

LANCASTER  
UNIVERSITY

Department of Philosophy



THE THINGMOUNT WORKING PAPER SERIES ON  
THE PHILOSOPHY OF CONSERVATION

**In this Very Place:  
War Memorials and Landscapes as  
an Experienced Heritage**

by

**Petri J. RAIVO**

TWP 99-07



ISSN: 1362 - 7066 (Print)  
ISSN: 1474 - 256X (On-line)

# **In this Very Place: War Memorials and Landscapes as an Experienced Heritage**

**Dr. Petri J. Raivo**  
**(Department of Geography, University of Oulu)**

Values and meanings attached to the landscape are cultural agreements about what is supposed to be seen or allowed to be seen. Landscapes have had and they still have, an important role as a part of the process of building national ideologies and identities. Thus places and landscapes that possess a certain relevance for a nation's history and heritage have usually been denoted as essential codes of a national signifying system.

The landscapes of war and conflict — such as battlefields, remains of military constructions and memorials — are fundamental parts of the national iconography of modern states, and thus they are also an essential part of the processes of preservation, re-creation and representation that belong to post-modern heritage-making and the tourism that has become attached to it. Museums, sites and milieux connected with wars have become more visible as tourist attractions during the last decade and at the same time these landscapes have been changed in form and existence. Along with traditional memorials and battlefield relics new kinds of re-structured replica landscapes and simulacrum milieux have appeared.

A landscape is always a landscape for somebody. It has its makers, authors, readers and spectators that produce, re-produce and represent cultural and historic signifying processes. This paper will discuss how these different types of heritage landscape are re-presented and re-produced and what cultural meanings and ideological aspects are related to them.

# **In this Very Place: War Memorials and Landscapes as an Experienced Heritage**

**Ph.D. Petri J. Raivo**  
**Department of Geography, Oulu University, Finland**  
e-mail: p.raivo@oymnt5.oulu.fi

## **Historical landscapes as remainders of memories**

The phrases ‘landscape as a text’ and ‘the iconography of landscape’ are frequently used in the sphere of contemporary landscape studies. Both of these metaphors emphasise the coincident existence of cultures in their social contexts and the representation of their ideological and symbolic values as a part of landscape reading and interpretation. This means that the traditional concept of the cultural landscape only as an areal container of visible cultural elements has been supplemented with the concept of a landscape as an intersubjective mental construction consisting of meanings and symbols which express the individual, communal and social values of a particular culture. Thus a landscape is understood as ‘a way of seeing’ - a communicative device in which the reproduction of meanings, values and social order is mediated. (Raivo 1997.)

The values and meanings attached to a landscape are cultural agreements about what is supposed to be seen or allowed to be seen in it. Landscapes have had, and they still have, an important role among the processes of building a national ideology and identity. Thus places and landscapes that possess a certain relevance for a nation’s history and heritage have usually been denoted as essential codes in the national signifying system. (Raivo 1996: 107-109.)

The value of a historical landscape is composed of the past of its places (Morphy 1995). The past is represented both through relics and traits as well as through names, meanings and stories. In other words, a historical landscape is ‘both material and meaning’, physical marks left behind by history as well as meanings and interpretations related to them (Baker 1992: 3). The historical landscape is also a landscape of memory, a surface inscribed by historical signs and stories to strengthen, direct and validate both a personal and a collective memory of its places (Kühler 1995: 86).

Still, despite all the layers of the past, the fundamental phenomenon of the historical landscape is its present nature and thus its engagements with the present day. As David Lowenthal reminds us, landscapes exist here and now and thus the past related to them is always to be interpreted from the present (Lowenthal 1975; 1985). Historical relics, monuments and memorials, for example, are situated temporarily in a remembered or imagined past but geographically in a present-day landscape. The primal function of these historical reminders is not to keep or preserve the past but re-waken it and celebrate it (Lowenthal 1979: 121; Heffernan 1995). This awakening is done from the present and it is not unchangeable. On the contrary, the meanings and historical narratives related to places and landscapes are part of continuous processes of reproduction and representation. There is always a story inside a historical landscape and it is not a matter of indifference how this story is told.

## **War sites and landscapes as part of a national heritage**

The narrative of European history is first and foremost a history of wars and warfare. In many cases our knowledge of the past is nothing more than a list of wars and territories won or lost,

names and years of battles fought and peaces made. Wars and their consequences are also visible in the European landscape. Historical battlefields and defence structures, statues of heroes and victors and memorials and cemeteries are all fundamental parts of the historical layers of our physical and symbolic environment.

War history is a part of the landscape everywhere in Europe, and war memorials are probably the most widespread mode of European public statuary (Davies 1993: 112). In some areas such as the famous battle zones of the First World War in Flanders, Verdun, Marne, Passchendale and Somme, the memory and recollection are still a highly visible part of the local cultural landscape (Winter 1995, 1). In many cases the names of battlefields or sites of suffering are still metaphors and metonyms of the history related to them. It is hardly possible to think about place names like Waterloo, Stalingrad or Aushwitz as empty words, sounds without meanings.

The historical landscapes of war and conflict — such as battlefields, remains of military constructions, memorials and graveyards — are fundamental parts of the national iconography of modern states. Famous battlefields such as Hastings (1066), Gettysburg (1863), Verdun (1916) or the Raate Road (1939) in Finland are places that possess a certain relevance for a nation's history and heritage. And it is not only battlefields that have usually been denoted as essential codes of a national signifying system but war also memorials and cemeteries. It is not so important whether these sites stand for victory or defeat, the important thing is that they represent a nationalistic past. They stand there not just for their own sake but to — regardless of its pitfalls and mythological aspects — evince a nationalistic narrative of unified history and culture from past time up to the present day.

Externally these monuments are usually little more than engraved or cut stones in the landscape, but through state rituals they are invested with national soul and memory (Young 1993: 2). Thus, monuments can be seen as national landscapes of their own. Representations of historical narratives inscribed on the physical environment for a particular purpose. Generally, war memorials should be read as the lapidary texts of a bellicognisant Western culture, in which war is a dominant part of human socialisation (Davies 1993: 122).

### **Battlefields and the politics of representation**

Places and landscapes related to wars are usually described as sites with a strong sense of place. As a part of nationalistic narrative and memory, they are often described as mystical places where it is still possible to experience imagined visions and sounds of the past.

”To visit Naseby, for example, on a late summer afternoon is a strangely moving experience, and it takes no great effort of the imagination to see Cromwell's Ironsides charging and routing Prince Rupert's cavalry, to hear the thunder of their hoofs, the cries of soldiers and the crackle of musket fire.”  
(Neuburg 1972, 93)

But is it really the case that battlefields evokes such a strong sense of place? In fact, visiting an actual battlefield is in many cases an anticlimax, or at least something different from what you expected. The meanings are not created ex nihilo. The historical landscape is thus a part of memory made visible by somebody, and usually for a purpose. The sense of place is never created by place itself, for alongside it meanings and imaginations related to the site are created, represented and maintained. The spirit of a place, genius loci, depends on what spirits, or in the case of battlefields perhaps ghosts, we are willing to see, hear and feel.

The battlefield of Naseby, where according to Neuberg the crackle of musket fire and the thunder of hoofs are still a part of the contemporary soundscape, is not an exception. The battle of Naseby that took place on July 14th, 1645, was a remarkable event in British history, a turning point of the English Civil War. It was at Naseby that the Parliamentary troops gained a decisive victory over the Royalists, taking over 5000 prisoners, capturing the King's artillery and annihilating Prince Rupert's experienced cavalry, the backbone of the Royalist army. After Naseby King Charles I could no longer raise an army capable of threatening the victory of Oliver Cromwell and the Parliamentarians. The tactical details of the battle of Naseby are well known and the battle itself can be placed in the context of the history of the Civil War. In other words, the aura of place is manifested only if its past is known and if people wish to remember this past or some part of it. The historical landscape needs its story. Without a story and its interpretations there are no ghosts and no sense of place.

Naseby is not only a significant part of the history of the English Civil War (1642-51), it is also a remarkable part of the nationalistic history of Britain, a victory for parliamentarianism — the very symbol of modern Britain — over absolutism. Naseby is thus a place that has a certain connection with our own time through the nationalistic rhetoric, a place where the history of England, and thus the history of present-day British society, was created. Consequently it is not wonder that Naseby is one of those battles that has been of a certain importance in British history, in the national curriculum and heritage. Interpretation from the present is typical feature to all historical sites and landscapes.

Another important factor that has helped to create such a strong sense or experience of place is the fact that the physical environment of Naseby has hardly changed. The old battlefield can be traced almost in the same condition in which it 'really' was over three and half centuries ago. The place is also marked. The site can be found from maps and, what is the most important in the national register of historical battlefields. The Naseby obelisk was erected in 1825, and some years ago a museum and visitor centre were built to maintain, recreate and support the sense of the place. In this centre the visitor can study the different phases of the battle or admire both archaeological finds from the battlefield and replicas of the old armour and arms. There is also an exhibition, a multimedia presentation and of course a gift shop. And if the visitors have arrived at the right time in the season they can watch one of the live heritage re-enactments shows in which the battle of Naseby is refought.

In other words, there are certain factors or processes that make it possible to see historical landscapes, such as Naseby or other battlefields through the present day. These factors may be identified as processes of 1) marking 2) naming 3) seeing and 4) controlling.

## **Marking**

Historical places, landscapes or milieux are always marked in one way or another. Without marking these places would not exist in our present-day landscapes. In most cases the marking of historical sites means that we equip them with memorials, signposts and other informative symbols. After that, we know that we are in a place of significance from the past because the wording on the memorial or signpost tells us so. Thus marking also means that the place is distinguished from its present environment. The marker emphasises its special antiqueness by contrast with its unsignposted present-day environs and diminishes the antique artefact's continuity with its surroundings (Lowenthal 1979: 109-110). These places marked with signposts thus gain the special meanings of historical sights. We stand in front of them as we do displays in

museums or exhibitions. Marking can also take place indirectly, e.g. through maps, tourist brochures and literature. In the absence of markers on the ground we mentally erect our own: yes there it is, or there it was, in the right place, standing out from the present-day things around it (Lowenthal 1979: 112).

Marking forms the message related to the place and thus guides the eyes of the observers. The signposts telling us what we should pay attention to, what we should see and in which direction we should look. In many cases we would not even know of the existence of historical sites without these signs to remind us (Lowenthal 1979: 109-110). This is particularly true in the case of former battlefields. A battlefield, an otherwise undifferentiated area of land, becomes an ideologically encoded landscape through the commemorative function of the "marker". As a marker inscribes war onto material soil, it becomes the sight (Diller & Scofidio 1994: 48).

The process of marking also means an attempt to convince us of the genuineness of the sight. It lends more credibility to the landscape. Because this place is marked, the battle was really fought here. The marking of the place, whether accurate or not, is a certificate of an authentic place and thus guarantees an authentic experience. For example, most of the visitors to Bosworth Field are not disturbed at all by the fact that it did not occur in the precise place where the signpost says that it did. They don't mind that the crown of Richard III fell on some other spot. It was still the most fascinating battle of the War of the Roses, and we have all seen the film in which Laurence Olivier meets his fate ("A horse! A horse! My kingdom for a horse!"). In fact the whole idea of false marking is a very annoying matter because it can confuse our experience. Polyphonic interpretations and doubts only confuse and diminish the experience created by the signpost and other markers. Thus, regarding our sense of place, where historical sites and landscapes are concerned "The image is everything and accuracy nothing. Obey your image!"

## **Naming**

The naming of a place is one means of marking it, and thus an important factor in creating a sense of place. A place must have a name in order to be remembered, for without a name there is no place. In many cases it is the name of the place that brings associations to our minds. On the other hand, it can happen that all we have left from historical events are place names.

The naming of battlefields is usually a task for future generations or commentators. The fighters themselves are not so clear as to what to call their battle. There are many possibilities for choosing a name. We could use the name of the general area or that name of the specific location where the main action took place. It could be named after a nearby river, wood or village, or something else could be found to add connotations to the name. Hence, the naming of a battlefield is not just a chance event. It is usually a process where the will to control the memory of the place is very much involved.

It is typical for sites of battles, and thus the names of battlefields, to be chosen in order to support the national interpretation of the historical narrative. A good example is the famous battle of Tanneberg in 1914, where Hindenburg and his German troops gained a decisive victory over the Russian army. It is generally known by this name, even though geographically the exact location of the battlefield is not at the site called Tanneberg. The name was chosen not because of the accurate location but for historical reasons. The name refers back to the earlier battle of Tanneberg, also called the battle of Grunefelde, or Grunwald, fought in 1410. Although this first battle ended in a major Polish-Lithuanian victory over the Knights of the Teutonic Order, it became one of the cornerstones among the German national history, a symbol of the everlasting battle between Slavic and Germanic nations in the eastern frontier zone. Thus, by naming the

victory of 1914 on the eastern front the battle of Tanneberg the Germans ensured that it could be associated with the everlasting mythical campaign between east and west. And this time it was Germans' turn to win!

The naming of battlefields for nationalistic reasons is a typical phenomenon everywhere where wars have been fought in areas related to real or imagined national territories. In the case of Finnish history, for example, almost all the battles that took place in Russian Eastern Karelia between 1941 and 1944 are known by their Finnish place names. Name is an important part of the memory and identity of places.

## **Seeing**

The visible marks and relics of historical landscapes will help us to remember. On former battlefields any visible constructions related to war, such as remnants of fortifications, pits, graves or ruins, are important documents to confirm that the place is real. Nowadays archaeological finds also make up an important part of the visibility of historical battlefields. Sometimes they are so important that they are used as the backbone of the collections and exhibits in the museums and visitor centres built at the sites.

In many cases, however, visible marks are rare or totally lacking. This sense of emptiness can be problematic for our experience of place. The names and the history related to the places feed our imagination, but the lack of visible evidence can awaken us to the reality. We must see the past if we want to feel it. Visible relics such as ruins or archaeological finds are so important because they dramatise the historical narrative of their places or landscapes, and by doing this they create, maintain and represent the sense of these places. And not only historical relics do that. Nowadays these are visitor centres, museums and replica landscapes to are create this sense of place and they usually doing so as well or even better than the original remains from the past.

## **Controlling**

Political control over the battlefield is an essential part of the victory, both that achieved in the battle itself and that attained later by symbolic dominance over the site. Control over the battlefield means in effect interaction between these two. During the Middle Ages this interaction was closely linked to physical control over the battlefield. The winning side had to be able to control the place for a certain formal length of time. There were also some formal rituals, such as eating, counting of the dead, official recording of both sides' losses and of course after-treatment of the casualties, including burring of the bodies on the battlefield. According chronicles, for example, after the battle of Hastings (1066) "Duke William ate and drank among the dead, and made his bed that night upon the field. The next day, he ordered the Norman dead to be buried" (St John Parker 1996: 17).

Control over the battlefield, and thus control over the narrative related to the place, could be strengthened by marking the site with visible memorials such as crosses, chapels or churches, or with signs and information boards as we do today. The battle of Hastings is again a very good example of this kind of control. After the battle, Duke William, from then on William the Conqueror, founded Battle Abbey on the site, and tradition relates that the high altar of the Abbey marks the spot where King Harold planted his standards and where he made his final stand (Smurthwaite 1989: 65). Thus the function of Battle Abbey was to commemorate the battle and honour the memory of King Harold, but above of all to celebrate William's victory. It is this

control that establishes whose interpretation is right, who has the privilege to say what should be remembered and how.

Hence historical places and landscapes and their meanings have never arisen for nothing. On the contrary, they are a part of wider social discourses and the reading and interpretation practises associated with these. These discourses act as frameworks that include particular combinations of narratives, concepts, myths, ideologies and signifying practices, each relevant to a particular realm of social action. They can enable and constrain meanings by constituting the limits within which ideas and practices are considered to be natural. The meanings of places are always contested or negotiated, and in the case of historical battlefields control over these meanings is usually very tangible. A landscape is always a landscape for somebody. It has its makers, authors, readers and spectators, who both produce and re-produce the cultural and historic signifying processes attached to it.

## **Finnish war landscapes and the national war heritage**

### **Five years and three wars**

The above is also very true in the case of Finland. The territory of contemporary Finland is literally covered with battle sites, memorials, remains of defence structures, boundary stones, trenches, pits, graves and other sites and memories of previous wars. Especially important and visible is the memory of the Second World War. It has been said that the Second World War was and still is the great narrative of the Finns (Haataja 1994: 9).

In many ways the experience and heritage of the Second World War is still a part of the Finns' everyday lives: and thus — whether they like it or not — part of their everyday cultural, social, temporal and spatial experiences. The Finns come across signs of those who participated in the war everywhere: in their ideas and values, in their literary works and books, in their memories and memorials (Haataja 1994: 9). The Second World War has also left its signs in the Finnish landscape. The remains of old battlefields in Eastern and Northern Finland and hundreds of war memorials and cemeteries all over the country are part of the local historical landscape and thus a part of the local memory and heritage. In other words, the war is still a part of the Finnish collective memory both social and geographical.

### **Commemorative landscapes: inscribed narratives of the nation**

The most definite parts of the collective memory in Finland are the commemorative landscapes, such as the war cemeteries and memorials. One of the main reasons for building memorials is the idea that they will last for generations to come. Thus, a war memorial is also an act of remembrance. It is a social and physical arrangement of space and artifacts intended to keep alive the memories and ideas of generations who participated in the war (Mayo 1988: 62).

Externally, these monuments are usually nothing more than engraved or cut stones erected in the landscape, but through the state rituals they are invested with a national soul and memory and can be regarded as national landscapes of their own, representations of historical narratives inscribed on the physical environment for a specific purpose (Young 1993: 2). In Finland the most typical war memorial is the cemetery for those fallen in the war in the local churchyard. Each of these acts as an icon and the symbol of the war. The burying of soldiers killed in action



in the cemeteries of their home parishes was a particularly Finnish phenomenon and institution, and about 83 000 soldiers are buried in 622 such graveyards all over the country.

Another traditional type of commemorative landscape feature is a monument. In Finland the erecting of war monuments began at the same time as the establishment of memorial cemeteries, but the process has been slower and is still going on. In fact, half of the monuments of this kind have been erected since 1975, and more than 30% between the years 1985 and 1995. Usually monuments are erected for commemorate particular battle sites, certain military detachments, especially severe civil casualties suffered during the war. Some of them are specific to the places where they are located but most of them can be found in areas other than where the actual events took place. As mentioned earlier, the principal function of a monument is not necessarily to preserve the past of its site but to celebrate the memory of a historical event.

The primary function of these commemorative landscapes at the time of their creation was to be a part of the mourning process. Finnish war cemeteries were built, like the memorials to the First World War in England, to act as places of personal and collective grief and veneration. They were places where local people could mourn their loved ones. On the other hand, they are also places of invented traditions and rituals, e.g. Veterans' day in Finland (also a day for remembering the fallen), Day of Finnish Defensive Forces and Independence Day, all of which have gained national meanings from the experiences of wars fought over fifty years ago. On these remembrance days, as also at Christmas, thousands of candles are lit in the war cemeteries all over the country. Thus these places of private mourning also serve as places of collective recollection of the war, places where both the local community and the nation at large is worshipping itself through the 'cult of the fallen' (see e.g. Mosse 1990).

The sense of nationalism — the ideology of belonging to the nation — is an essential part of war remembrance. Commemorative landscapes can be seen as part of the imagined geography of the nation and of its narrative. As mentioned earlier war memorials stand there not just for their own sake but to evince a national narrative of unified history and culture from the past time up to the present day. Commemorative landscapes are sites where national narratives and their lessons become inscribed on landscape (Foote 1997: 113). In the case of Finland, like every nation state elsewhere, the keywords of these national lessons are sacrifice, unity, victory and the enemy.

## **SACRIFICE**

The Second World War was a great tragedy for Finland. In fact it was not just one war, as the Finns fought three separate wars during the years 1939-1945: 1) the Winter War against the Soviet Union in 1939-1940, 2) the Continuation War against the Soviet Union in 1941-1944 as a cobelligerent with Germany, and 3) the Lapland War of 1944-1945 against Germany, to drive the Wehrmacht troops out of Lapland. Some 93 000 Finnish soldiers were killed in action and a further 200 000 or so were wounded (out of a population of less than five million). Finland had to cede some of its eastern territories to the Soviet Union (about 10 % of its total area) and gave rise to 423 000 Karelian refugees (representing 11% of the country's population) who had to be re-settled in the remaining parts of Finland.

## **UNITY**

The Second World War was the turning point that showed that Finland could stand as a united, sovereign nation against an overwhelming enemy. When the Finns talk of the spirit or the miracle of the Winter War, for example, they are referring so much to the decisive victories that they scored over the Red Army as to the unity of the nation that made those victories possible. According this narrative, the whole nation stood as one against the enemy when the Winter War began, which was quite surprising since the war broke out only 20 years after Finnish

independence and a bloodthirsty, cruel civil war that had divided society and filled people with mistrust and bitterness.

### **VICTORY**

According to the Finnish national narrative, they did not lose the war, although they were on the side of the losers and had to cede territories. After all, and again according to the nationalistic narrative, the outcome of the war a successful defence, in that the Finnish troops were able to frustrate the strategic aims of the Red Army to conquer and occupy the territory of Finland (in 1940 and 1944) and their attempts to overthrow Scandinavian way of life and traditions of democracy. Finland was never occupied by foreign forces. In fact there were only three European capitals that were involved in the Second World War which can make this claim: London, Moscow and Helsinki.

### **THE ENEMY**

The Finns themselves see no real differences between the three wars they had to fight during 1939-1945, because the image of the enemy was always the same (the Russians and the Soviet Union) and the threat was always the same (the loss of independence). The 1941-44 war is known in Finland as the 'Continuation War' because it is understood as an extension of the Winter War and an attempt to compensate for the losses suffered in that war. Moreover, in the Finnish national mythology the Second World War can be seen as a continuation of all previous conflicts between east and west that have taken place in the 'imagined territories of Finland'. It has been estimated that during the last 800 years there had been 20 wars or serious conflicts between east and west on the soil of present-day Finland.

### **Battlefields and museums: landscapes of tourism and heritage**

The historical landscapes of war and conflict are also an essential part of the processes of preservation, re-creation and representation that belong to contemporary heritage-making and the tourism that has become attached to it. As heritage has become more closely linked with tourism, the diversity of the sites, which are described as parts of that 'heritage' has increased. The term heritage in tourism has essentially come to mean landscapes, natural history, buildings, artefacts, cultural traditions and the like which are literally or metaphorically passed on from one generation to another and which can be portrayed as tourist products for promotion purposes. Heritage exists through interpretation. Historical reality does not pop up from the remains of the past; it has to be re-enacted. Heritage is a product of the present and is made for present needs, and sometimes these needs are no more than plain marketing (Schouter 1995).

The concept of nostalgia — a longing for something past — is an essential part of the interpretation of heritage. This longing includes a measure of escapism from the present to past times and places and a longing for the social structures and values related to them (Kong & Yeoh 1995: 17-18). It is a sense of nostalgia, rather than a need to understand, which makes heritage so attractive (Herbert 1995: 9). It has even been said that it was nostalgia and a sense of escapism that generated the whole heritage industry (Light 1995: 132).

This new heritage-making and sense of nostalgia has also emerged in Finland lately, where museums, sites and milieux connected with the Second World War have been become more visible tourist attractions during the last decade. There have been many reasons for this, of which the collapse of the Soviet Union is certainly one. The public atmosphere in Finland has become much less restrained since the disappearance of the country's communist neighbour, and there has been a lot of discussion in Finnish society since the late 1980's regarding the history and

outcome of the Second World War. One especially important aspect has been to reassess the history related to the battles of summer 1944. Nowadays even the official and formal interpretation of the outcome of the war is that it was a successful defence and not a defeat. The Finns have always been highly aware of their past and very proud of it. What is new is the louder and more visible patriotism that has swept across the country, especially among the younger generation.

During the last ten years war landscapes, especially former battle sites, have undergone very obvious changes or transitions on account of the new demands of the heritage industry and heritage tourism, and at the same time, these landscapes have altered in form and existence.

After the war some of the battle sites left within Finnish territory gained the status of protected areas of historical value. These preservation, conservation and protection processes also marked the beginning of heritage tourism with respect to the Finnish war landscapes, although this tourism maintained a very low profile until the 1980's, mostly restricted to marking places, erecting signposts, and repairing some trenches. What has happened since the 1980's is that more strident tourist and heritage-making measures have been taken in relation to the battle sites. One mark of this active production consists of the new heritage centres constructed in the old battlefield areas at which the past of the place can be presented and experienced through the medium of exhibitions (Walsh 1995, 105). A good example of this transformation is the famous battle site of Raate, where a small but highly motivated detachment of Finnish troops encircled and destroyed two Red Army Divisions (22 000 men) at the end of the year 1939. Earlier there had been a Raate Winter War exhibition in one classroom of what had previously been the local primary school, but in mid 1980's a new visitor centre 'The Gateway to Raate' (Raateen Portti) was built to cater for 25 000 visitors annually, mostly during the summer season.

Another phenomenon related to the battlefields is the emergence of new heritage sites. The famous sites of the Winter War such as the Raate Road have been part of the Finnish tourist circuit for the last 50 years. What is new is the publicity given to the sites used in summer 1944 to prevent Red Army breakthroughs into the main territory of Finland. Even unused fortification lines such as Salpalinja are now regarded as having been final lines of defence in summer 1944 and thus major local tourist attractions.

From the point of view of tourist marketing and heritage-making the problem has been that there are relatively few battle sites left inside Finnish territory. Most of the Winter War battle sites and almost all those of the Continuation War are situated on the Russian side of the border. Until recently these areas were beyond the reach of tourists. To compensate for this lack of material and to create a new type of memorial to honour the generation who fought in those wars, heritage sites such as re-structured replica landscapes and simulacrum milieux, have been built. These replicas of dugouts and trenches intended to act as substitutes for the former battle sites have emerged all over Finland, but particularly in Southern and Western Finland, far away from the historical front lines of the Second World War. These places are both replicas and simulacrums, copies of structures that were situated or are supposed to have been situated, somewhere else. These bunker constructions usually carry the status of a museum. In a reality, most of them are more like heritage centres, usually established to represent a very specific theme from the past, which can often be described as pseudo-historic, or sanitised and perfected history. These sites are thus a part of a reinvented nationalistic heritage and its aims to (re)create places of memory to support its narrative.

Replica landscapes and simulacrums, visitor centres and these new kind of war museums are of course representations of the nationalistic narrative and lessons of sacrifice, unity, victory and

the enemy. What is new is that now all that has been wrapped in a cloak of experience, entertainment and fun. Thus, the politics of memory has become a part of the politics of representation.

## REFERENCES:

- Baker, Alan R. H. (1992). Introduction: On Ideology and Landscape. In Alan R. H. Baker & Gideon Biger (eds.): *Ideology And Landscape in Historical Perspective: Essays on the Meanings of Some Places in the Past*, pp. 1-15. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Davies, John (1993). War memorials. In David Clark (ed.): *The Sociology of Death: Theory, Culture, Practise*, pp. 112-128. Blackwell, Cornwall.
- Diller, Elizabeth & Scofidio, Ricardo (1994). Suitcase Studies: The Production of a National Past, pp. 32-107. In Elizabeth Diller and Ricardo Scofidio (eds.): *Visite Aux Armées: Tourismes de Guerre // Back to the Front: Tourism of War*, pp. 32-107. F.R:A.C. Basse-Normandie.
- Foote, Kenneth E. (1997). *Shadowed Ground: America's Landscapes of Violence and Tragedy*. University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Haataja, Lauri (1994). Rauha ja sota. In Lauri Haataja (ed.): *Ja Kuitenkin Me Voitimme: Sodan Muisto ja Perintö*, pp. 7-10. Kirjayhtymä, Helsinki.
- Heffernan, Michael (1995). For ever England: the western front and the politics of remembrance in Britain. *Ecumene* 2: 3, pp. 293-323.
- Herbert, David T. (1995). Heritage Places, Leisure and Tourism. In Herbert, David T. (ed.): *Heritage, Tourism and Society*, pp. 1-20 Mamsell, Great Britain.
- Kong, Lily & Yeoh, Brenda S. A. (1995). The Meanings and Making of Place: Exploring History, Community and Identity. In Brenda S. A. Yeoh & Lily Kong (eds.): *Portraits of Place: History, Community and Identity in Singapore*, pp. 12-23. Times Editions, Singapore.
- Kühler, Susanne (1995). Landscape as Memory: The Mapping of Process and its representations in a Melanesian society. In Barbara Bender (ed.): *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, pp. 85-106. Berg, USA.
- Light, Duncan (1995). Heritage as Informal Education. In Herbert, David T. (ed.): *Heritage, Tourism and Society*, pp. 117-145 Mamsell, Great Britain.
- Lowenthal, David (1975). Past time, present place: landscape and memory. *The Geographical Review* 64: 1, pp. 1-36.
- Lowenthal, David (1979). Age and Artefact. In D. W. Meinig (ed.): *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays*, pp. 104-128. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Lowenthal, David (1985). *The Past is a Foreign Country*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Mayo, James M. (1988). War memorials as political memory. *Geographical Review* 78:1, pp. 62-75.
- Morphy, Howard (1995). Colonialism, History and the Construction of Place: The Politics of Landscape in Northern Australia. In Barbara Bender (ed.): *Landscape: Politics and Perspectives*, pp. 205-244. Berg, USA.
- Mosse, George L. (1990). *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Neuburg, Victor E. (1972). *The Past We See Today*, Oxford University Press, London.
- Raivo, Petri J. (1996). Maiseman kulttuurinen transformaatio. *Ortodoksinen kirkko suomalaisessa kulttuurimaisemassa*. *Nordia Geographical Publications* 25:1.
- Raivo, P. J. (1997). The limits of tolerance: the Orthodox milieu as an element in the Finnish cultural landscape, 1917-1939. *Journal of Historical Geography* 23: 3 pp. 327-339.
- Schouter, Frans F. J. (1995). Heritage as Historical Reality. In David T. Herbert (ed.): *Heritage, Tourism and Society*, pp. 21-31. Mamsell, Great Britain.

Smurthwaite, David (1993). *The Complete Guide to the Battlefields of Britain: With Ordnance Survey Maps*, Michael Joseph Limited, Singapore.

St John Parker, Michael (1996). *William the Conqueror and the Battle of Hastings*, Pitkin Guides.

Walsh, Kevin (1995). *The Representation of the Past. Museums and Heritage in the Post-Modern World*, Routledge, London.

Winter, Jay (1995). *Sites of Memory. Sites of Mourning: the Great War in european Cultural History*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Young, James E. (1993). *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*, Yale University Press. New Haven and London.