

Introduction

Selena Daly, Martina Salvante, Vanda Wilcox

Perhaps the most famous of all English-language First World War poems begins with a powerful evocation of landscape: “In Flanders Fields the poppies blow / Between the crosses, row on row.” John McCrae’s 1915 reflection on a comrade’s death, which became instantly popular upon its first publication, gave rise to the enduring use of the poppy as a symbol which resonates across the nations of the former British Empire as an emblem of the Great War.¹ It is a symbol which is profoundly embedded in landscape: beyond its evocative blood-red colour and innate fragility, resonant of life and death in war, the flower is rooted in the soil in which the war dead are interred. Without this inextricable tie to the earth and the battlefields upon which it blooms and where men died, it would lose its resonance. The overwhelmingly popular artwork by Paul Cummins and Tom Piper, installed at the Tower of London in 2014 and subsequently sent to tour the United Kingdom made this link explicit: entitled *Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red*, the installation consisted of 888,246 red ceramic poppies, each symbolising a British or colonial soldier killed in the war (figure 1.1). They flowed in a seemingly unstoppable tide across the ground, like a spreading pool of blood on the earth.

<FIGURE 1.1 ABOUT HERE>

Blood Swept Lands and Seas of Red, 9 August 2014. Wikipedia CC BY 3.0
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Blood_Swept_Lands_and_Seas_of_Red#/media/File:Blood_Swept_Lands_And_Seas_Of_Red_9_Aug_2014.JPG

Landscape is also front and centre of another important strand of contemporary commemorative and educational practice: battlefield tourism – which has replaced what for earlier generations was most accurately termed battlefield pilgrimage. A visit to the physical location of events is often conceived as intrinsic to gaining a deeper understanding of their nature. This is unarguably true from the perspective of military history – to understand the course of a battle requires a solid understanding of the terrain and its morphology. For many visitors, however, it would appear to be an emotional need more than an historical one: to walk imaginatively in the shoes of the men who fought a hundred years ago draws many thousands each year to the former Western Front, to Gallipoli, and to the mountains of the Italo-Austrian front.² The centrality of landscape to memory has been highlighted recently by the joint Franco-Belgian project *Paysages et sites de memoire de la Grande Guerre*, which is endeavouring to secure World Heritage Site status for the entire landscape of cemeteries and funeral monuments from the Swiss border to the North Sea, as embodied in eighty key French locations and a further twenty-five in Belgium.³

Beyond the formal processes of commemoration and memory which battlefield visits and memorial sites represent, landscape is profoundly embedded into the cultural imaginary of the conflict. In Italy, the conflict on the Austro-Italian front has been often described as the ‘white war’ (*guerra bianca*). The colour here immediately evokes the snow in the Alps, where the fighting took place.⁴ The uniqueness of this operational environment is also conveyed by referring to its spatial verticality.⁵ The Alps and Dolomites were significantly scarred, and their images profoundly changed, by these violent human interactions which also lived on in the memories of servicemen after the war.⁶ More recently, the melting glaciers of these mountain chains and ridges have revealed many material traces, such as human remains and shells, of that protracted coexistence.⁷ Significantly, the image of the ‘white war’ is popularly used as a synecdoche for the whole theatre, including the plains and low-lands

where snow did not fall, demonstrating the power of landscape to shape popular perceptions of the war. Likewise, as Daniel Todman has noted, the “dead landscape” of mud “form[s] a visual shorthand for the British experience in th[e] war.”⁸

Of course, the First World War also unfolded in landscapes far removed from Flemish mud or Alpine glaciers. In the ancient forests of the Vosges or Augustów, in Egypt’s Western Desert, in the Cameroonian jungle, on the lower slopes of Mount Kilimanjaro or in the rocky deserts and swampy alluvial plains of Mesopotamia, soldiers’ experience was shaped by the landscape they inhabited and by their ideas and expectations of it. The fighting would serve in turn to reshape these landscapes, sometimes permanently. The landscapes of war also include spaces beyond those used for military purposes, such as home-front landscapes in cities and towns at varying distances from the battlefields, and even across oceans from the actual fighting. On these home fronts, the many demands of industry and agriculture placed societies in a new relationship with landscapes, whether through the quest for new raw materials or the need to substitute products no longer easily available. Cityscapes were transformed by new economic, political and social uses of public and private space. Once the war had ended, its physical scars and environmental damage were enduring legacies; the landscape was also the locus of commemoration, with different national narratives about the war reflected in the various strategies adopted for the creation of permanent memorials both on the former battlefields and at home. Not all of these are equally prominent in popular memories or understanding of the war; some have become wholly forgotten, while others remain emblematic, even stereotyped.

Yet despite the centrality of landscape to the experience of the war and its prominence in many popular understandings of the war, it has only become the subject of scholarly attention relatively recently. It is an inherently interdisciplinary topic, existing as it does as the nexus between the material world and human interpretation, and the research which has

been published in the field reflects this. Art history, the study of visual representations, architectural history and the study of memorials have offered one important set of approaches, but in recent years environmental history, battlefield archaeology and medical humanities have also opened up new ways to think about war and the physical spaces in which it occurs. As a consequence, in recent years there has been growing scholarly interest in ‘landscapes of war’, and indeed it has been selected as the theme for the Society for Military History conference in 2018.⁹

This book aims both to showcase some of the diverse and fruitful ways in which landscape is currently being analysed, or used as a lens for analysis of the First World War more generally, and to open up lines for further research in relation to other conflicts. It seeks to suggest the value of dialogue between multiple methodologies and objects of enquiry, whilst also reflecting the emphasis that the ‘global turn’ has placed on a more geographically diverse approach to the Great War. This volume should thus prove useful not only to historians of that conflict, but to anyone interested in the history of human interactions with landscape. But before considering the ways in which the First World War might be better understood through this lens, it is worth first examining what we mean by landscape, and specifically by a ‘landscape of war’.

Defining landscapes of war

Firstly, a landscape is limited in space, and must have some kind of boundaries; we cannot speak of ‘the earth’s landscape’ but rather of many landscapes. Consequently, landscape is an inherently anthropocentric idea, requiring human interactions, at the very least from a viewer or viewpoint, since it is not delimited by any inherent geographical feature but instead defined by the person (or people) who is observing, describing or representing it. It is human categorisation and interpretation which distinguish one landscape from another, though that

process of definition might be based on many different criteria, such as agricultural usage, political or administrative boundaries, customs and tradition, or visual features.

Moreover, the concept brackets the geomorphology of a designated area together with human interventions into, and interpretations of, its features. Thus, landscape is not *only* mountains, plains, beaches, forests or deserts, but also the physical modifications made to them by successive generations of humans, and the cultural beliefs and practices which are embedded in and projected onto the terrain. Since a landscape includes both man-made physical features such as buildings, roads, farms, ditches or quarries, and cultural features such as sacred sites, landmarks, burial places or holiday locations, it is intrinsically mutable and transient, since both types of human modification inevitably change over time.

Simon Schama's 1995 book, *Landscape and Memory*, offers a densely argued proposition of landscape as a cultural creation, endowed with complex and mutable meanings by successive societies. Through investigating the three key elements of wood, water and rock he showed that it is not merely human use or modification of landscape which invests it with meaning, but rather numerous acts of interpretation, belief and myth-making.¹⁰ This position echoes the 1992 decision by UNESCO to include 'cultural landscapes' in the World Heritage Convention (in addition to 'natural heritage' such as forests or marine environments). UNESCO defines cultural landscapes as the 'combined works of nature and of man' (Article 1 of the Convention) and describes three distinct types: landscapes planned and defined entirely by man (which in the context of war studies might include city streets, trenches, memorial gardens and parks); organically evolved landscapes, where man-made elements have developed in response to natural features (battlefields, olive groves, oil wells); and associative cultural landscapes, where even without any man-made features, the natural landscape holds powerful meaning (symbolic natural borders like the Rhine, or the Alps and

Dolomites).¹¹ While UNESCO's categories cannot confine or contain landscapes of war, they can illustrate the rich complexity of definitions which may be required.

Landscape, then, is limited and defined in both space and time; it is the setting within which any human activity, including war, is contained. The features it acquires during and after a conflict are significant for many aspects of the study of war: for instance, the barbed wire and trench networks are features of First World War combat which can be analysed through the lens of tactical and operational military history. However, they are also part of the man-made landscape of war, with implications not only for fighting but for the environmental, geographical and economic dimension of conflict, as well as being cultural symbols which profoundly shape the legacies and memory of war. Landscape is thus both a material reality with which military and economic historians must engage, and a socially and culturally mediated space in which war is experienced, represented and remembered.

Landscapes of the Great War

It is perhaps easier to consider the landscapes of the Great War as aesthetic objects than as a matter for analysis and interpretation. Certainly, photographic and pictorial approaches to the topic have proliferated.¹² But recent scholarship has begun to consider the landscape of the Great War as an object of study in its own right, drawing on a huge diversity of possible approaches to the topic.¹³ Both prior to and as a result of its centenary, the historiography of the First World War has increasingly embraced a transnational methodology and a reconceptualization of the war in time and space which emphasises its global features.¹⁴ In many ways the study of landscape demands just such an approach, and like other recent works in this area, the present volume therefore looks beyond the Western Front and the 1914–18 period in its understanding of the war. Showcasing several methodological and theoretical approaches as well as highlighting the range of topics which landscape can serve to illuminate, the book is divided into four thematic sections: Environment and Climate at

War; Urban and Industrial Landscapes Transformed; Cross-Cultural Encounters with Landscapes and Legacies of the First World War in Landscapes.

Environmental history has been particularly successful at straddling landscape's challenging divide between the material and the cultural, and since 2000 it has made an important contribution to the study of war and warfare. In 2004, the landmark publication edited by Richard Tucker and Edmund P. Russell, *Natural Enemy, Natural Ally: Toward an Environmental History of Warfare* opened up a number of lines of enquiry, exploring the natural landscape as a source of essential economic resources, a determining factor in combat and a potential victim of military destruction.¹⁵ Notably, while the volume considers settings as diverse as early modern colonial India, Finland, the American Civil War and the Pacific theatre of the Second World War, the jacket image depicts an instantly recognisable scene from the Western Front of the First World War: a water-logged mudscape, with soldiers crossing a devastated wood on duckboards. It is this conflict which offers what today is seen as the archetypal landscape of war. Environmental history's focus on the *interaction* of humanity with the natural world – seeing the environment itself as an element independently worthy of study – offers important insights for the study of the First World War, in which the sheer volume of material available about the political, diplomatic, military and economic aspects of the conflict might easily overwhelm considerations about the physical spaces in which the war took place. With a growing number of specialists and graduate students working in the field, environmental analyses of the First World War look to be increasingly important, offering understandings of landscape rooted in ecology, sustainability and resource extraction.¹⁶ For instance, while it is commonplace to observe that it was a war of *materiel*, characterised by the action of machines including tanks, planes and trucks, rarely have historians fully engaged with the consequences of this fact for the petroleum industry. As Brian Black demonstrates in his chapter here, the war generated unprecedented demands for

petroleum products and was a transformational moment in what he calls the ‘culture of oil’, marking its emergence as an essential resource for national security purposes. A rather different energy source, olive oil, along with other olive-derived commodities, offer a new angle to examine the impact of the war on the Palestinian landscape and economy. Jeffrey Reger uses the methodologies of environmental history to consider deforestation and famine under Ottoman rule, enhancing our understanding of civilian experiences in the Middle East and offering a useful model of how to analyse a specific landscape. Environment and climate were also hugely significant for the conduct of military operations, as many military studies have emphasised – F. Spencer Chapman’s classic Second World War memoir *The Jungle is Neutral* (1949) serves perfectly to illustrate this point. Geology and environment determine terrain, an important element in any analysis of battle.¹⁷ Here, Isadore Pascal Ndjock Nyobe illustrates the practical and psychological impact of the environment in the generally neglected context of Cameroon, where the landscape was a vital protagonist in the war between Germany, France and Britain.

While agricultural and industrial landscapes were mobilised for war, so too were cityscapes; all three were spaces for living and working, for supporting or resisting the war, for political and cultural activism, for sickness and dying. Urban history can offer unexpectedly valuable perspectives on the First World War, as the two-volume comparative study *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919* edited by Jay Winter and Jean-Louis Robert (1997 and 2007) amply demonstrated.¹⁸ The urban experience generally, and cityscapes particularly, provide valuable ways to re-evaluate the impact of the war away from the front, including the very different experiences of city-dwellers in the United States.¹⁹ Ross Wilson explores how the public spaces of American city streets became a landscape of war, in which citizens could be both mobilised and controlled. Sandra Camarda’s chapter analyses the very different urban landscape of Luxembourg, where the

city was directly engaged in the war (as an occupied space targeted by aerial bombing) and where industrial landscapes were closely linked to national self-presentation: the cityscape became a space in which questions of identity and nationhood could be renegotiated. Both chapters demonstrate how economic, social, cultural and political dimensions of the conflict intersect within the changing landscapes of cities at war.

If to study landscapes of war means to analyse city-dwellers, oil manufacturers and olive farmers, it must also, of course, entail the study of armies and their members, who interact with their environment in a vast range of ways. As well as performing technical military analyses, officers and men also viewed landscapes through scientific, cultural and psychological lenses, as the three chapters in the book's third section make clear. The German army was keen to research the Ottoman landscape from a military and scientific perspective, to serve both wartime and post-war purposes. Geographical and geological features (water, oil) were important as were scholarly interests such as archaeological remains; Oliver Stein's chapter illustrates that the landscape was a rich and fruitful object of study for the German military and its 'scientists in uniform'. Very different projections were made onto the Middle Eastern landscape by the protagonist of Samraghni Bonnerjee's chapter, Bengali doctor Kalyan Mukherji, who served with the Indian Expeditionary Force in Mesopotamia. Bonnerjee argues that his encounter with that unfamiliar landscape was shaped by his deep-seated cultural expectations about the region; the literary landscape of his imagining was quite unlike the landscape of war he would discover there. Cross-cultural encounters of the type described by Stein and Bonnerjee have become an important strand in the current drive towards exploring transnational dimensions of the First World War;²⁰ beyond the meetings of individuals, the encounter with landscape was also a significant and often challenging experience. This was not only an intellectual or cultural meeting but a physical one, as Jessica Meyer highlights in her analysis of British stretcher bearers on the

Western Front and in Egypt, whose daily tasks were directly shaped by the landscape in which they worked. Meyer uses this encounter to explore the relationship between landscape and masculine identities; in this case, the physical features of the terrain — both natural and man-made — interact with the human uses of space and understandings of its meaning in a complex, multi-layered relationship.

Cultural history has also engaged with the theme of landscape as an enduring element in the legacies of war. A foundational text for First World War memory studies is Jay Winter's *Sites of Memory, Sites of Mourning* (1995), which examined the importance of physical spaces, such as cemeteries, in cultural readings of the war.²¹ Landscape is at the centre of many approaches to memory, whether literally (battlefield pilgrimage and tourism, monument building) or figuratively (the cultural history of mud, trenches, poppies and so on).²² Related disciplines such as architecture, art history and historical geography also have much to offer here: the recently-published collection *Commemorative Spaces of the First World War. Historical Geographies at the Centenary* suggests a range of approaches, including cartography, 'ecologies' and the changing uses of space, to explore facets of war commemoration and memory which are deeply rooted in landscape.²³ In the last section of this volume, Aaron Cohen focuses on space, both physical and imaginary, in his investigation of Russian memorials to the war: given the political climate after the war, a conventional memorial landscape was impossible and so an alternative relationship between the material and the emotional was required. By way of complete contrast, as Tim Godden shows, the British and Commonwealth commemoration on the Western Front was deeply embedded in the physical landscape: a study of the architecture and layout of cemeteries there reveals that wartime landscape features were carefully preserved and even deliberately emphasised. These two chapters show that there is no one memorial landscape of the Great War, but that,

on the contrary, political, social and ideological differences profoundly inform the possibilities of using and interpreting landscapes.

A final approach to landscapes of war which has become particularly significant in recent years is that of conflict archaeology, now the subject of dedicated research centres and publication series and an area of considerable interest to the general public. Drawing both on traditional archaeological practices and methods, and on insights from the study of material culture, both battlefield archaeology more narrowly and conflict archaeology somewhat more broadly have much to offer to the study of the First World War.²⁴ Nicholas Saunders has been one of the most prominent scholars in this field since its inception, and here his contribution – which concludes the collection – highlights not only the usefulness and appeal of the archaeological approach but also argues convincingly for the importance of interdisciplinary approaches to the study of war.

War, as a human activity, cannot be fully understood through any single approach; military history has long learned to draw on social and cultural history, and war studies has increasingly come to incorporate a great range of approaches from disability history to memory studies, with attention devoted to topics ranging from economics to emotions. Amid the greatly enriched understanding of conflict that comes with this breadth, we risk a dispersal of focus; this volume's thematic approach suggests one way in which diverse experiences can be linked together, while also speaking to wider trends in transnational history, especially in its focus on cross-cultural encounters. At the same time, a return to the specificity of physical space, bodily experiences and material culture serves to anchor these ideas concretely, as is fitting given the fundamental nature of war. We hope that readers will come away convinced of the usefulness of landscape as a means of thinking about war and excited by the new connections and insights which it opens up.

-
- ¹ See Nicholas J. Saunders, *The Poppy: A History of Conflict, Loss, Remembrance, and Redemption* (London: Oneworld, 2014).
- ² For a contemporary example from Italy of a wide range of cultural trails on First World War battlefields, see the website “Itinerari della Grande Guerra,” <http://www.itinerarigrande guerra.it>, accessed 24 November 2017. See also Marco Mondini, *Andare per i luoghi della Grande Guerra* (Bologna: Il Mulino, 2015).
- ³ See “Sites funéraires et mémoriels de la Première Guerre mondiale – Front Ouest,” *Paysages et sites de mémoire de la grande guerre*, <http://www.paysages-et-sites-de-memoire.fr>, accessed 24 November 2017.
- ⁴ Mark Thompson, *The White War: Life and Death on the Italian Front* (London: Faber & Faber, 2008). The ‘Museo della Guerra bianca’ in Italy is one of many museums of the Great War disseminated along the Alps: see <https://www.museoguerrabianca.it/>, accessed 10 December 2017.
- ⁵ Diego Leoni, *La guerra verticale: uomini, animali e macchine sul fronte di montagna, 1915–1918* (Turin: Einaudi, 2015).
- ⁶ The way those mountains were transformed into national symbols is analysed in Marco Armiero, *A Rugged Nation: Mountains and the Making of Modern Italy: Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries* (Cambridge: White Horse, 2011). Mountaineering and nationhood are also examined in Alessandro Pastore, *Alpinismo e storia d’Italia: dall’Unità alla Resistenza* (Bologna: Il mulino, 2003) and Tait Keller, *Apostles of the Alps: Mountaineering and Nation Building in Germany and Austria, 1860-1939* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2016).
- ⁷ Michele Gravino, ‘A Century Later, Relics Emerge From a War Frozen in Time,’ *National Geographic News*, 18 October 2014, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2014/10/141017-white-war-first-world-war-italy-austro-hungarian-mountains-history/>. Accessed 24 November 2017.
- ⁸ Daniel Todman, *The Great War: Myth and Memory* (London: Hambledon and London, 2005), 1.
- ⁹ See “Call for Papers: ‘Landscapes of War and Peace’, 85th Annual Meeting of the Society for Military History,” The Society for Military History, <http://www.smh-hq.org/2018/2018/2018cfp.html>, accessed 24 November 2017.
- ¹⁰ Simon Schama, *Landscape and Memory* (New York: Vintage Books, 1995).
- ¹¹ “Cultural Landscapes,” UNESCO World Heritage Centre, <http://whc.unesco.org/en/culturallandscape/>, accessed 25 August 2017.
- ¹² An excellent example is Simon Doughty, *Silent Landscape: Battlefields of the Western Front One Hundred Years on* (Solihull: Helion & Co, 2016).
- ¹³ Such themes as poetry, theatre, nursing and sexuality are explored in Angela K. Smith and Krista Cowman, eds., *Landscapes and Voices of the Great War* (London: Routledge, 2017); another important example of interdisciplinary work is Antonio Sagona et al., eds., *Anzac Battlefield: A Gallipoli Landscape of War and Memory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), which employs cartography, archaeology, memory studies and more.
- ¹⁴ Alan Kramer, ‘Recent Historiography of the First World War – Part I’, *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 1 (2014): 5–27; Alan Kramer, ‘Recent Historiography of the First World War – Part II’, *Journal of Modern European History* 12, no. 2 (2014): 155–74; see also Heather Jones, ‘As the Centenary Approaches: The Regeneration of First World War Historiography’, *The Historical Journal* 56, no. 3 (2013): 857–878. See also Robert Gerwarth and Erez Manela, eds., *Empires at War: 1911–1923* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
- ¹⁵ Richard P. Tucker and Edmund Russell, *Natural Enemy, Natural Ally: Toward an Environmental History of Warfare* (Corvallis: Oregon State University Press, 2004); see also Edmund Russell, *War and Nature: Fighting Humans and Insects with Chemicals from World War I to Silent Spring* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001); Chris Pearson, *Mobilizing Nature: The Environmental History of War and Militarization in Modern France* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 2016).
- ¹⁶ See, among others, Tait Keller, ‘Destruction of the Ecosystem’, in *1914–1918–Online. International Encyclopedia of the First World War*, ed. Ute Daniel et al. (Freie Universität Berlin, 2014), http://encyclopedia.1914-1918-online.net/article/Destruction_of_the_Ecosystem; Tait Keller ‘The Ecological Edges of Belligerence - Toward a Global Environmental History of the First World War. *Annales (English Ed.)* 71, no. 1 (2016): 61-78. The same author is currently writing *A Global Environmental History of the Great War* (under contract with Cambridge University Press).
- ¹⁷ Military geographers have offered numerous detailed analyses of landscape as fighting terrain in the First World War, for some examples see Peter Doyle, *Disputed Earth: Geology and Trench Warfare on the Western Front, 1914–18* (London: Uniform Press, 2017); Peter Chasseaud and Peter Doyle, *Grasping Gallipoli: Terrain, Maps and Failure at the Dardanelles, 1915* (Stroud: Spellmont, 2015); James F. Gentsch, “Italy, Geography and the First World War,” PhD diss., King’s College London, 1999).
- ¹⁸ Jay Winter and Jean-Louis Robert, eds., *Capital Cities at War: Paris, London, Berlin 1914–1919*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997, 2007). For other individual case studies, which adopt a variety

of approaches, see: Maureen Healy, *Vienna and the Fall of the Habsburg Empire: Total War and Everyday Life in World War I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Roger Chickering, *The Great War and Urban Life in Germany: Freiburg, 1914–1918* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007); Adam R. Seipp, *The Ordeal of Peace: Demobilization and the Urban Experience in Britain and Germany, 1917–1921* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009).

¹⁹ Ross J. Wilson, *New York and the First World War: Shaping an American City* (London: Routledge, 2015); Adam J. Hodges, *World War I and Urban Order: The Local Class Politics of National Mobilization* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).

²⁰ See for example the project “Making War, Mapping Europe: Militarised Cultural Encounters, 1792-1920,” funded by HERA (Humanities in the European Research Area), led by Oliver Janz, John Horne, Leighton James, and Catriona Kennedy, 2013-2016, <http://www.mwme.eu/index.html>, accessed 10 December 2017.

²¹ Jay Winter, *Sites of Memory Sites of Mourning: The Great War in European Cultural History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

²² For just a few examples, see Ken S. Inglis, *Sacred Places: War Memorials in the Australian Landscape* (Melbourne: Melbourne University Press, 1998); Meinhold Lurz, *Kriegerdenkmäler in Deutschland. 4. Weimarer Republik*, vol. 4 (Heidelberg: Esprint-Verlag, 1985); Nicholas Bullock and Luc Verpoest, *Living with History, 1914–1964: La reconstruction en Europe après la première et la seconde guerre mondiale et le rôle de la conservation des monuments historiques* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2011). On battlefield tourism see David Wharton Lloyd, *Battlefield Tourism: Pilgrimage and the Commemoration of the Great War in Britain, Australia, and Canada, 1919–1939* (Oxford: Berg, 1998); Richard Butler and Wantanee Suntikul, *Tourism and War* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013); Stephen Miles, *The Western Front: Landscape, Tourism and Heritage* (Barnsley: Pen and Sword, 2017); Myriam Jansen-Verbeke and Wanda George, “Memoryscapes of the Great War (1914–1918): A Paradigm Shift in Tourism Research on War Heritage,” *Via@ Tourism Review* 8 (2015), <http://journals.openedition.org/viatourism/494>, accessed 8 December 2017.

²³ James Wallis and David Harvey, *Commemorative Spaces of the First World War. Historical Geographies at the Centenary* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2018); on geographies of remembrance, see also Nuala Christina Johnson, *Ireland, the Great War, and the Geography of Remembrance* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

²⁴ See, among others, Nicholas J. Saunders, ed., *Matters of Conflict: Material Culture, Memory and the First World War* (London: Routledge, 2004); Nicholas J. Saunders, *Killing Time: Archaeology and the First World War* (Stroud: Sutton, 2010); Paul Cornish and Nicholas J. Saunders, eds., *Bodies in Conflict: Corporeality, Materiality, and Transformation* (London: Routledge, 2013); Ross Wilson, *Landscapes of the Western Front: Materiality during the Great War* (London: Routledge, 2012).