

Playing with fire: struggling with 'experience' and 'play' in war tourism

Mads Daugbjerg*

Aarhus University

Abstract

This paper takes up the ambiguities of embracing 'experiential' and 'playful' ways of learning at war sites. It takes as its point of departure the widespread tendencies in the heritage industry to align communication to new emotional and playful ways of learning about the past and goes on to demonstrate and discuss how these assert themselves at a specific Danish war site. The links between the concepts of heritage, experience, romanticism and nationalism are investigated with historical reference to the Scandinavian open air museology and theoretical inspiration drawn from Scott Lash and his notion of a 'second' modernity. It is argued that the current obsession with 'experience' in the heritage sector displays a range of neo-romantic traits. At the Danish centre, staff and visitors are shown to negotiate and struggle to 'balance off' their playful and romantic engagements against more distanced, non-involved stances towards the war past.

Key words: battlefields, war heritage, experience, play, romanticism

'Experience' seems to be the word of the day in today's heritage industry. Over the past two decades, it has become widely accepted that to stay in business, museums and historical attractions must stress multi-sensory communication, a personal, dialogic or 'interactive' involvement with the visitor, and speak to their sentiments and emotions instead of their reason and rationality (Hall 2006; McIntosh 1999; Bagnall 1996; Moscardo 1996). The conventional glass-case museum is thought obsolete as the customer of today is seen as requiring more than 'pure' enlightenment and 'dry' information. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (1998: 139) neatly sums up this widespread stance:

The presumption (...) is that visitors are no longer interested in the quiet contemplation of objects in a cathedral of culture. They want to have an "experience." Museums worry that they will be bypassed as boring, dusty places, as spaces of death – dead animals, dead plants, defunct things.

Such a presumption is supported by booming fields of scholarship, emanating primarily from marketing and business studies (e.g. Pine & Gilmore 1999; O'Dell & Billing (eds) 2005; Boswijk *et al.* 2007)¹ and from learning and communication theory (Falk and Dierking 1992; Hooper-Greenhill 1994; Durbin (ed.) 1996), with considerable overlaps between the two. The so-called 'experience economy', a term coined by Joseph Pine and James Gilmore (1998; 1999), is said to provide both for commercial gain and to speak profoundly to the customers' whole sensual apparatus. 'An experience', according to Pine and Gilmore (1998: 98), 'occurs when a company intentionally uses services as the stage, and goods as props, to engage individual customers in a way that creates a memorable event'. In contrast to 'commodities', 'goods', and 'services' – all emblems of previous economical regimes which the experience paradigm ostensibly replace and supersede – 'experiences are inherently personal, existing only in the mind of an individual who has been engaged on an emotional, physical, intellectual or even spiritual level' (ibid.: 99).

The heritage industry is one sector in which experiential ideas and initiatives thrive. Regarding the relation between site and visitor, it is assumed that 'optimal learning' requires an

informal and anti-authoritarian environment in which the learner/visitor is invited to adopt a curious, explorative and playful stance (Hein 1998; Csikszentmihalyi 1975). Martin Hall (2006) even suggests that museums today find themselves in an 'experiential complex'. Drawing upon and attempting to align classic works by Walter Benjamin, Jean Baudrillard and Tony Bennett with Pine and Gilmore's more recent experience paradigm, Hall contends that 'the experiential complex is marked by the return of the aura of the work of art in an age of digital simulation' (ibid.: 94). He suggests that today's successful heritage and experience providers, such as Disney, succeed in 'reinjecting realness' (ibid.: 93) through virtual means but also by including and reframing 'real' material objects in their product.

When it comes to the interpretation of sites of war and atrocity, however, the embracement of emotion, experience, simulation and play is fraught with complexities. On the one hand, there can be no doubt that war as a subject is eminently suitable for emotional utilization: the dramas and horrors of war speak directly to our hearts, as perhaps most evidently testified by the multimillion dollar Hollywood war movie industry. On the other hand, specific heritage sites often hold powerful connotations of death, loss, sacrifice, pride and/or triumph which are seen by some to be threatened by a playful approach. Thus, the 'playful learning' approach advocated by most educational experts and museum communication theorists meets with firm resistance from those who argue that war sites should be characterized by solemnity, respect, remembrance and contemplation, not experiments in 'experience' and replayed war scenes.²

'These places of death and play are complex', notes John Urry (2004: 211), 'entailing performances of respect, collective grief, and emotion'.³ My paper takes up this complexity pertaining to war sites, drawing upon ethnographic material from an experience-based battlefield centre in Southern Denmark.⁴ I discuss various field cases in which staff and visitors are seemingly caught in tensions and predicaments related to the unclear status of 'play' at the centre. Theorizing the notions of play and experience, I also present and discuss peculiar differences in the practices and perspectives of Danish and German tourists towards the centre's take on war and suffering. In conclusion, I discuss how, in the face of accusations of impropriety and play, heritage managers at Dybbøl frequently fall back on a 'glass case museum' discourse while at the same time ambivalently embracing the new learning potentials thought to inhere in the experiential heritage paradigm.

Context: the 1864 war

The Dybbøl battlefield centre is located right in the heart of the historical battlefield on which the Danish army was crushed and routed in 1864 by the Prussians. It marks the loss of lives, land and Danish dreams of European power. Although viewed from an international perspective the 1864 war was but a minor conflict, it is commemorated in Denmark as a decisive, indeed defining, moment in the nation's history. One third of the Danish land and two fifths of its citizens were seized by the Prussians and annexed to the new German Empire under Bismarck in 1871. Thus, concludes historian Uffe Østergaard (2004: 34), 'in the wake of military and political disasters a middle-sized, multinational, composite state was reduced to the small, linguistically and socially homogeneous nation-state we know as Denmark today'. In the eyes of the vanquished Danes, Dybbøl came to signify qualities of steadfastness, heroism and ultimate sacrifice in the name of the nation. Also, a certain introspective attitude swept over the country, condensed in the popular slogan 'what is lost externally shall be regained internally'.⁵ This did not simply refer to the economic loss of the rich duchies to the south, but also, in a metaphoric sense, to the Danish character and *Volksgeist* in dire need of bolstering. Following from this, the 1864 war has been seen by scholars as the final break with earlier 'civic' conceptions of nationhood and the confirmation, instead, of a strong 'ethnic' Danish nationalism which had been simmering since the 1830s.⁶ This ethnic nationalism based itself upon romantic national ideals (imported, ironically perhaps, from German intellectuals such as J.G. Herder and J.G. Fichte) stressing a primordial unity of blood, language and *Volk*, and asserted itself in Danish literature, poetry, art and politics – often with Dybbøl as one of its key symbols.

But if Dybbøl was a token of grief and mourning, it soon became simultaneously a site of triumph. In 1920, following the German defeat in the First World War, a plebiscite in Schleswig was forced through by the victorious powers based on the principle of 'the peoples' right of self-

determination' devised by American President Wilson. The result was the 1920 (and present-day) border, dividing the contested duchy of Schleswig into a Danish and a German part and thus returning to Denmark parts of the lost land, including the symbolic battlefield of Dybbøl. This turn of events has meant that while the 1864 battle itself resulted in utter Danish defeat, the collective memory clinging to it is very much a memory of the national struggle for claiming back the motherland's 'robbed daughter, deeply lamented'⁷ – a metaphor coined by Danish author Henrik Pontoppidan in 1918 – and eventually succeeding in 1920 after 56 years of German rule. Still today, the consequences of the 1864 war are sometimes in Denmark referred to as an 'excretion' [*udskillelse*] of the 'German' duchies, suggesting a more or less inevitable, organic and healthy process in which impure body parts have been expelled (e.g. Korsgaard 2004: 305).

In 1920, a steady 'danification' of the Dybbøl commemoration area was initiated. This culminated in 1945 when two massive German monuments marking the Prussian 1864 victory were blown to pieces one week after the allied forces had lifted the German occupation of Denmark. This iconoclasm, most likely the work of members of the Danish resistance movement, serves to stress the way in which Dybbøl as a site and symbol has been the locus not only of powerful Danish-national emotions, but also (and as part of that) strong anti-German sentiments.

The Dybbøl battlefield centre: a counter-museum

In the late 1980s, following some decades during which the site's national connotations had not been outspokenly voiced, it was decided politically to establish a new visitors' centre in the Dybbøl Hills. The *Dybbøl battlefield centre*,⁸ opened in 1992 and resting on private funding, seeks to provide an introduction to the surrounding landscape by means of audiovisual media, landscape models, oral guiding (termed 'storytelling'), and – as its most recent expansion – full-size open-air reconstructions of parts of a Danish 1864 redoubt system. Through their centre visit, visitors' subsequent visual engagements with the physical Dybbøl landscape are thus framed and guided. By virtue of its alternative form, the centre was envisaged from the outset as an alternative to conventional museum communication, and seen as giving voice, so to speak, to the mute historical landscape.

Today as then, centre staff members are eager to stress that the battlefield centre is *not* a museum. Instead, they prefer the term 'house of storytelling' [*fortællehus*]. Indeed, the staff cast the centre as everything a museum is not. Often, visitors are explicitly encouraged to reject 'normal' museum behaviour. On one fieldwork occasion, for instance, I overheard a storyteller remark to a group of tourists that they must remember that 'this is a site of storytelling, not a museum' and state that *here* (implying: in contrast to a museum), they were in fact allowed to climb the ramparts or take a walk in the moat. Later, he explained to me that he found it necessary to give the visitors such instructions, as they possessed what he termed a 'built-in fear of museums'.⁹ 'They are completely brainwashed', he continued, and suggested I should study how centre visitors (according to him) notoriously followed the gravelled pathways outside the centre and remained unwilling to step outside the demarcated areas. In this institutional self-perception, the centre is perceived as what we may term a 'counter-museum' devoted to relieving the public of their subconscious childhood-endorsed museum phobias or traumas. This is all the more interesting given the fact that in 2004, the centre was absorbed by the public museum at Sønderborg castle which is in charge of the centre's operation today (more on this takeover below); in other words, the centre is officially (part of) a museum.

How should we, then, interpret the staff's insistence on *not* being a museum? It is clearly meant to confront the conventional image of the 'glass case museum' understood to be an institution of hushed and silent contemplation, of seeing but no touching, and of marked distance between exhibits and observer as well as between experts and amateurs; in short, a site of order, authority and visibility. This stereotype corresponds to the image of the early museum and the 'exhibitionary complex' (Bennett 1988) of which it formed part, analysed convincingly by Tony Bennett in particular (1995; 2004; 2006) but also by a number of other theorists of museum and modernity (e.g. Hooper-Greenhill 1992; Macdonald 2003). In Bennett's Foucauldian 'archaeologies' of the museum institution, museum visiting is viewed primarily as a civic ritual. The museum works, he suggests, as sites of 'governmentality'

(Foucault 1991) in which 'citizens' go to discipline themselves and in the process learn of their 'rights and duties as citizens' (Bennett 2006: 63). And such governmental learning is understood to be an activity premised on the activity of the eye: museums are 'primarily institutions of the visible in which objects of various kinds have been exhibited to be looked at' (ibid.).¹⁰

In the counter-museum self image of the Dybbøl centre, the basic philosophy is that such top-down ways of gazing at and learning about 'reality' are insufficient today. Instead, heritage communication should become subjective, personal, and multi-sensory. The visitors, it is believed, need to immerse themselves physically; they need to smell the gunpowder, hear the thundering guns, and feel the fleas in the hay-filled sleeping huts of the Danish 1864 soldiers. Such understandings are evidently strongly bound up with the experiential turn outlined in this article's introduction. The 'experience', 'interactive' and 'multisensory' discourses asserting themselves are well-known from numerous studies in heritage tourism, some enthusiastic, others highly critical towards such modes of communication.¹¹ In his seminal work on popular memory and heritage, Raphael Samuel provides a remarkably fitting picture of the democratic and anti-authoritarian ideals of the Dybbøl centre:

At the museums where 'living history' has been adopted as a watchword by go-ahead curators it takes the form of audio-visual display, using artists' impressions, photographic blow-ups or replicas to exhibit what ought to be there but is not and contextualize the artefacts in a narrative whole. Instead of being temples for the worship of the past, these museums make a fetish of informality, discarding glass cases in favour of free-standing exhibits which ideally can be handled and touched, encouraging visitors to hob-nob with the demonstrators, and replacing galleries with intimate 'rooms'. Instead of a solemn hush, the visitor is assailed by a cacophony of sounds. (Samuel 1994: 177)

The 1992 Dybbøl centre was born into this exact spirit of touching, feeling and hobnobbing. In combination with such low-brow and democratic aspirations however – and this is where the paradoxes of 'play' begin to emerge – a distinct romantic national stance characterized the early centre. It finds perhaps its clearest expression in the formulations of the architects who won the 1989 competition for the centre building. In their winning proposal, they stated:

The centre building itself is shaped like a sharp corner of a defensive bastion. As a national monument, it gushes forth from the soil, a memory of the horror of the war – an inferno when Denmark was overrun – but at the same time a testimony to courage, strength and will to survival. (...) The visitors' centre shall be a monument in the landscape – a romantic monument to Danishness – set exactly at Dybbøl, which became the proof that Denmark was worthy of survival as a nation. (Freddie and Lohse 1989, cited in Adriansen 1992: 280-281, my translation)

Promotion material from the early battlefield centre cultivated this same romantic national conception, speaking for instance of Dybbøl as 'the very heart of the Danes' self-image' and the site where 'justice triumphed' at the 1920 border revision.¹² A number of the centre's initial installations, many of which are still in use, convey a distinctly romantic vision of Danishness and the Dybbøl defeat while not leaving much room for the Prussians. When I discussed this with the centre's founding father and former manager, he granted that at the time, there was indeed no inclination to include the 'others':

[The original idea was] that if the Germans want to tell their 1864 history, they must build a centre on the other side of the border. This is the Danish history (...) told in a particularly lucid way. That was the idea. Why on earth should we build something in which German history was included? A very clear conception, and very widespread among Danes. And there are still Danes who say so: that the Germans must build their own.

This initial exclusivist view is still quite evident in parts of the centre. It has however been challenged and revised significantly in recent years, in particular following a political decision taken in 2003, and executed in 2004, to hand over the daily administration of the centre to its neighbouring institution, the public historical museum at the Sønderborg castle. This decision,

taken in the wake of a series of controversies and a heated public debate on the centre's form and communication strategies around the turn of the millennium, means that the battlefield centre, conceived around 1990 in a profoundly romantic national spirit, is operated today by some of its former sharpest critics.

Theorizing experience, romanticism and play

Thus, we may speak of two loose sets of currents or discourses which informed the construction of the battlefield centre: one that embraces 'experience' and 'living history' in contrast to conventional museum exhibition, and a second one which celebrates the Danish nation in a romantic, indeed romantic national and exclusivist fashion. How are we to grasp the relationships between these two currents or discourses?

To begin clearing this connection up, it may be useful first to note that the conflict between experiential and conventional exhibitionary forms is far from new. As a case in point, the Scandinavian open air museum movement mushrooming just before and around 1900 was driven by parallel aspirations to multi-sensory experience and 'atmosphere'. Drawing key inspiration from the international exhibitions of the 19th century, the open air museology was a reaction against the dominant evolutionary 'science and progress' exhibitionary form of the period and aspired, so to speak, to re-enchant the museum with feeling, sensuality and spirit.¹³ In a larger perspective, the open air movement was part and parcel of a romanticist reaction against a paradigm of science, rationality and enlightenment, and often tied, explicitly or implicitly, to specific romantic national projects. This larger romantic turn, which the open air museums epitomized, contained a yearning for 'authentic' and 'primordial' qualities of life, and insisted on speaking to visitors' sentiments and feeling – not their reason. Thus, the open air museums specifically aimed at capturing wholes, atmospheres and feelings instead of parts, causal chains and facts, as a reaction against the conventional glass-case museum.¹⁴

In theorizing the link between experience and romanticism, I find inspiration in the work of Scott Lash and his notion of a 'second modernity' (1999). In opposition to the 'first' (or 'high') modernity of the Enlightenment and its rationality of progress, order and homogeneity, Lash argues, a second and often overlooked strand of modernity has emerged. It is characterized by a 'different rationality' which does not merely accept order, progress and science as inevitable givens but begins to question and reflect upon these ideals. Lash builds his argument on a detailed account and analysis of diverging traditions within early social science, resting on different philosophical paradigms. He proposes that 'two modernisms developed in early sociological theory' (ibid.: 111) and goes on to pin them out:

One is French; the other is German. The French version is positivist. It is based on the model of an abstract 'system' which is then used to understand social relations. The German model is more of an interpretive sociology. It opposed systems and positivism, holding that the latter was corrupting real social relations. To this it counterposed an inner sphere modelled on the lines of a poetics. (ibid.)

The precursor of this German model was Romanticism. According to Lash, the romantically inspired second modernity presumes a very different relationship between subjects and objects, investing both with 'being', 'inner experience' [*Innerlichkeit*] or ontology. On the status of 'the object', he argues:

The object in the second modernity has become ontological. It is possessed with being. It is no longer reduced to a thing whose sole function is the assertion of valid predicative statements. The object in the second modernity gains vastly in status. It is now not just a speck, a point to be known. It comes to take on an ontological structure. It comes to take on a structure of meaning. A meaning that is not reduced to epistemological and utilitarian functions. The object in high modernity was not a thing-in-itself. It did not possess an ontological structure. The object's ontological structure in the second modernity allowed it to take on epistemological functions, but also to be invested with affect, with desire, with care, to be lived by and lived with. (ibid.: 339-40)

And on the second modern subject, Lash goes on:

Subjects are no longer universal, but singular. They approach the world no longer from the infinite position of epistemology but from the finitude of experience. Subjects no longer know objects, they instead experience objects in the second modernity. The universal object has thus become finite and singular. (ibid.: 341)

This may all seem a bit abstract, and Lash is rather silent as to how we are, as analysts, to grasp these allegedly altered relations as characteristics of lived life. Nevertheless, I find his argument highly suggestive. If, in the above quotations, we substitute 'object' with 'museum object' and 'subject' with 'museum visitor', this seems to me a rather exact diagnosis of much of what goes on in today's heritage sector. The move from detached and assumingly objective knowledge, to immersive, partial and subjective experience mirrors, I believe, the current trends in the heritage industry. Thus, the so-called experience economy seems to entail a range of romantic ('second') modern ideas about sensuality, emotion and personal experience – and about the 'value' of such experiences.

In a more recent paper, Lash (2006) attempts to clear up the notion of experience and its contemporary relevance by distinguishing between and discussing the German concepts of *Erfahrung* and *Erlebnis* – the second of which is, argues Lash, essentially romantic and connected to the second modernity:

Kant's experience is thus epistemological experience. *Ontological* experience (Gadamer) is in the first instance poetic and from Romanticism (Schiller, Goethe). It is most often called *Erlebnis* and in contradiction to Kantian *Erfahrung*. We note further that *Erfahrung* is cognitive experience while *Erlebnis* is also aesthetic experience. (Lash 2006: 338, italics in original)¹⁵

Turning again to the Dybbøl centre, it was as I have noted characterized from its conception by a stark romantic nationalism and a profound belief in the powers of the place: Dybbøl was – we may say, paraphrasing Lash – precisely not just conceived as 'a speck, a point to be known', but was expected to take on a heavy 'structure of meaning', and to be 'invested with affect, with desire, with care'. The centre's evident if implicit genre inspiration from the early open air museums, and the larger romanticist paradigm they formed part of, point to a subtle but profound connection between romanticism, 'experience' [*Erlebnis*], and – in some cases, at least, and in my own case rather blatantly – nationalism of the 'ethnic' variant.

Recently, Lash has applied much of his theory on the second modernity to what he and Celia Lury term 'the global culture industry' (Lash and Lury 2007). This 'industry' encompasses 'cultural objects' (ibid.: 3) with a global span, including cartoon and computer animations, major sport events, product branding and art happenings.¹⁶ Drawing upon but also rethinking capitalist critiques from Adorno, Benjamin and others, Lash and Lury propose that a shift 'from representation to thing' is occurring in these cultural-economic spheres (ibid.: 183). This entails a shift from science/epistemology to art/ontology, two poles they take Kant and Goethe to represent, respectively:

'Kantian' science is about things-for-us appearances: that is phenomena. (...) Goethean art is about things-in-themselves: it relates to essences or noumena. Science is about the outer logic, the extensive logic, the connections between and external organization of these phenomena. Art, for its part, addresses Adorno's 'internal organization of the object, 'its inner logic'. (ibid.: 186)

This evidently mirrors Lash's earlier argument on the second modernity and his analysis of the *Erfahrung/Erlebnis* distinction. It seems that what Lash and Lury term the 'global culture industry' and the 'informational capitalism' share important characteristics with the second modernity Lash argued evolved from German romanticism.

Of particular and immediate relevance to my own analysis is the notion of *play* which Lash and Lury assign a key role in today's cultural domain:

There is another piece to the puzzle of the shift from representation to the object: *play*. The narrative and representational social imaginary lies in the *reader* or

audience, while the *player* engages the culture of things. For Hans-Georg Gadamer (1976) we can experience a cultural entity either, on the one hand, epistemologically or, on the other, ontologically. In an epistemological encounter, we relate to the entity from its outside; as a thing-for-itself. In an ontological relationship we relate to it from its inside: as a thing-in-itself (Lash and Lury 2007: 189-90, italics in original).

As already hinted at, and as will become clearer in my analysis below, the Dybbøl battlefield centre rests upon an outlook which fits this playful stance rather perfectly. It is a site of romantic engagement with the past, of sensual experience and of 'getting ontological with the object (...) in play', as Lash and Lury (*ibid.*: 190) put it. 'In play, we descend into the world with objects. We deal not with a text but with an *environment* of cultural objects' (*ibid.*, italics in original). But this same powerful playfulness which the experiential heritage approach affords is regarded *also* as a problem, by some visitors, to whom the centre experience takes on a rather ambivalent nature. I now turn to this ambiguity.

Ambivalent visitors: the pros and cons of playing

Most of the visitors I followed and interviewed during my fieldwork¹⁷ readily embraced the experiential dimensions of the heritage communication at the battlefield centre and often praised (what I have called) the centre's counter-museum approach. In particular, families with children utilized the reconstructions of the redoubt, trenches, and soldiers' huts for physical engagement and interaction rather enthusiastically. For instance, the centre's recently completed 1:1 blockhouse reconstruction – a massive wooden shelter located in the centre yard – clearly spoke to visitors' curiosity and sense of play. To give an example, one Danish family investigated the house by touching and taking in the smell of the wood, climbing up and peeping out of the house's gun slits, taking up imitated shooting positions, and navigating the interior carefully while taking care not to bump their heads into the heavy wooden posts supporting the roof. The blockhouse afforded an eminently physical, explorative and multisensory engagement and in this respect can be seen as a paragon of the turn towards experience and play in much of the heritage sector.

A number of theorists, often relying on phenomenological inspiration with implicit or explicit reference to the work of Maurice Merleau-Ponty, have argued for a stronger focus on the embodiedness of perception and of 'seeing' (e.g. Ingold 2000; Crouch 2002; Edensor 2006). In tourism studies, such arguments are often pitted as part of a critique of John Urry's influential notion of the 'tourist gaze' (Urry 2002). David Crouch (2002: 212), for instance, convincingly argues that 'gazing at particular 'sights' (sic) is inflected by all sorts of other visual, as well as multisensual awarenesses'. And it is not merely that tourists engage other senses in their 'visual' engagements, they also conjure up or imagine the sensory qualities of the stuff they look at. In other words, it is not only that we need to pay heed to the relatedness of the senses but also that in order to understand the tourists' (or whoever's) practices, we need to include their imaginary efforts. In the words of Crouch:

Embodiment presented as only a physical phenomenon is incomplete. It is necessary to relate that physicality to imagination, to social contexts and to a 'making sense' of practice and of space. (Crouch 2002: 209-10)

In his analysis, drawing upon Merleau-Ponty, Crouch stresses the mental dimension of gazing, or rather of 'making sense'. Even though we do of course, at any given moment, 'see' things, places, exhibits, etc. from one particular physical viewpoint, our perception of them is not restricted to this visual perspective. Instead, says Crouch, 'places and their contents are seen from numerous angles and are apprehended as fractured but recomposed in mental processes' (*ibid.*: 212). In other words, even though we only see a part, we imagine the whole.¹⁸

My field material contains numerous examples of such an imaginative capacity asserting itself at the battlefield centre. Many visitors would negotiate and discuss ongoing interpretations of the war events during their visit. One Danish visitor, a family father in his forties, is exemplary in this regard. During his touring of the centre, he tended to constantly verbalize his ongoing

interpretation of the 1864 war episodes while drawing upon different sources of information, some of which he had obviously been picking up during his visit. At the centre's panoramic viewpoint, for instance, he paused to take in the landscape, pondering over the Danish 1864 positions while in the process sharing his ad-hoc interpretations with his wife and two kids. The following excerpt from my transcription of the family's tour provides an example of this:

Father: 'Of course, they [the Prussian attackers] utilized their knowledge of the [Danish] redoubts, so they knew they had to... that's why they came this way [points] via the *Alssund* [the Sound of Als] and then came down the other way round [turns while pointing out the circle he believes the Prussians to have taken]. And then they suddenly attack the [Danish] positions from the other side, from their weak side, perhaps, you see?'

Daughter plays around with her sweater, listening to but hardly following her father's explanation, but *Son* listens closely and says: 'Yes.'

Father goes on: 'And when they [the Prussians] then surprise them [the Danes] by drawing attention to... with such a heavy bombardment of [the town of] Sønderborg, and of this position, so that all attention is turned towards this point – then they can more or less undisturbed cross the *Alssund*. That was smart.'

Son: 'Yes.'

In a strict historical sense, the deductions of this father are highly conjectural. His unfolding of the 'cunning' Prussian battle plan is definitely not in line with history books on the matter. The key focus for my current discussion, however, is not historical accuracy, but the extraordinary creativity displayed in this subjective appropriation of the Dybbøl events. Persistently and enthusiastically, and assisted by his family, this visitor kept conjuring up, expanding upon and transforming different tales of war and schemes of history that made sense to him. He seemingly could not help spinning stories and obviously enjoyed the challenge of trying to interpret the site as he walked along. What this example highlights, then, is the way in which the centre's layout and form invites creativity and curiosity, and not only in terms of multisensory and physical affordances, but also when it comes to stimulating the imagination of visitors, in line with Crouch's argument above. In other words, the centre experience is not simply of a bodily and physical kind, but connected to imaginations, memories and scenarios invoked on-site.

Visitors such as the Danish families above thus embraced the experiential potentialities. Not everyone, however, found the centre's ways as easy to come to terms with. In particular, a number of the German tourists to whom I spoke found (what they experienced as) the playfulness of a site devoted to 'war' hard to cope with. For instance, a German group of four visitors, two couples in their forties, had been touring the centre. Throughout their circuit they were generally cheering and playful, joking at their own roles as tourists and at their various activities in the centre. For instance, one of the men cast a bullet and joked with the staff member acting as blacksmith, displaying a somewhat role-distanced stance toward the activity of bullet casting, seemingly perceived by him as somewhat childish (Goffman 1961). We may also describe the general attitude of the group as 'post-tourist' (following Feifer 1985) in that they were deliberately playful, reflecting on their roles as tourists involved in a performance, knowing 'that tourism is a series of games with multiple texts and no single authentic tourist experience' (Urry 2002: 91).

Whatever term we choose to describe such practice, I want to draw attention here to the clash between the group's cheerful and playful behaviour, displayed during their walk, and the more solemn attitude manifest in the interview I conducted with them afterwards. In this talk, they all agreed that the Dybbøl centre, while interesting, did not succeed in transmitting the horror of war. In particular, they – in common with most of the German tourists I spoke to – found the centre's playground sandbox, in which kids could play with model cannons and build their own model fortresses with wooden blocks, to be highly inappropriate. They also regarded the clean and cosy look of the soldiers' sleeping hut as problematic, and on the whole, they found the site

to have 'a general feel of an adventure playground' [*Abenteuerspielplatz*], as one of them coined it. He went on to suggest a range of other European historical war sites he had visited which he said had been much more affectively 'penetrating' [*eindränglich*] (architect from Lübeck, Germany, male, age 44). Thus, although they themselves had obviously enjoyed their tour of the centre, their post-visit critique seemed to be directed at the powerful and playful affordances of the centre – which they felt themselves, it seemed, to have been 'victims' of. Their resentment was thus not directed at their own performances but of the centre which had allegedly forced them to adopt a cheerful stance and failed to convey a 'proper' 'penetrating' attitude in them.

Another party of German visitors levelled a parallel criticism at the centre. Like the visitors above, they too described their general centre experience in a positive tone. They stressed how they really liked the reconstructed milieu – the like of which, according to them, was rarely seen in Germany. One of them explained it thus:

I thoroughly like reconstructions. (...). Because it is a more living approach to history. In a museum, where you have all the objects taken out of context, often you cannot understand them. If you see them in context, in a reconstruction, you understand them better. (regional politician from Kiel, Germany, male, age 54)

In this regard, they shared most of my visitor informants' positive evaluation of the reconstruction and *living history* genre which was seen as providing for 'better understanding' of context, compared to conventional museums and traditional archaeological sites. What they liked, we may say, was the improved holistic experience available here. Nevertheless, and mirroring the previous German group above, these four men expressed strong reservations when our interview proceeded into the themes of national identity and appropriate war site interpretation. Again the sandbox was taken up. The visitor quoted above went on:

We were really alienated from this children playground. I mean, as Germans we do not like such things. To say: we have a site where you go and have national feelings – in this case, for Denmark – such a thing would not be made in Germany, it is not appropriate. And to construct a children playground, where you have small cannons and such things... for a German that is... such a thing would not be made in Germany.

One of his comrades added:

Or inside that hut where the kids have to write letters as if they were soldiers. Write field mail. That seems pretty odd to us. (dentist from Kiel, Germany, male, age 51)

A third member of their group agreed: 'We find that very negative' (social education worker from Kiel, Germany, male, age 56). Thus, we see how such visitor reservations towards play and pretension are not restricted to the actual handling of replica guns and weapons, but indeed applies to any activity casting children as 'soldiers'. When I followed up by asking them of their thoughts of the fact that this reserved view seemed dominant among my German visitor informants, one of them explained:

Because we have a very strong reservation against militarism. (Interviewer: Because of the German history?) Because of history. Militarism is considered, by most, very negative. (...) But of course ... there are also Germans who attend such things, and then practice traditional nationalism [*Altnationalismus*], so to speak. But that, to us, is automatically right-radicals. You don't do such things. (dentist from Kiel, Germany, male, age 51)

Almost every German visitor I spoke to during my field work seemed to share such anti-militaristic, and anti-nationalistic, sentiments. A number of them connected this stance of theirs specifically to the troubled history of Germany. One visitor explained this by means of what we may call a generational or epochal logic:

You see, my grandfather – this is a long time ago – he was an Emperor-loyalist [*Kaisertreuer*]. And then the generation of our parents, they were national

socialists. And we were, from the beginning, brought up to be very strictly republican, in opposition to that. (retired doctor from Hamburg, Germany, male, age 64)

Those few who do not fit into such a generational scheme are invariably, or 'automatically', as the previous visitor (above) had it, classed as right-radicals.

As should be clear from both the Danish and German visitor engagements described so far, the Dybbøl centre does afford a certain playful and explorative behaviour, but in the eyes of some, this quality is offset by a perceived lack of seriousness and propriety. In effect, their immersion into a playful mode leaves some visitors with a bad conscience over the fact that they or (more often) the site have/has not lived up to expectations of what visiting a proper and appropriate battlefield site 'ought to' be about. Being very much an *Abenteuerspielplatz* in which anything can happen and weird tales and interpretations grow sits in an uneasy relationship to the stern requirements of a war memorial – the German term *Mahnmal* captures the conscientious dimension more aptly¹⁹ – that some demand Dybbøl should be.

Managerial efforts: avoiding play, cultivating demonstration

None of my Danish visitor informants ever mentioned the sandbox as a problem. Often I had the impression that they did not see it at all. Or rather that it was conceived of as simply a convenient 'parking lot' for kids, a feature taken to be natural, even obligatory for a tourist attraction like the centre. Likewise, the toy cannons and building blocks were never taken up by my Danish visitor informants. They did not perceive the connotations of militarism which many German visitors did. There were however a few Danes who *did* view the sandbox as a problem: the curators of the nearby museum at the Sønderborg castle.

As already mentioned, the castle museum had taken over the responsibility of the running of the centre in 2004. This did not entail a major shift of staff, but nevertheless a new and less romantic outlook was deemed appropriate by the centre's new curatorial superiors. During my 2006 fieldwork, a number of meetings and discussions were held on the new role of the centre. A central concern in the institutional renegotiations was the issue of play and how to go about 'demonstrating' but not 'playing' war at the centre, as they termed it. The playground sandbox and its toy cannons was one of the cases brought up. Although the centre manager argued against it, eventually the castle museum's head curator insisted that the sandbox had to go. He knew about its inappropriateness in the eyes of many Germans, having himself toured the centre with various German colleagues, and explained to me that the sandbox 'tipped the balance' for visitors from south of the border. In the spring of the 2007 season, the sandbox was therefore removed. Although negotiated and conducted in calmness and good order, this move was one of the clearest examples of direct museum intervention in the centre's daily operation during my fieldwork.

Thus, things are indeed in motion at today's battlefield centre. An inclusive and assumingly nonbiased stance on former enemies is on the rise. This same head museum curator explained to me about the reconfigured role of the battlefield centre and its activities, that 'the centre should *demonstrate* war technology and the everyday life of the soldiers, but we cannot let situations arise in which the audience thinks 'we' and 'them''. And, commenting on the amateur re-enactors who sometimes perform mock battles at the centre, he said: 'I do not want to see them fight Danes versus Germans. But I would like to see them perform an extended advance, or fire systematic volleys, and all the rest'. In such a rationale of demonstration, the centre is to be cleansed of its ethnic-nationalist stance (see Daugbjerg 2009). It is not to evoke national feelings – no we versus them – but instead rely soundly on demonstrating allegedly nonbiased and non-emotional military techniques ('extended advances, systematic volleys, and all the rest').

In short, the centre should avoid 'play' and further 'demonstration' according to its new museum superiors. This understanding is evidently related to the German *Abenteuerspielplatz* accusations targeting the perceived playfulness at a site which 'ought to' be about solemnity and reflection. However, adopting such a stern 'demonstration' discourse is complicated by the fact that the centre's very existence in effect relies on funding given on conditions of a 'playful learning' strategy. Thus, the centre is one of a number of so-called *knowledge-educational*

*activity centres*²⁰ upholding a substantial support from the Danish Ministry of Education conditioned on a set of participatory learning criteria. The 'knowledge-educational' activities of the centre include various practices which put visiting children firmly into the shoes of the 1864 soldiers and indeed seem close to 'playing'. As already indicated, much of the new learning theory on which the 'knowledge-educational' paradigm rests hinges on a core assumption stressing the advantages of play and participation in learning. In other words, 'play' is in a sense written into the economic structure of the centre. Creativity, experience, and play assumingly go hand in hand in furthering an ideal learning environment.

A few examples of such 'knowledge-educational' activities are in order. Key among these are the centre's replica cannon firings, conducted by a staff storyteller assisted by a gun crew of five or six children volunteers. The cannon sessions are indeed templates of multisensory experience: roaring, blurry, physical and exhilarating interruptions of the orderly visiting schedule. Nothing could be further from the conventions of the classic custodian museum, and visitors exposed to the big bang are, almost without exception, thrilled by the immense and physically felt roar of the gun. Other 'knowledge-educational' activities include calculating artillery ranges, casting bullets at the blacksmith's, and cooperating in operating the heavy retractable bridge. During my 2006 fieldwork, a future scenario was discussed in which the children are to march while under the 'command' of a storyteller, across the bridge into the redoubt. In short, the audience – in particular the youngest segment of it – is routinely asked to identify with (certain) conditions of the 1864 soldiers, in educational activities bordering on 'play'.

The centre staff are keenly aware, however, that this is sensitive ground. During my fieldwork, the staff worked hard to avoid being lumped with play and fun while embracing 'demonstration' and 'education'. The centre manager told me that to him, there was a fine but clear line between 'playing' and 'demonstrating' war. Playing was not deemed appropriate, demonstrating was. 'We can march with them [the pupils]', he said, 'if we do it with commands that are correct'. He continued:

So we demonstrate it and have a talk about why you do that with soldiers. So that they reach an insight, so that they understand why we do so [march]. Or rather, why they do so within the military.

Another staff member, a senior storyteller, told me about the 'knife edge' between playing and demonstrating and said that he always stressed to the teachers of visiting school groups that 'we do not *play* war here'. Because, he said to me, 'when you play war, then it's like you want to teach them how to wage war, right? But you can *demonstrate* how they did back then.' Indeed, the centre storytellers routinely asked the visitors to please remember that war is an awful thing, and that they should never wish to be in one.

Exploring this 'knife edge' a bit further, and bearing in mind the theoretical landscape outlined with Lash earlier, we may ask: what is the difference between play and demonstration? As evidenced by the above, it is hardly a matter of the concrete activities, all of which could be claimed to – and are often accused of by critics such as the German visitors quoted earlier – hold elements of play. Rather, the difference, as explained to me by centre staff, seems to be a matter of context; of how the activities are framed, staged and presented. What the centre strives to avoid is that visitors actually 'imagine' or pretend that they *are* soldiers; or put differently, it seeks to ensure that they maintain a certain distance to the activity at hand. With Lash, we may say that 'play' is thought too *innerlich*, too romantic, too invested with feeling and sensation. Conversely, 'demonstration' as a term has a high modern rationality and instrumentality to it: what is being taught here is thought to involve detachment and disinterested and objective 'knowledge'. Continuing in the terminology of Lash, we may say that centre staff balancing the knife's edge find themselves forced to re-invoke 'representation' and 'epistemology' in the face of accusations of 'getting ontological' and playful. They retreat into the safe territory of external representation, demonstration and what we may call 'involved non-involvement' – participating without playing – while on the other hand working to maintain a clear difference from conventional museum communication, so as not to lose their hard-fought ministerial support conditioned on the stringent criteria of participatory learning.

Conclusion: rethinking war, experience and play

In this article, I have explored the ambivalent ways in which a playful learning paradigm asserts itself at a specific Danish war heritage site. I have presented the Dybbøl battlefield centre as a site imbued with perplexities pertaining to the frictions between such an experiential approach and a sterner perspective in which war sites are seen as venues for conscientious and non-involved contemplation. Discussing the Dybbøl centre's attempts at shedding its original romantic national moorings, I have applied the theories of Scott Lash and others in an attempt to link the notions of romanticism, experience and play, and suggested that the experiential heritage paradigm displays numerous neo-romantic traits. Regarding the visitors' engagements with Dybbøl, I stressed the frictions between the lures of emotional immersion and the felt need for rational distancing. Finally I discussed how centre staff find themselves on a 'knife edge', having to ensure that their way of going about interpreting the 1864 war is, on the one hand, playful *enough* to secure ministerial funding and, on the other, not so playful as to alienate those among both clientele and staff who find 'play' misplaced at a historical war site.

Where does this leave Lash's points on the second modernity and Lash and Lury's arguments on the cultural industry of our time? As inspirational as I have found them to drive along my investigation, I believe my studies question one key point in such theories, namely their alleged epochal nature. What I have shown to be the case in the Danish heritage sector – and I believe its applications to be broader – is that even at a site seemingly emblematic of the current turn towards ontology and experience, such recent (or rather, recently re-invoked, neo-romanticist) modes of interpretation exist in a constant tension with more conventional enlightenment or high modern practices. What we see at Dybbøl is, so to speak, that the first modernity 'strikes back' against the frivolity of its second sibling. What characterizes the parts of the cultural industries which I have analysed is thus not so much an epochal transition to a second modernity – a movement 'from representation to things' – but rather an ongoing tension and ambiguity between these two poles.

A final glimpse into the subtle symbolic manoeuvring between ontology and epistemology at today's battlefield centre can be obtained by considering a so-called 'construction redoubt' [*byggeskanse*] which has recently (in 2008) substituted the torn-down sandbox. This new feature, planned specifically to accommodate the centre's school audiences, is in effect a mini version (scale 1:5) of the full-size redoubt. This smaller version is fitted out with mobile building blocks and elements, allowing school groups and other visitors to construct and adapt their own fortification, and learn about construction and strategic principles behind an 1864 redoubt. The first time the centre manager explained his plans to me I could not help thinking that this new construction site sounded remarkably similar to the recently razed sandbox. But the (reflective, controlled) 'educational' context meant to substitute the former practices of (frivolous, unguided) 'play' of the politically incorrect cannon-sandbox seems to make all the difference. This is a telling indicator of the ambivalent ways in which the principles of enlightenment, demonstration and representation are currently impacting. In the face of the threat of the *Innerlichkeit* of the second modernity, the forces of the first modernity strike back, looking to assert a modicum of order, discipline and distance at the Dybbøl battlefield centre. The experiential counter-museum, paradoxically embracing 'play' while denouncing it, thus seems on its way to becoming a counter-counter-museum.

Received: 15 January 2010

Finally accepted: 24 March 2011

Notes

- ¹ Gerhard Schulze's earlier (1992) thesis on the 'experience society' is less business-oriented but more comprehensive in its sociological claims.
- ² Recent undertakings in what is known as 'conflict' archaeology attempt to straddle these issues by aiming to facilitate visitors' experiences of the 'true military landscape', as a recent study by Robertshaw and Kenyon (2008: 32) has it. They distance themselves from the experiential strategies of what they term 'heritage marketing' (*ibid.*: 16), suggesting instead that the 'archaeological experience' allows visitors to 'get closer to the real character of the

conflict' (ibid.: 34). Thus, opening up the public's eyes and access to actual trenches and excavations can be one way of attempting to balance the strengthened demand for experience with a strong emphasis on scientific enlightenment. See also Scott et al. (eds) 2009; Osgood and Brown 2009; as well as the sub-discipline's key journal, *Journal of Conflict Archaeology*.

- ³ Some have suggested understanding such sites as destinations of 'dark tourism' (Lennon and Foley 2000) or 'thanatourism' (Seaton 1996; 1999), a label which A.V. Seaton takes to apply to 'five broad categories of tourist behavior', including visits to battlefields (Seaton 1999: 131). Sharon Macdonald (2009: 1) has proposed the term 'difficult heritage' to account for 'a past that is recognized as meaningful in the present but that is also contested and awkward for public reconciliation with a positive, self-affirming contemporary identity', while Lynn Meskell (2002: 558) coins the term 'negative heritage' to describe 'a conflictual site that becomes the repository of negative memory in the collective imaginary.'
- ⁴ This paper is based on ethnographic fieldwork at and around the battlefield site of Dybbøl, the main bulk of which was conducted during spring and summer 2006. The field data formed part of the material for the author's PhD (Daugbjerg 2008), a larger study concerning the connections between tourism, heritage policies and national memory connected to Dybbøl as a site and symbol.
- ⁵ Original Danish wording: 'Hvad udad tabes, det maa indad vindes'. Different English translations exist. This one is taken from 'the official website of Denmark' operated by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs: <http://www.denmark.dk/en/menu/About-Denmark/Denmark-In-Brief/Denmark-An-Overview/FromSuperpowertoMiniatureState/>. Accessed 8 July 2009.
- ⁶ E.g. Sørensen 1996; Østergaard 2004. For a brief introduction to the 'civic' and 'ethnic' concepts of nation, see e.g. Calhoun 1997: 86-103; Diaz-Andreu 2001.
- ⁷ My translation. Pontoppidan's original Danish wording: 'En røvet datter, dybt begrædt'.
- ⁸ The Danish name of the centre is *Historiecenter Dybbøl Banke*, literally 'History centre Dybbøl Hill'. However, in its English-language promotion material, the centre terms itself a 'battlefield centre'.
- ⁹ All quotes from oral sources in this paper are my translations from Danish and German, respectively.
- ¹⁰ Commenting on such a disciplinary view on the museum, Kevin Hetherington (2007: 170) has pointed out that 'the museum is not simply an institution concerned with the governance of subjects – though I agree that it is that – it is also a response to the uncertainties of capitalism.' See Daugbjerg 2009: 433-36 for a related critique.
- ¹¹ For critical voices, see e.g. Hewison 1987; Bennett 1995. For countercritiques, see e.g. Urry 2002; Samuel 1994. For a detailed overview of the heritage debate, see Smith 2006: 11-43.
- ¹² Early battlefield centre brochure reproduced in Rasmussen 2000: 175, my translation.
- ¹³ On the Scandinavian open air museology, see Stoklund 1993; Crang 1999; Klein 2006; Rentzhog 2007.
- ¹⁴ Stephen Bann (2004) has argued that 'museological modes of organizing data have been polarized for some two centuries between two broad scenographic practices' (Preziosi and Farago 2004: 15). Contrasting two early (post-revolutionary) Paris museums, Bann proposes that in what he terms 'metonymic' museum practices, objects are displayed according to

chronological and/or stylistic succession, while, conversely, 'synecdochic' museum practices aim to recreate a dramatic effect of 'being there', creating powerful 'period' effects and enveloping the visitor in the illusion of visiting the past (Preziosi and Farago 2004: 15-16). Bann's aim – which I share – is not one of placing the two modes at 'different points in a single evolutionary scheme, but of showing how their differing types of discourse relate to different epistemological totalities' (Bann 2004: 73).

- ¹⁵ In a related vein, Kevin Hetherington takes up the *Erfahrung/Erlebnis* opposition in the works of Walter Benjamin, arguing that '[a]t the heart of this modern institution of the museum is a concern with the question of experience (*Erfahrung*). Modernity alters the character of experience fundamentally. As we have seen already with Benjamin, modern capitalism, with its de-traditionalizing effects, forces a breakdown of experience as a totality (*Erfahrung*) grounded in the topos of memory, custom, and epic narrative and sees the emergence of a more fractured and fragmentary set of experiences where the present is seen as a series of events whose lived character resists understanding and easy communication (*Erlebnis* (...))' (Hetherington 2007: 170, italics in original).
- ¹⁶ Interestingly, Lash and Lury never refer to Pine and Gilmore's concept of experience economy, but their 'culture industry' shares fundamental experiential and commercial characteristics with it.
- ¹⁷ Dividing my visitor studies evenly between the centre and the neighbouring Sønderborg castle museum, I conducted a total of nineteen semistructured interviews with 50 informants (19-52 minutes), plus eleven so-called 'video walks' in which I tracked visitors' routes, engagements and conversations on (40-minutes) video recordings (on this last method, see Gjedde and Ingemann 2008). On top of these recorded files, my field notes contain numerous informal conversations with staff and visitors at and around the sites.
- ¹⁸ See also Ingold 2000: 226-228, on Merleau-Ponty and 'how to see the world from everywhere at once', as well as Willerslev 2007 for an ethnographic account of the merits of Merleau-Ponty's idea of having 'the world at a distance'.
- ¹⁹ For discussions of the subtle German terminologies of war memorials and remembrance, see Till 2005: 82-86; Macdonald 2009: 8-12.
- ²⁰ The original Danish term is 'videnpædagogiske aktivitetscentre'. In 2009, fourteen such centres upheld political funding.

References

- Adriansen, Inge (1992) 'Dybbøl – et dansk og tysk nationalt symbol', *Sønderjyske Årbøger*, 249-90.
- Bagnall, Gaynor (1996) 'Consuming the Past', in Stephen Edgell, Kevin Hetherington and Alan Warde (eds) *Consumption Matters: the Production and Experience of Consumption*, 227-45, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Bann, Stephen (2004) 'Poetics of the Museum: Lenoir and Du Sommerard', in Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago (eds) *Grasping the World: the Idea of the Museum*, 65-84, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Bennett, Tony (1988) 'The Exhibitionary Complex', *New Formations* 4 (Spring) 73-102.
- Bennett, Tony (1995) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London & New York: Routledge.

- Bennett, Tony (2004) *Pasts Beyond Memory: Evolution, Museums, Colonialism*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Bennett, Tony (2006) 'Civic Seeing: Museums and the Organization of Vision', in Sharon Macdonald (ed.) *A Companion to Museum Studies*, 263-81, Oxford: Blackwell.
- Boswijk, Albert, Thomas Thijssen and Ed Peelen (2007) *The Experience Economy: A New Perspective*, Amsterdam: Pearson.
- Calhoun, Craig (1997) *Nationalism*, Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Crang, Mike (1999) 'Nation, Region and Homeland: History and tradition in Dalarna, Sweden', *Cultural Geographies*, 6, 447-70.
- Crouch, David (2002) 'Surrounded by Place: Embodied Encounters', in Simon Coleman and Mike Crang (eds) *Tourism: Between Place and Performance*, 207-18, New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Csikszentmihalyi, Mihaly (1975) 'Play and Intrinsic Awards', *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 15, 41-63.
- Daugbjerg, Mads (2008) *A Site to Die For: Practices of Nationalism at a Danish Heritage Site*, PhD thesis, Aarhus University, Faculty of Humanities.
- Daugbjerg, Mads (2009) 'Pacifying War Heritage: Patterns of Cosmopolitan Nationalism at a Danish Battlefield Site', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 15 (5) 431-46.
- Díaz-Andreu, M. (2001) 'Guest Editor's Introduction: Nationalism and Archaeology', *Nations and Nationalism*, 7 (4), 429-40.
- Durbin, Gail (ed.) (1996) *Developing Museum Exhibition for Lifelong Learning*, London: Group for Education in Museums.
- Edensor, Tim (2006) 'Sensing Tourist Spaces', in Claudia Minca and Tim Oakes (eds) *Travels in Paradox: Remapping Tourism*, 23-45, Lanham & New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Feifer, Maxine (1985) *Going Places*, London: Macmillan.
- Foucault, Michel (1991) 'Governmentality', in Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon and Peter Miller (eds) *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, 87-104. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1976) 'The Phenomenological Movement' in *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, 130-81, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Gjedde, Lisa and Ingemann, Bruno (2008) *Researching Experiences – Exploring Processual and Experimental Methods in Cultural Analysis*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Goffman, Erving (1961) 'Role Distance', in *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*, 85-132. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Hall, Martin (2006) 'The Reappearance of the Authentic' in Ivan Karp, Corinne A. Kratz, Lynn Szwaja and Tomás Ybarra-Frausto (eds) *Museum Frictions: Public Cultures/Global Transformations*, 70-101, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Hein, George E. (1998) *Learning in the Museum*, London and New York: Routledge.

- Hetherington, Kevin (2007) *Capitalism's Eye: Cultural Spaces of the Commodity*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Hewison, Robert (1987) *The Heritage Industry: Britain in a Climate of Decline*, London: Methuen.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean (1992) *Museums and the Construction of Knowledge*, Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean (1994) *The Educational Role of the Museum*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Ingold, Tim (2000) 'To Journey Along a Way of Life: Maps, Wayfinding and Navigation' in *The Perception of the Environment: Essays in Livelihood, Dwelling and Skill*, 219-42. London & New York: Routledge.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara (1998) *Destination Culture: Tourism, Museums, and Heritage*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Klein, Barbro (2006) 'Cultural Heritage, the Swedish Folklife Sphere, and the Others', *Cultural Analysis*, 5, 57-80.
- Korsgaard, Ove (2004) *Kampen om folket: Et dannelsesperspektiv på dansk historie gennem 500 år*. København: Gyldendal.
- Lash, Scott (1999) *Another Modernity, a Different Rationality*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Lash, Scott (2006) 'Experience', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23 (2-3) 335-41.
- Lash, Scott and Lury, Celia (2007) *Global Culture Industry*, Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Lennon, John and Malcolm Foley (2000) *Dark Tourism*, Edinburgh: Continuum.
- Macdonald, Sharon (2009) *Difficult Heritage: Negotiating the Nazi Heritage in Nuremberg and Beyond*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Meskill, Lynn (2002) 'Negative Heritage and Past Mastering in Archaeology', *Anthropological Quarterly*, 75 (3) 557-74.
- McIntosh, Alison J. (1999) 'Into the Tourist's Mind: Understanding the Value of the Heritage Experience', *Journal of Travel and Tourism Marketing*, 8 (1) 41-64.
- Moscardo, Gianna (1996) 'Mindful Visitors: Heritage and Tourism', *Annals of Tourism Research* 23: 376-97.
- O'Dell, Tom and Peter Billing (eds) (2005) *Experiencescapes: Tourism, Culture and Economy*, Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press.
- Osgood, Richard and Martin Brown (2009) *Digging up Plugstreet: The Archaeology of a Great War Battlefield*, Sparkford: Haynes Publishing.
- Østergaard, Uffe (2004) 'The Danish Path to Modernity', *Thesis Eleven*, no. 77: 25-43.
- Pine, B. Joseph and Gilmore, James H. (1998) 'Welcome to the Experience Economy', *Harvard Business Review* (July-August), 97-105.
- Pine, B. Joseph and Gilmore, James H. (1999) *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre & Every Business a Stage*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

- Preziosi, Donald and Claire Farago (2004) 'Creating Historical Effects', in Donald Preziosi and Claire Farago (eds) *Grasping the World: The Idea of the Museum*, 13-21. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Rasmussen, René (2000) 'Slaget om Dybbøl Banke. En øjenvidneskildring af kampen om Historiecenter Dybbøl Bankes udvidelsesplaner', *Fortid og Nutid*. 171-98.
- Rentzhog, Sten (2007) *Open Air Museums: The History and Future of a Visionary Idea*. Östersund: Jamtli Förlag.
- Robertshaw, Andrew and David Kenyon (2008) *Digging the Trenches: The Archaeology of the Western Front*, London: Pen & Sword Military.
- Samuel, Raphael (1994) *Theatres of Memory, vol. 1: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture*, London & New York: Verso.
- Schulze, Gerhard (1992) *Die Erlebnis-Gesellschaft. Kulturosoziologie der Gegenwart*, Frankfurt & New York: Campus Verlag.
- Scott, Douglas, Lawrence Babits and Charles Haecker (eds) (2009) *Fields of Conflict: Battlefield Archaeology from the Roman Empire to the Korean War*. Dulles: Potomac Books.
- Seaton, A. V. (1996) 'Guided by the Dark: From Thanatopsis to Thanatourism', *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 2 (4) 234-44.
- Seaton, A. V. (1999) 'War and Thanatourism: Waterloo 1815-1914', *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26 (1) 130-58.
- Smith, Laurajane (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Stoklund, Bjarne (1993) 'International Exhibitions and the New Museum Concept in the Latter Half of the Nineteenth Century', *Ethnologia Scandinavia*, 23: 87-113.
- Sørensen, Marie Louise Stig (1996) 'The Fall of a Nation, the Birth of a Subject: the National use of Archaeology in Nineteenth-century Denmark', 24-47 in Margarita Díaz-Andreu and Timothy Champion (eds) *Nationalism and Archaeology in Europe*. London: UCL Press.
- Till, Karen E. (2005) *The New Berlin: Memory, Politics, Place*, Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Urry, John (2002) *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*, 2nd revised edition, London: Sage Publications.
- Urry, John (2004) 'Death in Venice', in John Urry and Mimi Sheller (eds) *Tourism Mobilities. Places to Play, Places in Play*, 205-15. London and New York: Routledge.
- Willerslev, Rane (2007) 'To Have the World at a Distance: Rethinking the Significance of Vision for Social Anthropology' in Cristina Grasseni (ed.) *Skilled Visions: Between Apprenticeship and Standards*, 24-46. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books.

***Mads Daugbjerg**

Assistant Professor, PhD
 Section for Anthropology and Ethnography
 Aarhus University
 E-mail: mads.daugbjerg@hum.au.dk
 Website: <http://person.au.dk/kunmd@hum>