and place, they host an opportunity to recall the past and provide conditions for new responses in the future (Border, 2009; Viejo-Rose, 2011).

Participants spoke to the emotional reaction that the names on the cenotaph plaque elicited as representations of wasted lives and the personal loss of young people who came from the same city. Participants also shared that they caught themselves looking for familiar names whether of their own kin or families from their community. Regardless whether the cenotaph was in their community or in another country, the act of checking was important to them, as the physical connection to the impact of historical events in the present. In the literature consulted, the transformation of personal grief to public statements of community

sorrow and loss was an important political process of justifying conflict (Hutchison, 2009, p. 413). Families found comfort in having fallen family members honoured through this medium (Stephans, 2007; Hutchison, 2009).

Though participants identified with the sacredness of the space, they described dissatisfaction with the current location of the cenotaph. Participants who frequently pass the cenotaph, stated they never pass it with the intention to visit or remember. It exists as part of the urban landscape. (Bold, Knowles, & Leach, 2012) observed that once society assigns monumental form to memory it divest itself for the obligation to remember, thereby becoming passive spectators (p. 128).

In the project findings a few participants expressed a disconnection from the space and what it represented. Doss (2008) suggests that when memorials blend into the landscape they are at risk of people not seeing them, losing their ability to trigger memories or emotions (p. 471). Nora (1990) was concerned that when people commit their memories to the spatiality of memorials, they rid themselves of the individual responsibility to remember (p. 284). Therefore, as future generations are further removed and disconnected from the events that transpired and people who survived through them, the cenotaph is in jeopardy of fading into its surroundings by failure to stay culturally or socially relevant.

A critical point of learning in the study was how to maintain sacredness of space while honouring the needs required from that space that are limited due to location. In a discussion with participants over desired qualities of a commemorative space, participants expressed inclination for pedestrian heavy area, with a green open space designed for people to gather, and a space that would host events of remembrance more integrated into other aspects of the city's life. Participants acknowledged a desire for something more artistic to connect to, mentioning modern memorials such as the Vietnam War Memorial as more relatable. Oschsner (1997) discussed how the Vietnam War Memorial was designed with the intention for human interaction. Further, Bjorgvinsson & Hansen (2011) state that by moving away from passive public commemoration of traditional cenotaphs, viewers were able to connect and relate to more collaborative and engaged monumental art spaces (p. 4).

Social Ritual and Ceremony

In the research findings, less than half of the participants stated they regularly attended Remembrance Day services in the city of Guelph, stressing they found the experience meaningful and important for them. A few participants stated they would consider attending but they are usually at work. The reviewed literature acknowledges that people have a strong need to have ritual, a series of fixed behaviours that are agreed by people in society and that represent, in terms of commemoration, a formal way in which the past is remembered (Hunt, 2010, p. 173). Hunt (2010) uses the example of the ritual of a minute of

silence at the eleventh hour of the eleventh day of the eleventh month, every year. The ritual of silence indicates there is a shared memory, a social discourse that ensures society will not forget the dead, fulfilling the need for that ritual fixed behaviour (p. 173).

Project findings and literature reflected the view that something as out of the ordinary as war needed this sort of public memorialization and ritual making (Stephans, 2007; Hutchison, 2009; Hunt, 2010). Space is made meaningful through memory and commemorative practice (Mayo, 1988; Halbwachs, 1992; Osbourne, 1997). However, the population of community members who were affected firsthand by the events leading to the inception of the cenotaph is aging. The cenotaph as a space and ritual is changing and also aging.

Project findings and literature indicated there were a diversity of ways to memorialize and remember (Clark & Franzmann, 2006; Bjorgvinsson & Hansen, 2011; James, 2013). Participants stated that pending spiritual and religious perspectives, if you have a personal connection to someone who has passed, you may not necessary need a physical place to go to remember them. Further, the Remembrance Day ceremony is not a one-size-fits all ritual; different experiences will change the rituals. Project findings showed that participants chose to attend one ritual over another because it offered an experience they personally needed that another ritual could not meet.

This study supports the importance of further understanding what is needed in public grieving, the function of ritual and ceremony, and public memorialization. It also supports future planning of public memorialization and ritual planning to be more inclusive and accessible to all.

Story and Narrative

Project findings and literature conveyed the theme of commemorating one's own history and connecting future generations to the stories of the past was frequently brought up (Stephans, 2007, p. 245). Stories manifest in diverse ways whether from memory (individual, collective, or official) or historical record. In the intersection of history, memory, and identity, people's narrative and stories are constantly being re-negotiated, re-told, and re-shaped by context and time. Due to underlying systems of oppression, many stories were eradicated from the public narrative as they did not fit the official record. A struggle for authorship is an opportunity for more stories and sharing of experiences.

Participants discussed the important role memorials, such as cenotaphs, played in their own personal connection to family and family history, manifesting in their own personal identities and worldviews. This is consistent with the literature in which studies speak to the power of memory exchange from one generation to the next through stories, images and behaviours, whereby individuals do not need to have experienced the event to identify it as

part of their memory (Hirsch, 2008; Noakes, 2009). Both project findings and literature indicated that many families have wartime stories of both civilian and military life, which are told and retold and passed on through generations (Noakes, 2009; Hunt, 2010; Eley, 2014). Participants stated that memorials allowed for a visible, physical medium by which stories could be more easily shared with other generations, and sparking dialogue around sensitive subject matter.

Project findings illustrate the cenotaph manifesting the intersection of individual, family memories and history. These findings are congruent with the literature review in which individual and family memories are woven together and become the collective memory, which maintains its continuity (Sivan, 1999; Noakes, 2009). Collective memory, national identity, and social cohesion all require a symbolically loaded and shared narrative, in order to retain official memory, which includes both social and historical narrative of the events (Ashplant et al., 2000; Doss, 2008). In turn, official memory can only retain its political effectiveness, if it continues to engage with individual memory. The cenotaph acts as a validation for future political actions and upholds the status quo. Project findings indicated curiosity around responsibility of maintaining memories alive, whether the practice is a private family based practice or a government initiative.

Participants who did not identify with the narrative associated with the cenotaph, stated it was difficult to oppose or be critical of what it represents, because the narrative is so deeply entrenched with a particular set of Canadian values. The exclusion and inclusion of narratives surfaced as a theme and a critical point of learning within both the project findings and consulted literature. Fournier, Loughridge, MacDonald, Sperduti, Tsimicalis, & Taber, (2012) argue that official war remembrance is too often militarized and masculinized in ways that work to exclude those who do not fit a specific Canadian ideal as represented through a prescribed collective memory (p. 41).

Project findings reflected that participants' main participation with the rituals of the cenotaph were during their time in public education. Further, participants stated they never practiced the ritual once they had the freedom to choose. Literature suggests that citizens learn how to remember past and current wars, in part through their interactions with the education system as well as politicized spaces such as the cenotaph where the narrative is focused on a single, specific, stereotyped version of history; one that is dominated by a certain type of discourse and white masculinity.

How community could respond to the diversity of citizens' experiences of conflict was another major theme that surfaced in the project findings. By examining the prescribed collective memories of war taught in the context of the Ontario education system, Fournier et al (2012) found that students who enter the education system with a culture and language

uncharacteristic of the Canadian identity may feel pressured to engage in the collective memory of their new country by being forced to choose between maintaining their own cultural diversity or engaging in the collective memory of Remembrance Day (p. 42). The diverse cultural identity, heritage, and related experiences may be displaced as a result, disregarded in favour of the publicly or politically approved narrative that works to perpetuate militarism (p. 43).

Representation

Participants discussed the conflicting feelings they held for the cenotaph space, as it symbolizes both a glorification of those who had died, and a larger framework of the glorification of war. Both project findings and consulted literature challenge how spaces such as the cenotaph contribute to perpetuating the divisions caused by conflict versus manifesting and reflecting peace (Viejo-Ross, 2011).

Project findings indicated that consideration needs to be given to addressing who is telling the story when exploring the message of the cenotaph. The findings support mindfulness of what perspective was favoured at the cost of other perspectives that are excluded. Differential access to power affects one's ability to influence prevailing narratives or project one's narratives into wider areas (Ashplant, Dawson, & Roper, 2000, p.21). The literature demonstrates that monuments contain strong narratives, influence identity, commemorating historical events that necessitate the centering of certain memories and the marginalization of others (Worthy, 2004; Fournier et al., 2012). The act and intention of remembrance can therefore offer a single and very specific narrative that does not allow for dialogue and encourages exclusion (Bold et al., 2002).

Participants felt affected by the missing names on the cenotaph plaques wanting to delve deeper into the reasons for the omissions. One participant stated the cenotaph represents those who benefit from the military industrial complex, and that those who identify with the narrative of the cenotaph might be aligned politically and narratively with the people in power who made omissions. Most participants stated they were not surprised by the omissions, based on legacy of systematic discrimination and oppression that continues to exist today.

Project findings and the literature indicate a need for greater inclusion of other roles, and experiences of conflict; participants explained interest in exploring the contributions made to the war effort traditionally overlooked by the social and culture constructs at the time. Participants reflected the difficulty in drawing the line in the context of inclusion of names. Stating there is a general lack of recognition of survivors; people who are traumatized, marginalized, and alienated. In Becker (2006) only heroes are remembered within the language of commemoration, often omitting innocent civilians' experiences of violence,

and brutality. The need to commemorate and remember victims marked a shift from the commemoration of soldiers to the memorialization of victims and civilians; deviating from traditional heroic notions of war, and instead focusing on the encapsulating the consequences of war (Beaty, 2009).

The learning opportunity reflected in both project findings and the literature is to garner mindfulness over what sorts of events, or people the community deems worthy of commemoration, meanwhile doing more for the living, the survivors and all those affected by violence. Further, a critical point of learning for this project is the need for more inclusive spaces of dialogue around spaces of healing across a broader spectrum of experiences, thereby shifting from war memorials to peace memorials.

Summary

The project findings and the literature highlight the relationship of commemorative spaces in physical form, spatiality, location, and connection to community and greater scope of the city. Research participants shared that the cenotaph represented a designated space for remembrance of loss, sacrifice, and the cost of the First and Second World Wars. To maintain relevance, and sacredness of space, a shift from passive public commemoration of traditional cenotaphs to more collaborative and engaging forms of commemoration based on human interaction was necessary.

Social ritual and ceremony were cited as a strong need for people in terms of commemoration, and participants choose for themselves what rituals fulfill their need. Project findings found that there is a diversity of ways to memorialize and remember events of the past exist that could be more inclusive and accessible in conjunction with traditional Remembrance Day ceremonies. Consideration needs to be given to address what is needed in public grieving and public memorialization.

The theme of commemorating one's own history, and connecting future generations to the stories of the past was frequently brought up. People's narratives and stories are re-negotiated, re-told, and re-shaped by context and time where history, memory, and identity intersect. Many families have wartime stories of both civilian and military life, which are told and retold and passed on through generations. However, they may or may not be recognized within the larger official record of memory. Narratives and identities are not static.

Participants who did not identify with the narrative stated it was difficult to oppose or be critical of what the cenotaph represents, because the narrative is deeply entrenched as the Canadian identity. Official war remembrance is often dominated by militarized and masculinized in ways that exclude those who do not fit a specific Canadian ideal as presented through a prescribed collective memory. A critical point of learning for this

project is the need for more inclusive spaces of dialogue around spaces of healing across a broader spectrum of experiences.

Differential access to power affects one's ability to influence prevailing narratives or project one's narratives into wider areas. There is a lack of recognition of survivors, and people with various roles and experiences of conflict. Consideration needs to be given to addressing how stories are told and explore what society deems as worthy of commemoration, and how the narrative of commemoration is upheld.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this project was to explore community perspectives pertaining to the engagement of citizens of Guelph in adding missing names to the cenotaph plaques, as well as investigating how citizens of Guelph identify with the space. Based on the research and analysis conducted in the project, this section provides five recommendations for the City of Guelph and respective departments. For immediate action: adapt the current changes need for the Roll of Honour plaques; create a sub-advisory committee for the inclusion of names to the cenotaph; utilize technology to create more interactive spaces; the creation of a public community art space with the mandate of building peace; and creating community spaces for storytelling. Key to the implementation of these recommendations are the following guidelines.

For Immediate Action

Cenotaph Policy and the Inclusion of Names

Names of those previously omitted from the Roll of Honour will be added. Names of those individuals currently listed on the Roll of Honour that were previously misspelt should be corrected. Further, the inclusion of the year of death should be added to each individual honoured to provide context for the community.

The City of Guelph will host a public ceremony of dedication of the names added, to ceremoniously honour those individuals. An invitation will be made to all local community members through a press release from the City of Guelph, which will be published online and in local newspapers. The City of Guelph will also send out personalized invitations to known family members of those who individuals whose names are to be added.

Creation of Sub-Advisory Committee for the Inclusion of Names to the Cenotaph Plaques

The City of Guelph is to create a sub-advisory committee under the Guelph Museums Advisory Committee for the inclusion of names to the cenotaph plaques. This committee mandate is to provide assistance and recommendations for the inclusion of missing names as the City of Guelph's Cenotaph Policy is implemented. The committee will be convened for the current missing names, and in the event that families or interested parties bring forward a name to be included on the cenotaph in the future.

Individuals from community groups (e.g. Guelph Neighbourhood Support Coalition, the Royal Canadian Legion), representatives from the 29th Field Battery Armoury, interested veterans, are strongly encouraged to apply to be part of the committee. The sub-committee will report to the Guelph Museums Advisory Committee, who will make recommendations to council.

Accessible Civic Education & Foster Spaces for Citizen Dialogue

The Community Connections Sub-Committee of the Guelph Museum Advisory Committee is to create accessible civic education and foster spaces for citizen dialogue a mandate. As part of engaging citizens with the narrative and stories of the cenotaph, technology should be utilized to encourage interaction with the space by making use of existing community resources.

Stories of people honoured on the cenotaph have been compiled by the Guelph Public Library- Famous Guelphite portal, as well as former writer of the Mercury Newspaper, Ed Butts. The creation of web and/or mobile applications would allow audiences to look up the people honoured on the cenotaph while visiting the space. The information would showcase the deceased's contribution to the war, where the person died, at what age, when it happened and other important facts. Along with the names of those honoured on the cenotaph, people who contributed to community during the time of the conflicts would also be listed on the web/mobile application.

Further, the committee is to explore how to offer more creative and innovative civic education resources that speak to more contemporary experiences of violence and conflict, and their intersection to the Second World War. This could include an oral history project, video project, and continued dialogue about the impact of conflict for the living.

For Action Within the Next Two Years

Making Public Space for Public Grief and Building Peace

The City of Guelph is to explore the creation of interactive art based commemorative space(s) that can acknowledge experiences of violence and war experienced by community members, and focus on reflections of peace. The interactive art space is to be a place where citizens feel they belong to a ritual of remembrance that necessitates peace. This will be done through the assistance of the existing Public Art Advisory Committee, that can facilitate the Community Art project, listed under the Guelph Public Art Policy.

Creating a space designed for expressions of peace that is safe and inclusive is important for representation, validation of experiences, and healing. This will require consultation with members of the community and community organizations that are relevant to the communities the space is to serve, particularly making an effort to collaborate with marginalized communities of Guelph.

When tragedy affects a community, reflections of public grief happen organically, motivated by healing, validation and grief. It is important that communities explore their own rituals without having one foisted upon them.

The public art installation is to be incorporated into a space that already exists thereby encouraging multi-purpose use. When defining what this art based commemorative space the Public Art Advisory Committee, artist and community must ensure:

- People easily walk to the space
- Pedestrian space, vehicles must not prevent individuals from easily getting to the space
- Making the space feel safe and for everyone
- Space has places to sit in the sun and shade
- Reflection of peace of all communities
- Critical analysis of narrative
- Ensuring that communities feel properly represented, and engaged in the process of creating it

Focusing on Creating Community Spaces for Storytelling and Experience Sharing

The City of Guelph in conjunction with the Guelph Museums are to support organizations in the community who are striving to create safe spaces for all citizens to talk about recent and past lived experiences of trauma, conflict, systematic violence, and reconciliation.

Storytelling is a powerful peacebuilding tool. Support is defined as financial assistance for the cost of running programming, the allowance of using City spaces for subsidized cost, as well as assistance with the creation of programming. Special focus given to programs that encourage restorative justice framework.

8. CONCLUSION

War memorials and cenotaphs across Canada can be found from the smallest towns to the largest cities. The memorials commit to upholding collective memory regarding social wounds afflicted by war and act to publicly acknowledge community members lost in active duty during time of war; to remember them. Cenotaphs are a space that activate national pride and showcase the need and desire for public forums of grief and commemoration. They are the venue for the intersection of history and memory, social trauma, and social discourse around collective narrative, memory and grief.

Being a static carved stone, aspects of the role of the cenotaph have changed over time. As urban landscapes change, communities are beginning to address how best to use public space. One wonders how people share space with these historical earmarks, how they can harness their longevity, and how to understand these spaces in their context, while making them relevant to the day-to-day lives of the citizens. For this reason, the inclusion of names once omitted from the Guelph cenotaph plaques was important. Further, creating a policy for the future inclusion of names on the cenotaph was a commitment to uphold the tradition and purpose of the cenotaph.

The project findings regarding the space showed that participants find value in practices of commemoration and choose for themselves what rituals fulfill that need. This sparked the need for dialogue over what is needed in public memorialization, and mindfulness of narrative and the stories told. Memorials hold power of official discourse. The critical point of learning for this project is the need for more inclusive spaces of dialogue and narrative as well as exploration as to what society deems as worthy of commemoration.

References

- Ahr, J. (2008). Memory and Mourning in Berlin: on Peter Eisenman's Holocaust-Mahnmal (2005). *Modern Judaism*, 28(3), 283–305. <http://doi.org/10.1093/mj/kjn015>
- Ashplant, T. G., Dawson, G., & Roper, M. (2000). The politics of war memory and commemoration: contexts, structures and dynamics. In T. G. Ashplant, G. Dawson, & M. Roper (Eds.), *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (pp. 3–85). New York: Routledge.
- Barron, D. S., Davies, S. P., & Wiggins, R. D. (2008). Social integration, a sense of belonging and the Cenotaph Service: old soldiers reminisce about Remembrance. *Aging & Mental Health*, 12(4), 509–16. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13607860802224268>
- Beaty, B. (2009). The Superhero Comic Book as War Memorial. In *War Memory and Popular Culture* (pp. 120–134).
- Becker, A. (2006). War Memorials. In *Europe Since 1914: Encyclopaedia of the Age of War and Reconstruction* (pp. 2695–2699). Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Bjorgvinsson, E., & Hansen, A. H. (2011). Mediating memory: Strategies of interaction in public art and memorials. *Journal of Arts & Communities*, 3(1), 3–22. <http://doi.org/10.1386/jaac.3.1.3>
- Bold, C., Knowles, R., & Leach, B. (2002). National Counter memories: Feminist Memorializing and Cultural Counter Memory: The Case of Marianne's Park. *Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28(1), 125–148. http://doi.org/10.1163/_afco_asc_2291
- Bonder, J., & Levinas, E. (n.d.). On Memory, Trauma, Public Space, Monuments, and Memorials, 62–70.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <http://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Clark, J. (2008). Challenging motoring functionalism Roadside memorials, heritage and history in Australia and New Zealand. *Journal of Transport History*, 29(1), 23–43. Retrieved from <http://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-57749123250&partnerID=tZOtx3y1>
- Clark, J., & Franzmann, M. (2006). Authority from Grief, Presence and Place in the Making of Roadside Memorials. *Death Studies*, 30(6), 579–599. <http://doi.org/10.1080/07481180600742574>

- Doss, E. (2008). War, memory, and the public mediation of affect: The National World War II Memorial and American imperialism. *Memory Studies*, 1(2), 227–250. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750698007088388>
- O'Flanagan, R. (2015, April 20). *Guelph Mercury*. Retrieved from Guelph creates policy for cenotaph Roll of Honour: <http://www.guelphmercury.com/news-story/5567574-guelph-creates-policy-for-cenotaph-roll-of-honour/>
- Fournier, G., Loughridge, J., MacDonald, K., Sperduti, V., Tsimicalis, E., & Taber, N. (2012). Learning to Commemorate: Challenging prescribed collective memories of war. *Social Alternatives*, 31(2), 41–45.
- Gough, P. (2000). From Heroes' Groves to Parks of Peace: Landscapes of remembrance, protest and peace. *Landscape Research*, 25(2), 213–228. <http://doi.org/10.1080/713684669>
- Gould, M. R., & Silverman, R. E. (2013). Stumbling upon history : collective memory and the urban landscape. *GeoJournal*, 78(5), 791–801. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-012-9466-6>
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On Collective Memory*. (L. A. Cose, Ed.). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hirsch, M. (2008). The Generation of Postmemory. *Poetics Today*, 29(1), 103–128. <http://doi.org/10.1215/03335372-2007-019>
- Hunt, N. C. (2010). *Memory, War and Trauma*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hutchinson, J. (2009). Warfare and the sacralisation of nations: the meanings, rituals and politics of national remembrance. *Journal of International Studies*, 38(2), 401–417. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0305829809347538>
- Johnson, N. C. (2002). Mapping monuments: the shaping of public space and cultural identities. *Visual Communication*, 1(3), 293–298. <http://doi.org/10.1177/147035720200100302>
- Low, P., & Oliver, G. (2012). Comparing Cultures of Commemoration in Ancient and Modern Societies. In P. Low, G. Oliver, & P. J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Cultures of Commemoration* (pp. 1–12). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lyon, G. (2007). Is it time to forget Remembrance? *Historical Association*, (September), 46–51.
- Marshall, D. (2004). Making sense of remembrance. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 5(1), 37–54. <http://doi.org/10.1080/1464936032000137975>

- Moffett, A. (2000). "We Will Remember Them": The Poetic Rewritings of Lutyens' Cenotaph 1. *War, Literature & the Arts*, 229–246.
- Noakes, L., & Pattinson, J. (2014). Introduction: "Keep calm and carry on": The Cultural memory of the Second World War in Britain. In L. Noakes & J. Pattinson (Eds.), *British Cultural Memory and the Second World War* (pp. 1–24). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Nash-Chambers, D. (2015). Memorializing Lieutenant-Colonel John McCrae Civic Commemoration and the 100th Anniversary of "In Flanders Fields". *Canadian Military History*, 24(1), 361-379.
- Nora, P. (1989). Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire. *Representations*, (Spring), 7–24. <http://doi.org/10.2307/2928520>
- Neuman, L. W. (1997). *Social research methods, qualitative and quantitative approaches* (Vol.3). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Ochsner, J. K. (1997). A Space of Loss: Memorial Veterans the Vietnam. *Journal of Architectural Education* (1984-), 50(3), 156–171.
- Opp, J., & Walsh, J. C. (2010). *Placing Memory and Remembering Place in Canada*. (J. Opp & J. C. Walsh, Eds.). Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Osborne, B. (2001). Landscapes, Memory, Monuments, and Commemoration: Putting Identity in its Place. *American: History and Life*, 33(3).
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Riegl, A. (1996). The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Essence and Its Development. In N. S. Price, K. Talley, & A. M. Vaccaro (Eds.), *Historical and Philosophical Issues in the Conservation of Cultural Heritage* (pp. 69–83). Los Angeles: The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Rigney, A. (2008). Divided pasts: A premature memorial and the dynamics of collective remembrance. *Memory Studies*, 1(1), 89–97. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750698007083892>
- Rothberg, M. (2010). Between Memory and Memory: From Lieux de mémoire to noeuds de mémoire. *Yale French Studies*, (118), 3–12.
- Schensul, S. L., Schensul, J. J., & LeCompte, M. D. (2013). *Initiating Ethnographic Research*. Lanham: AltaMira Press.

- Schramm, K. (2011). Introduction: Landscapes of Violence: Memory and Sacred Space. *History & Memory*, 23(1), 5–22. <http://doi.org/10.2979/histmemo.23.1.5>
- Shipley, R. (1987). *To Mark Our Place*. Toronto: NC Press Limited.
- Stanley, J. (2000). Involuntary commemoration: post-traumatic stress disorder and its relationship to war commemoration. In *The Politics of War Memory and Commemoration* (pp. 240–260). London: Routledge.
- Sturken, M. (1998). The Remembering of Forgetting: Recovered Memory and the Question of Experience. *Social Text*, 16(4), 103–125.
- Szpunar, P. M. (2010). Monuments, mundanity and memory: Altering “place” and “space” at the National War Memorial (Canada). *Memory Studies*. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750698010374286>
- Thelen, D. (1989). Memory and American History. *The Journal of American History*, 75(4), 1117–11129. <http://doi.org/10.2307/1908632>
- Tritle, L.A. (2012). The Vietnam Veterans Memorial. In P. Low, G. Oliver, & P. J. Rhodes (Eds.), *Cultures of Commemoration* (pp. 159–180). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tuan, Y.F. (1975). *American Geographical Society*, 65(2), 151–165. <http://doi.org/10.1038/126199a0>
- Viejo-Rose, D. (2011). Memorial functions: Intent, impact and the right to remember. *Memory Studies*, 4(4), 465–480. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1750698011411367>
- Worthy, S. (2004). Communities of Remembrance: Making Auckland’s War Memorial Museum. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 39(4), 599–618. <http://doi.org/10.1177/0022009404046756>

Appendices

Appendix A- Interview Questions

Reconciling the Guelph Cenotaph
Sonia Preisler (Master of Dispute Resolution)
(School of Public Administration- University of Victoria)

- 1) Information about you: Your age now? How long have you lived in Guelph? Do you work in Guelph? Do you have family who are serving or have served in the National Defense and Canadian Armed Forces?
- 2) What does the cenotaph conjure for you? What does it mean to you?
- 3) When is the last time you passed it or took notice of it? What was your experience?
- 4) Do you attend Remembrance Day service there? Why or why not? If so, do you identify with the community you find present there? Why or why not? What do you would entice you to come in the future? Do you feel the space is accessible?
- 5) Who or what do you think is represented on cenotaph plaques? What does seeing the names of soldiers mean to you?
- 6) In your opinion, who would you like to see represented on the plaque?
 - a) Do you think anybody else should be there? Why or why not?
 - b) If so, have you submitted the name to the City of Guelph? Or would you submit the name?
 - c) If answered yes to (b). What has stopped you?
- 7) Do you have relatives who have been honoured on a cenotaph or other war memorial? If so, do you know why they were honoured? What does that mean to you? Have you been to this place? Do you want to visit this place?
- 8) Families live in different cities; people move for jobs more readily; and some may argue that the notation of 'hometown' has changed. For example, Joanna was born in Bancroft but moved to Ottawa when she was ten. Her parents were separated, so Joanna spent equal time living in both places. In university Joanna moved to Guelph, which became her own community. If Joanna died in active duty and was to be honoured on a cenotaph, where do you think she should be honoured? What is your reasoning behind it? (is there the same need for cenotaphs now?) (what avenues exist now to commemorate someone who is not coming back?)
- 9) Do you identify with the narrative associated with the Guelph Cenotaph? Why or why not?

10) Inconsistencies were recently found on the Guelph Cenotaph. A citizen did some research and found that the names of deceased were honoured at the Commonwealth War Graves Commission in Ottawa, however were missing from the Guelph Cenotaph. Furthermore, it appears that the excluded names were omitted at the time due to discrimination based on gender, race, and socio-economic status.

- a) What did you think when you realized what had happened?
- b) What impact has this incident had on the Guelph community?
- c) What do you think needs to happen to make things right?

11) What does inclusion on the Guelph cenotaph mean to you? What would you change about it?

12) City of Guelph has recently recommended that: “the names of any members of the Canadian Forces from Guelph, who have died as a result of their military service, will be added to the Guelph Cenotaph in honour of their service”. This will allow for the inclusion of those who participated in peacekeeping or other NATO activities, in addition to those who served during a declared war or conflict. What are your impressions of these recommendations?

13) 100 years from now, what will the cenotaph conjure for people? Will it have the same relevance?

Is there something important we forgot? Is there anything else you think I need to know about the Guelph Cenotaph?