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**Abstract**

If the link between war and tourism has already received considerable academic and media attention, the spatial representation of war in the tourism sector is still emerging in the fields of cultural geography and anthropology. In this paper I seek to explore the reconversion and touristification of sites traumatised by war – which I have approached using the concept of *Traumascape* – by presenting a case study in the Balkan region, Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina. This city lived through a terrible and traumatic siege during the Balkan wars of the 1990s and is now undergoing a process of post-conflict reconstruction. Tourists are now coming back to the region and many are eager to visit the war heritage left by the conflict. So-called ‘war tours’, leading tourists through war-affected areas, are appearing in the town: the *Times of Misfortune tour*, *The Total siege tour*, *the Mission Impossible tour* and other tours labelled as *political tours* are taking place in the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina. The touristification of these sites and of the Balkan wars in general raises many questions in terms of the representation and interpretation of a collective and recent trauma: why are certain sites touristified and others not? Can tourism foster cooperation and reconciliation between divided communities? Can tourism be a vector of expression and information? And finally is the difference between a tourist attraction and a memorial as clear as it is generally stated?
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1. **Introduction**

This paper will explore a case study of a city that is characterized by the siege it lived through, during what was commonly termed the ‘Balkan wars’ in the nineties. It will present the way some sites closely connected to this war are reconverted, interpreted and presented, with a particular focus on their touristification. Indeed, Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia-Herzegovina, is now exposing sites specifically linked to the war to tourists through what is labelled as ‘war tours’. Independent tour guides, tourism agencies and former actors in the wars, such as journalists or fixers, are now proposing tours leading visitors to war torn areas of the city. With the return of tourists to the region, the reconversion and the touristification of those *traumascape* raise a number of questions in terms of the interpretation and representation of a collective trauma, but also regarding economic and territorial development, and even reconciliation and social cohesion:
Why are some sites rehabilitated and others not? Can tourism foster reconciliation between divided communities? Can tourism be a vector of information and even a vehicle of expression for silent voices? Or on the opposite side, could the touristification of traumatic elements aim to serve the powers in place? Furthermore, while situating a trauma like war in an industry close to leisure, do we not take the risk of disconnecting it from its traumatic history? Finally, such questions raise a more general concern on the traditional difference that is supposed to exist between a memorial and a tourist attraction.

To contextualize the following discussion, it is first necessary to take a brief look at the history of the siege that heavily destroyed the city and traumatized its inhabitants. The existing literature connecting war and tourism, and in a more general way, trauma and tourism will also have to be analyzed with a critical eye. This problematic is generally approached through the notion of dark tourism, which is presented as the act of visiting sites of death, disaster and atrocities. As it will be demonstrated, this very descriptive approach is still limited and subsequent empirical work has yet to be accomplished. The concept of traumascape must also be clarified to illuminate its transformation into a touristscape. Finally, the presentation of the ‘war tours’ will serve to introduce issues raised by the interpretation and the presentation of a heritage connected to the Sarajevo siege.

Most of the data presented in this paper is the result of fieldwork undertaken in the former Yugoslavia during 2010 and 2011, and a few elements are the result of previous fieldwork in Cambodia and Vietnam.

2. 1992-1996: From Siege to Division

The Sarajevo siege is considered to be the longest one in modern history. It began between March and April 1992, following the declaration of independence of Bosnia-Herzegovina from Yugoslavia on 3 March 1992. Shortly after the European Community’s recognition of Bosnia and Herzegovina as a sovereign State, an armed conflict broke out. The Yugoslav People's Army (JNA), which later became the Bosnian Serb Army under the orders of General Ratko Mladic, established a total blockade of the city in May 1992. In comparison with the siege forces, the Bosnian forces were very poorly armed. Nevertheless, Serb forces did not manage to take the city and so concentrated their efforts on weakening Sarajevo’s inhabitants by blocking access roads, cutting supplies and utilities and continuously bombing the city from the surrounding hills.

In October 1995, a cease fire was established and the Bosnian government officially declared the end of the siege in February 1996. Following the Final Report of the United Nations Commission of Experts, it was estimated that almost 10,000 people were killed, including over 1,500 children; the report states that: ‘UNPROFOR and city officials have indicated that shelling of the city ranges from about 200 to 300 impacts on what they refer to as a quiet day to 800 to 1,000 shell impacts on an active day.’
The Dayton agreements signed by presidents Milosevic (Serbia), Izetbegovic (Bosnia), Tudman (Croatia) and former presidents of the main Western countries on the 14th of December 1995 is seen as the event that concluded the Sarajevo siege and the war in Bosnia in general. The Dayton agreements also marked the division of the country into two entities: the ‘Republika Srpska’ under Serb authority and the Federation of Bosnia-Herzegovina under Bosniak and Croatian authority. The city of Sarajevo itself mirrors this separation, with the centre and the Western part of the city becoming part of the Federation and what is known as East Sarajevo becoming part of the ‘Republika Srpska’. Although divided in its entities, Bosnia-Herzegovina retains a central government with a rotating State Presidency and a constitutional court. And yet, the two entities have their own administrations, ministries, school systems and police, and are under the supervision of the High Representative Office, which has the difficult task of monitoring the numerous conflicts caused by this divided power. As an illustrative example, at the time of writing, Bosnia had not had central government for over ten months. For these reasons, Sarajevo can be considered as a divided city.

3. The limits or the dark tourism approach

In the current literature, the link between trauma and tourism and more specifically, between war and tourism, has already been illustrated by numerous authors. Derek Hall states that ‘sites associated with war and conflict become particularly popular.’ Valene Smith goes further, introducing the idea that ‘memorabilia of warfare and allied products constitute the largest single category of tourist attractions in the world.’ The touristification of sites related to war is generally problematized through the notion of dark tourism or thanatourism, in the same way as sites linked to natural disasters or terrorism attacks. Such research is often produced in the fields of hospitality management and marketing. Most of them are limited to quantitative analyses leading to results presented through rigid typologies disconnected from reality. Stone, for instance, intends to point out the different shades of darkness a site can take on, in a spectrum going from the lightest to the darkest. Following his idea, Auschwitz would be darker than the Museum of Holocaust in Washington DC, as the latter is more disconnected from the Second World War genocide. He defines different categories on this spectrum depending on dimensions such as education, authenticity, leisure, location, chronological distance or even the degree of touristification. Others scholars produced diverse categorizations of sites or practices linked to trauma. Seaton introduces the idea that dark tourism is the travel dimension of thanatopsis and that this form of travel, far from being recent, ranges from the Middle Ages to the modern day. He proposes five broad categories of travel practices: to witness public enactments of death (e.g. public executions), to visit sites of mass or individual deaths (e.g. Auschwitz or James Dean’s grave), to visit sites of internments or memorials to the dead (e.g. catacombs or war memorials), to view
material evidence or symbolic representations of death (e.g. weapons in a museum or the embalmed body of Lenin), and finally to participate to re-enactments or simulation of death (e.g. battle re-enactments staged by the English Civil War Society). Dunkley, on the other hand, defines thanatourism site typology as being based on seven categories: horror tourism (e.g. Jack the Ripper tours or Madame Tussaud’s chamber of horrors), grief tourism (e.g. Arlington cemetery or Highgate), hardship tourism (e.g. Alcatraz or Northern Ireland), Tragedy tourism (e.g. Hiroshima or Ground Zero), Warfare tourism (e.g. battlefields or war museums), Genocide tourism (e.g. Auschwitz or Rwanda) and extreme thanatourism (e.g. public executions or staged crucifixions).

It will be stated in this paper that a more comprehensive approach, with more qualitative and interdisciplinary methods, has to be undertaken in order to generate a reflection that goes far beyond the tourism sector. The typologies presented by authors such as Stone, Seaton or Dunkley tend to present visitors as a homogeneous group as is demonstrated in the study of Biran:

[... tourists are often regarded as a homogeneous group and as passive receptors that should be educated [... Studies ignore the fact that tourists have different levels of knowledge and familiarity as well as diversity of views in relation to the display [...] all of which may affect their preferences of on-site interpretation. While some tourists may be interested in interpretation that is educational, others may be seeking an emotional, spiritual, or sentimental experience.]

Focusing on Auschwitz, which is presented as the epitome of dark tourism, Biran’s study seeks to enhance the current understanding of dark tourism. He argues that while a conceptual approach is dominant, empirical research on sites presenting death is lacking. Indeed, more empirical studies will demonstrate the limits of dark tourism theories and their homogenous visions of visitors to what is labelled as dark sites. It seems evident that a Holocaust survivor will not experience a visit to Auschwitz in the same way as a school child who is largely disconnected from the trauma of the Holocaust. Similarly, during fieldwork carried out in Cambodia in 2009, a chief of project at the Documentation Centre for Cambodia indicated that most of the people visiting the Toul Sleng Museum in Phnom Peen were foreigners:

Cambodians are poor. They will not spend money to visit Toul Sleng or the Killing Fields. It is very hard for us. And they know the prison. Locals come if they are invited. Sometimes we organized visits for population from villages. I saw once a
woman crying because she recognized somebody on one of the pictures on the wall.\textsuperscript{16}

This reaction seems to illustrate well the different experience that a Cambodian strongly connected to the trauma would have, in comparison to a foreign tourist. Based on this observation, it seems questionable to situate those sites following typologies linked to the shade that could take a site in connection to its traumatic history. A place like the Cu Chi tunnels\textsuperscript{17} in the area of Ho Chi Minh City is seen by many tourists as a kind of ‘war Disneyland’, where it is possible to wander through a reconstituted Vietcong tunnel and try to shoot with authentic rifles. It can be stated without hesitation that someone who experienced those tunnels during the Vietnam War would have another vision of it. Following this idea, what shade of darkness would a site like Toul Sleng Museum or the Cu Chi Tunnel take on Stone’s spectrum?

Dark tourism theories also tend to limit the motives for tourism to these sites to the desire to satisfy a morbid curiosity, conceptualized by the German word Schadenfreude\textsuperscript{18}, which combines the notions of both joy and harm. On the other hand, following the dark tourism theory, the management of those sites would be guided by this morbidity in order to satisfy financial needs. As it will be suggested in this paper, this conceptualization is again too limited and as Beran’s study shows in its findings:

\[
\text{[...] tourists motives are varied, and include a desire to learn and understand the history presented, a sense of ‘see it to believe it,’ and interest in having an emotional heritage experience.}^{19}
\]

Sharpley admits that many sites may be consumed differently by tourists. He affirms that ‘a fascination with or interest in death may often not be the principal factor driving the consumption of such experiences.’\textsuperscript{20} He presents a ‘continuum of purposes’ of supply of dark tourism attractions or experiences, varying from ‘accidental’ to ‘purposeful’ supply. Following this idea, he constructs a matrix of dark tourism demand and supply, classifying demand from the palest to the darkest, and supply from accidental to purposeful.

It will be suggested in this paper that more than a simple desire to satisfy a morbid curiosity, the enhancement of education and knowledge is a central motive for tourism. Furthermore, it will be assumed that the presentation and interpretation of war heritage in the context of Sarajevo is closely linked to the idea of fulfilling a will for knowledge. In this context, tourism could be seen as a vector for information as much as a memorial practice.

4. From Traumascpe to Touristscape: Touring the War
As it has been written, before taking a close look at the touristification of sites traumatized by war, it is important to explore the notion of *traumascape*, which the historian Maria Tumarkin defines as a distinct category of places transformed both physically and psychically by a trauma and as a landscape marked by the need to build memorials at sites of massive death. *Traumascape* are not only perceived as locations where a trauma occurred but as mediators between the living and the dead: ‘[…] *traumascape* become much more than physical settings of tragedies: they emerge as spaces where events are experienced and re-experienced across time.’21 A trauma, which can be linked to war, natural disaster or even a terrorist attack, is not only embodied in the place and the event, but in the way this place and event are lived, experienced and represented through time. De Jong proposes a broader conception of the notion of *traumascape* through the presentation of a model for: ‘understanding and studying the interactions between extreme stress, the individual, social ecology, history and culture.’22 He uses the term *traumascape* to represent the systemic dynamics of local and international representations and actions around extreme stress. In this context, tourism can become a vector of experience and interpretation of the trauma and the place with which it is associated. Sarajevo is one of the seven cases that Tumarkin uses to illustrate her concept of *traumascape*. In this paper, some landmarks of this *traumascape* that is Sarajevo will be identified and analysed. The city is now in the process of post-war reconstruction, and tourism is developing moderately. Foreign visitors have come back to Bosnia-Herzegovina in a significant way since 2005, with Sarajevo as the main destination in the country. Tourists are given the possibility of guided tours through the city that focus on its war heritage. These tours are sometimes presented as ‘historical’ or ‘memorial’ tours and may also be referred to as ‘war tours’. The next part of this paper will take a closer look at the way some of these war sites are presented and interpreted.

In Sarajevo, all of the tours that are available to visitors who are interested in seeing the stigmata left by the siege include a visit to the Tunnel of Hope (image 1). During the war, this tunnel was the only connection between the besieged city and the external world. Since it was abandoned by the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina army at the end of the war, it has become a museum privately run by the family who owns the house where the entry is situated. Despite having existed for fifteen years without any governmental support, this place is becoming the most visited site of the Bosnian capital, receiving hundreds of visitors daily.
The Times of Misfortune tour is the most common and advertised of these tours. It is organized by a local tourism agency and their leaflets (Figure 2) are available in all the tourism offices of the city, as well as in many hotels. This tour, aside from a brief city centre sightseeing tour in a minibus, is limited to a visit to the Tunnel of Hope museum.

Image 1: Entrance of the Tunnel of Hope. (By the author, 2010)

Image 2 - Advertising for the Time of Misfortune Tour. (www.sarajevoinsider.com)
The Times of Misfortune tour is generally guided by students, who were often in asylum during the war and who now have the advantage of speaking foreign languages, even though most of them did not live through the siege of the nineties. These tours are very popular and one of the guides, who also leads other types of tours, states that: ‘the Times of Misfortune tour is the most demanded of our tours with the Historical tour.’

But the fact that many guides are very young and somehow disconnected from the traumatic siege of Sarajevo is a source of criticism, as illustrated by a comment left on the Internet by an Italian tourist:

We took this Times of Misfortune tour through the Tourist Information Centre and I would not recommend it! The only reason I can recommend this tour is because you are driven around the city and shown the sites of the war. Useful if you do not have transportation. If you are looking to actually learn in depth facts of the war, this is not the right tour. This tour was narrated by a seventeen-year-old kid who used the tour as a platform to voice his personal opinions and biases. He could give general facts he probably learned in school, but, as he was only born during the war, he had no personal knowledge and certainly was unable to discuss any tactical aspects of the fighting. He incorrectly talked about some historical facts regarding the war as well as World War two. No 17-year-old high school student should be giving such a tour.

‘You see smiling people, nice dresses… happy foreigners. It’s good… But now you are going to see the bad side of Sarajevo. Places that are not on the map. Places that are not recommended. Places that are covered.’ Those are the words that the guide leading the Mission Impossible tour used to introduce to the tour through the ruins of the last war. The guide is a former fixer who used to work for the Red Cross and guide UN soldiers during the war. He proposes a more complete panorama of sites, including, among others, the old Olympic bobsleigh track that was shelled during the war, the ruins of the anti-fascist monument, the burnt down library and what he calls ‘the Mujahidin Market’, next to the Kralj Fahd Džamija (King Fahd Mosque), as can be seen in this text extracted from his advertising leaflet:

During this private tour you can see: Old City Hall (Ex Library), Sarajevo Hiroshima, The Battlefield of Zuc hill, War Cemetery, Romeo and Juliet Bridge, Olympic Bobsleigh ruins, Maternity Hospital, Oslobodenje newspaper Building, Ruins of Home for the Aged, Sniper positions around Sarajevo and Bosnian Serbs
Sieges Lines, Ex Parliament, Tunnel under the Airport, Minefields around Sarajevo, Ruins of the Jewish Cemetery, Ex Yugoslav Army Camp (Marshal Tito), Border with Republic of Srpska, King Fahd Mosque, Market Massacre places, First victims bridge, Orphan Village, and much more. You can ask, I will answer. (politic, statistic, Sarajevo by the numbers, past and future of Sarajevo, situation today). Coffee break 20 min.26

This guide presents himself as the first legitimate post-war guide and insists on the impartiality and the veracity of his discourse, as well as on the uniqueness of his presentation. He frequently points out his experience of the war and the large work of post-war inquiries he led during the last ten years. He was indeed part of different TV documentary projects and he is now the president of the new Tour Guides Association. He does not hesitate to question other tour guides’ information, employing a certain liberty of speech that would be unavailable, in comparison, to other actors, saying for instance that they would not talk about the black market or about the construction of a second tunnel during the war. In his opinion, ‘young guides, especially those speaking foreign language, weren’t here during the siege, there is a lot of things they can’t know.’ He started the ‘war tour’ experience with the Radovan Karadzic pop art tour that used to lead visitors along the footprints of the famous chief of the Serbian forces of Bosnia, including, for instance, the village where he was born in Montenegro, his house in Sarajevo and his headquarters during the war in the nearby town of Pale. As he says now: ‘This tour is not demanded anymore since the arrest of Karadzic.’ He also organizes day trips to Srebrenica, including the Potocari memorial, the former UN Dutch basement and a silver water source nearby.

Another independent travel agency appeared in 2010 under the name of Sarajevo Funky Tours.27 It is managed by a student who also organizes day trips to Srebrenica and what he calls the Total Siege Tour, which leads tourists to the Tunnel of Hope Museum, the bobsleigh track and a former bunker near the Serb front lines. It is important to add that all the tours presented below are proposed along with other, more regular tours, like water rafting or city walk tours. But in all three cases, these so-called ‘war tours’ are in the most demand, as has been quoted before and as the Sarajevo Funky Tour guide confirms:

I do a Total siege tour every day. War here is the most common topic. I do also a lot of Srebrenica tour. Sometimes my father does the tour; he was a soldier during the war so he also knows the topic. But in Srebrenica the official guides of the memorial take tourists for the tour in the memorial. So my father can bring tourists to Srebrenica.28
Finally, another tour simply named *Political Tour* also appeared recently and is organized from London by a former *New York Times* correspondent. These tours are organized in different parts of the world, like North Korea, Georgia and Northern Ireland. One of these tours is called *Mladic’s Legacy - A Political Tour of Bosnia and Serbia*. Sarajevo is only part of this week-long trip, which includes key speakers who are mostly former foreign correspondents who had worked in the region. The first day of the tour is spent in Sarajevo and is described as follow:

Sarajevo under Siege: An introduction to Sarajevo on the eve of war. Tour of city with [a former BBC correspondent] to revisit areas she reported from during the three year long siege. Lunch followed by visit to The Tunnel museum. The tunnel under Sarajevo airport was one of the few conduits for supplies during the shelling. […] Dinner with selected guests

5. War Heritage in a Divided City

To understand the dynamics that guide the management and the interpretation of Sarajevo’s traumatic past, it is important to go beyond the tourism sector and to take a broader look at the socio-economic context of Bosnia-Herzegovina’s capital. The city of Sarajevo is experiencing a social and political division and this situation often leads to the obstruction of numerous projects. This fact is often put forward by the *Mission Impossible tour* guide, who illustrates this trend using the example of the Vraca monument, another site in his tour. This antifascist monument was built by Josip Tito after the Second World War and was destroyed during the war of the nineties. Before this last war, it was well-known as a place for school visits, as well as a venue for official ceremonies. The guide points out that after the Dayton agreements, the border dividing the two entities was established, crossing the ruins of the monument with the purpose of sharing the place equally between the different communities:

Dayton agreement put the border here, just to give chances to both sides if they wanted… It means if they wanted…No problems! They could have had the border 15 meters away and it would have been only to Federation… But no! They wanted to give chances to both sides. […] And this is the result… Today here are the needles of the narco users, condoms of thefuckers… Mafia meeting, a safe place for narco dealers. […] And now you can’t find this place on any map.29

If his statement can be invalidated by the official documentation of the National Monument Commission of the Federal Ministry of Culture, stating that this site is entirely part of the Federation,30 it is true that the future of certain sites and
institutions will be determined by the socio-political division of the country. State institutions like the National Library famous for its shelling by the Serbian forces, which resulted in the burning of about two million books in August 1992, can illustrate the difficulties linked to the division of the country into two entities. An NGO activist in Sarajevo exposes the main reason for the lack of funds for the library’s reconstruction:

Before the war the funding of the National Library came from the State, because as a national institution the library is dependent on the State. And now in the Parliament, delegates from ‘Republika Srpska’ say: ‘No this institution is dependant of the Federation.’31

The result is now a total absence of funding for the library and most of the books saved from the flames are stored precariously in barracks. This famous building is finally after many years under a process of reconstruction in order to host the City Hall as it did before the Second World War and only part of the building will be dedicated to the library. The situation of the National Museum, another State institution, can also serve to illustrate the pernicious effects of this division, as in the statement of its Deputy Director:

After the war of the nineties, the Dayton Agreements separated the country into two entities. It became a big problem for State Institutions. There is now no more Ministry of Culture at the State level, only at the entity level. But this museum is not an entity museum. So we have now big problems of funding. We have a strange Minister – the Ministry of Civil Affairs –, which covers everything that is not covered by other Ministries. They take charge of cultural affairs at the State level. But we are still waiting for a grant. The country had no government for ten month now. We haven’t gotten money since April 2010.32

6. Private Memorials for Silent Voices?

As it has been shown, social and political aspects related to this post-war context are crucial to understanding the dynamics that will guide the future and the management of certain sites and institutions. Following those observations, could we introduce the idea that independent projects – or even familial ones – such as the Tunnel of Hope or certain private initiatives, such as those accomplished by some of the tour guides previously presented, would more easily bypass bureaucratic and political barriers? Furthermore, could those different projects be seen as alternative vectors of expression for silent and marginal voices? Tumarkin33 describes The Tunnel of Hope not only as a private museum, but also
as a private memorial. This conceptualization has been partly supported by the *Mission Impossible* tour guide who describes the creation of the Museum in the house at the entry of the tunnel:

> The army just let him [the owner of the house now curator of the museum] alone. And his house was damaged... what to do now? And he decided to establish a tunnel Museum. It’s five marks a ticket you know... He sells some things ... Ok! But this is private.34

The curator and owner of the house confirmed in 2010 that his museum was totally private. In this context, could the Museum and other initiatives presented be seen as a challenge to the representation of trauma by the powers in place? Before attempting to answer this question, it is important to note that certain situations may evolve; for example, the museum could instead take a different direction, if we take into account the comments of the son of the curator of the Tunnel of Hope Museum in 2011, who also works at the site:

> This is still a family business. There are plans now to reconstruct the entire tunnel. Since this year...The government would reconstruct it and we would continue to work for the museum. Before they were not interested. But that is only the plan. It will take a long time. Everything is very slow here in Bosnia.35

Even though the future situation of the Museum could be subject to changes, this example serves as a good illustration of a private and familial success. The new interest of the government in this project can even confirm it. However, the curator of the museum insisted on his determination to avoid nationalistic influences from different communities and even added, referring to the opening speech of the fifteenth anniversary of the construction of this museum in 2010:

> I don’t like everybody to talk about the tunnel. Some politicians tried to use it for their own publicity. I will not allow politicians to do the discourse; it will be one of the best students who will read it.36

After having examined those examples, it would now be interesting to introduce the notions of ‘gentrification’ and ‘encirclement’ that Jenny Edkins assimilates to two different ways of managing a trauma. Edkins looks at the ways a trauma is inscribed and re-inscribed into everyday narratives through remembrance, memorialisation and witnessing. She adds that this process also
takes place in political actions and that these practices are the site of struggles. But Edkins states that ‘despite this, there is an imperative to speak, and a determination to find ways of speaking that remain true to the trauma.’ Following her argument, the re-inscription of a trauma into linear narratives would be a process that tends to depoliticise it:

We cannot try to address the trauma directly without risking its gentrification. We cannot remember it as something that took place in time, because this would neutralise it. All we can do is “to encircle again and again the site” of the trauma, “to mark it in its very impossibility.” Memory and forgetting are crucial, both in contesting the depoliticisation that goes under the name of politics, and in keeping open a space for a genuine political challenge by encircling the trauma rather than attempting to gentrify it.

If the reinstallation of time as linear is central to the process of re-inscription, the encirclement of the trauma and of sites of trauma would imply forms of memorialisation that do not produce a linear narrative, but another notion of temporality. That is what Edkins illustrates by the fact of encircling the trauma rather than gentrifying it. She puts into perspective what she considers as the ‘trauma time’ and the ‘linear time’ that define and constitute each other like opposite poles of a dichotomy. A form of memorialisation disconnected from a linear narrative and retaining the trace of another notion of temporality does occur when the political struggle between linear and trauma time is resolved ‘by a recognition and surrounding of the trauma […].’

On the other hand, the touristification of traumatized sites also raises the question of their trivialization and historical detachment, as stated by Christina Schwenkel on Vietnam: ‘Despite government efforts to retain its historical and commemorative significance, Vietnamese youth, in particular, have transformed the Cu Chi Tunnels into a site of entertainment that is largely detached from the war.’ Through her study on the Vietnam War memorialization, she assumes that the way the Cu Chi Tunnels site is experienced, especially for the Vietnamese youth, generates anti-memorial functions that suggest a detachment from the traumatic history of Vietnam. Causevic also introduces the notions of ‘trivialization’ and ‘Disneyfication’ of war through cinema or tourism. She compares the Sarajevo Tunnel of Hope and the Cu Chi tunnels, which she presents as two major tourist destinations, pointing out the process of ‘Disneyfication’ and underlining the fact that these sites have to be understood within their historical dimension: ‘Denial is forbidden because it leads to Disneyfication.’

7. War Heritage between Museumification and Memorialization
As it has been shown, the interpretation and management of a sensitive heritage directly connected to a traumatic past raises many questions concerning ethics and power. It seems also that the status of some of these post-war sites, between museum and memorial, should be brought to light, as Paul Williams does in his book on memorial museums. Williams demonstrates that the traditional difference between memorials and museums is often blurred, even though: ‘a memorial is seen to be, if not apolitical, at least safe in the refuge of history. […] A historical museum, by contrast, is presumed to be concerned with interpretation, contextualization, and critique.’

In this unit Collins situates the origins of war memorials in the classical era of Greece. She defines them as highly personal, multiform, either permanent or temporary, either sanctioned or vernacular, but never neutral. She points out how the Eyes Wide Open memorial challenges the official narratives on the war in Iraq and the patriotic commemorations attached to it. Following Edkins’ conceptualization of the gentrification and encirclement of trauma, the Bush administration’s narratives justifying the war in Iraq could be seen as a form of trauma gentrification. However, the Eyes Wide Open memorial could represent a kind of encirclement of this trauma by challenging the official narratives and presenting an alternative interpretation. As Collins demonstrates, the US soldier’s boots symbolizing the human cost of war cannot be seen without encountering the civilian shoes, booties and flip-flops representing Iraqi lives. These representations visually challenge ‘the neat division of the world into good and evil, innocent America and terrorist […]’.

The Breaking the Silence project held in Hebron and described by Clark in this volume could also represent an interesting illustration of trauma encirclement, challenging what the author qualifies as ‘strategic narrative’ justifying Israeli military actions:

"Breaking the Silence seeks to provide a corrective memory of the Hebron conflict, but that shared memory is a challenge, not a comfort, requiring a revision of self and society, how we and they, how victim and victimizer are understood."  

Clark adds that Israeli soldiers and the veterans managing the project seek a ‘way of resistance’ through those testimonies in order to react against ‘the disruptions in power at the root of their trauma. Furthermore, sites associated with the trauma are seen as centers of protests to reclaim and rewrite their memory as a form of resistance. Tours of Hebron are organized to expose the realities of the city and are seen as ‘on-the-ground resistance’. Of course, it can seem questionable to compare ongoing conflicts like the war in Iraq and the armed struggle in Palestine to the war in Bosnia. Nevertheless, some of the war tours organized in Sarajevo could also be seen as a kind of resistance. Tours organized by independent guides or operators..."
are in a way participating in the process of encirclement of trauma by offering an alternative presentation of the war heritage than that which is issued by governmental bodies and official commemorations. As Causevic states: ‘The reason for the Sarajevo Tunnel being the most visited site is that the story of the conflict is explained through the ordinary people of Sarajevo, people in every sense similar to the tourists themselves and whose lives were saved thanks to that tunnel.’48

The importance of the place in the process of memorialization is also brought into light by Boone, Abrams and Gallant49 in this unit. They point out that place ‘serves as a vicarious reminder of the horrors that human beings were forced to endure.’ They introduce Keats’ distinction between ‘first hand witnessing’ and ‘vicarious witnessing’, defining the first as a person who can say ‘I have seen, hence I know.’ Regarding what has been written previously on the importance of having lived the Sarajevo siege to be able to talk about it, this distinction can be of primordial importance. Students not present during the siege guiding tourists through war stigmata can be considered as vicarious witness and some – other guides or visitors – consider them to be less reliable than first-hand witnesses, even though Keats states that ‘the vicarious witness carries the memory of the trauma event into the future when all known survivors are gone.’50

8. Conclusion

Whether we are talking about memorials, museums or war sites visited through guided tours, the presentation and interpretation of this heritage cannot be considered as neutral. Boone, Abrams and Gallant51 remind us that ‘memory relies on emotions such as fear, guilt, pride, and love’ and Aristotle has pointed out the emotional and uncontrolled characteristic of memory. In Sarajevo, tour guides involved in war tours often put forward the fact that it is their story and their opinion that is presented and that visitors should take the time to also consider stories from another perspective. Bosniak guides will often mention heroic Serb behaviour and put forward the fact that a lot of different communities were besieged in Sarajevo, including Serbs that stayed in the city and fought against the besiegers. Following this observation, it would seem tempting to consider this type of tourism as a tool for reconciliation in a divided society. But such statements should not obscure certain realities in the field. All of the so-called war tours are organized and promoted in the Sarajevo city centre, entirely part of the Federation and totally disconnected from the ‘Republika Srpska’ administration, and all the guides leading the tours are Bosniaks. On the other hand, the Serbian community is naturally reluctant to present a traumatic heritage perpetrated by the Serbian army, an issue that raises the question of the definition of ‘victims’ and ‘perpetrators’. For these reasons, it seems questionable to consider war tourism as a tool to achieve reconciliation. Furthermore, the promotion of the war heritage could even enhance the division existing between the Bosniak and the Serb community in
Sarajevo by vividly maintaining the trauma that was at the source of this division. Finally, would more regular tourism, such as mountain tourism or agro-tourism, be more efficient as a tool for reconciliation? One main condition would certainly be to involve both sides in the process. Unfortunately, the institutional and political division inherited from the Dayton agreements does not seem to leave much space for hope in the upcoming years. Some authors introduce the notion of political tourism, illustrating it by the case of Northern Ireland, among others, where some tours are organized by ex-prisoners of the two communities (republicans and loyalists) and where the ideologically-oriented interpretation of the conflict is assumed and promoted. The authors are exploring whether this political form of tourism, often advertised ‘under the wider umbrella of cultural and heritage tourism’, has the potential to succeed in reducing tensions and mistrust, or on the opposite side, if it could strengthen existing misconceptions and stereotypes. In the context of Bosnia, a country seeking to regain its place on the European tourism circuit, many within or outside the tourism industry are warning against the tendency to see Bosnia trapped in its dark past. Between the attempt to exploit this recent conflict to boost tourism and the desire to turn the page and revert to traditional tourist sites, different forces compete in a city and a State on the road to stabilization.

As we can see, the relation between tourism and war, and trauma in general, is multifaceted and a tourism management approach such as the one proposed by dark tourism scholars is not sufficient to fully understand its complexity. In this context, interdisciplinary methods are indispensible to constructing a productive reflection. Paul Williams remarks on the complexity of differentiating memorials and museums, illustrating the ambiguities that exist in trying to situate sites like, for instance, the Tunnel of Hope in well-defined categories, as it has been presented before in the context of dark tourism typologies. As it is argued in Beran’s study, an alternative approach to the understanding of sites connected to trauma such as a war should draw on heritage tourism studies. Whether we are talking about heritage, historical or even cultural tourism, there is a need for more holistic approaches, with qualitative and interdisciplinary methods in order to develop an analysis that goes far beyond the tourism industry. As previously demonstrated, socio-political implications associated with the touristification of sites are essential for the understanding of this issue. Causevic considers war tours and general city tours in Sarajevo as very similar. Therefore, she adds that dark tourism ‘appears to be without meaning. War is a part of every city tour and history is a part of every war tour. Dark tourism as a category does not make any sense.’ Finally, the discourse of some tour guides demonstrates a desire to make their voices heard on a very sensitive matter and in a national context, which goes far beyond the sole process of ‘past Disneyfication’ postulated in dark tourism. Causevic insists that the Sarajevo tunnel cannot be understood in accordance with the theory of the imaginary world of dark tourism as a ‘past Disneyfication’. 
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