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Dear Reader,

It is our great pleasure to present a publication which is a fruit of a unique meeting of scholars, heads of museum institutions, and museum curators from around the world. The World Battlefield Museums Forum was held for the first time in Gdańsk on September 4–6, 2018, with the participation of noble guests from the United States, China, Belgium, France, Ukraine, Turkey, Czech Republic, Greece, Slovakia, Bulgaria and, naturally, Poland.

The conference provided an opportunity for an exchange of experiences in the sphere of raising historical awareness and cultivating the memory of various crucial events in the history of individual countries represented at the meeting. For us, the staff of the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk, the Forum was also a perfect opportunity to acquaint the world with our vision of the future museum to be constructed at Westerplatte; at the site which, to this very day, has been one of the principal symbols of the outbreak of the most tragic military conflict in the history of human civilisation, World War II.

Thus in the present publication the reader shall find a multitude of both practical ideas and theoretical reflections focussing upon various museum-related and commemorative questions. The broad, intercontinental perspective of the presented papers and panel discussions will enable us to understand the essence of a dialogue which often touches upon sensitive, important, and critical issues of wars – the unfortunate events in the histories of individual nations.

I wish you a pleasant reading!
National Patronage of the President of the Republic of Poland Andrzej Duda

On the 100th Anniversary of Independence

over

the World Battlefield Museums Forum

in Gdańsk on 4–6 September 2018

In the year of a great national jubilee, as we are remembering the bravery and contribution of all those who fought for Poland’s independence; in commemoration of the heroic defenders of Westerplatte;

with compliments to the organiser of the Forum – the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk for promoting knowledge about national symbols and important events in the recent history of Poland; with conviction that commemorating battlefields where our ancestors shed their blood is our national duty; wishing you many successful endeavours in the future that will serve to educate Polish people about their history.

Warsaw, 20 July 2018
Ladies and Gentlemen,

It was with great interest that I read the programme of the World Battlefield Museums Forum which starts today. Unfortunately, owing to its geopolitical location, Poland is in a unique position when it comes to developing narratives about different battles. This is why I am glad that it is a Polish museum that takes the initiative and hosts an international meeting dedicated to the topic of battlefields.

In my opinion, world battlefields require in-depth investigation, which may result, for example, in determining the necessary scope of research for a given battlefield as well as finding means to disseminate the acquired knowledge to the general audience. Of course, these tasks pose a great challenge, especially when we realize the diverse subject matter that battlefield museums have to deal with. Nevertheless, it seems that regardless of the geographical location and chronological framework of a given battlefield, certain aspects of museum activity, such as landscape preservation, archaeological research, or verification of historical sources relating to a battle are quite similar for all battlefields. Similarities can also be observed when it comes to everyday problems that museum staff, people present here in the audience, have to face daily while running such museums. Exchange of experiences in these areas will surely contribute to developing a better and more comprehensive approach to historical battlefields. No doubt, these battlefields must also be regarded as historical artefacts and should receive appropriate protection just like traditional museum exhibitions, with a set of rules for their viewing.

I therefore would like to wish you constructive discussions and, given the complex subject matter of the meeting, I hope that the World Battlefield Museums Forum hosted by the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk will only be a starting point, an important step forward towards subsequent international meetings aimed at protecting and promoting the knowledge about past events that sometimes, like the 1920 Battle of Warsaw, determined the fate of the entire world.
Ladies and Gentlemen,

World Battlefield Museums Forum is an unprecedented event. For the first time, representatives of so many institutions that look after battlefields crucial for the history of international conflicts can meet and share their experiences. I congratulate Karol Nawrocki, director of the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk on the idea to organise this conference.

We meet in September, the month when the Second World War broke out. For the Polish nation, it was the first war so fraught with tragic consequences. The battle that was supposed to eliminate the Polish nation.

In September 1939, the Polish radio reported that Westerplatte was still defending itself and the Hel Peninsula defenders were putting up resistance against the invader. The valiant and heroic conduct of soldiers boosted morale, urged others to fight, and sparked hope.

Westerplatte is a special place for the Poles. Therefore, all the more saddening is the fact that this patch of land, so many years on, has not yet been properly managed and commemorated – along the lines of what has been done in Pearl Harbor, Beijing, or Europe’s battlefields. We would like to change that. We would like to show Europe and the world what Westerplatte was and why it is so important.

Westerplatte is not only the place where the Second World War started – of course, bearing in mind that the first bombs fell on Wieluń and its sleeping civilians – Westerplatte is a symbol. It is a momentous history about how a handful of soldiers, whose defence was expected to withstand mere several hours, lasted seven days at their post. They kept fighting despite attacks coming from the air, land, and sea, and they mounted resistance despite the superior strength of the enemy. This is heroism of the highest order! We, the Poles, are grateful to them and very proud of them. For this reason, adequate remembrance of Westerplatte is our moral duty.

The conference is a perfect opportunity to exchange experiences, analyse solutions, and discuss the management concept for the Museum of the Second World War and Westerplatte proposed by director Karol Nawrocki and his team. In the era of the internet and social media, one must find the golden mean to attractively present the most important values and ideas, and find the way into young people’s hearts and minds.

The Republic of Poland is and has been rich in the heroism of its people. Oppressed by the Partitions, German, and then Soviet occupation, it survived and it can be a beautiful example of rebirth. History is memory. We want and must remember those who deserve eternal memory – such as Westerplatte soldiers.

I wish you a pleasant stay and fruitful debates.
NUMEROUS NARRATIONS, ONE OBJECTIVE — TO PRESERVE MEMORY

KAROL NAWROCKI, PH.D.
DIRECTOR OF THE MUSEUM OF THE SECOND WORLD WAR IN GDANSK
Ladies and Gentlemen!
I’d like to warmly greet you again at the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk. In Gdańsk, which, on the historical map of the 20th century, is a special place, because it was here where the shots fired at Westerplatte on 1 September 1939 started the Second World War – the most tragic armed conflict in the history of the whole human civilisation – on the European continent. The war broke out as a result of an agreement between two totalitarianisms: the German Nazism and Soviet communism. And although the former lost in 1945, it was the Soviet communism that influenced people’s lives in this part of Europe for a few decades. It wasn’t until the 1980s, also in Gdańsk, 500 metres from here, at Gdańsk Shipyard, that the process of the communist system’s collapse began. It was where in August 1980 the Independent Self-governing Labour Union “Solidarity” was born – a movement aimed at everybody, rather against anyone. For this reason, I’m really pleased that representatives of equally important, exceptional and symbolic places of memory have arrived today in the city-symbol.

We have met here to discuss how to effectively preserve or develop, for the purposes of memory, sites of numerous important battles, but also to ask ourselves a number of questions about constructing and taking care of forms of memory based on the values which spring from the history of the battlefields themselves. We have tried to, quite subjectively, close the intentions of the World Battlefield Museums Forum in the logo presented. We have showed armed soldiers from three distant historical periods against the background of a shield. To the right, a heavily armoured infantryman with a spear and shield – a hoplite from the Battle of Marathon (490 BC); in the middle, an 18th-century soldier fighting for independence of the United States (1776–1783); finally, to the left, a soldier from Westerplatte of September 1939 – the symbol of Poles’ struggle to defend independence. What do they tell us? First of all, they indicate the horrifying and, at the same time, unchanging, centuries-old tradition of armed conflicts. They started at the beginning of the civilisation, continued in the ancient period, 20th century, and, as we know, unfortunately in the 21st century too. Soldiers have different clothes, different equipment and weapons, but they make the same sacrifice in the fight for freedom, for their “sacred cause”. They talk about the war, which is a scary aspect of human history. But also about the fact that there are values worth fighting for and that should be fought for. Sometimes, unfortunately, with weapons in one’s hand. Irrespective of the historical period, awareness, world view; irrespective of the gravity of the threat and prospects of the fight’s success which are difficult to predict – all three of them fulfill an obligation towards a given community of values. Fulfilling that obligation, they often die prematurely. As was written by Georges Duhamel in Lives of Martyrs, in this case about those who perished at Verdun: “This cemetery is not the place of eternal rest for the old age and illness. It is the cemetery full of young and powerful men”.

Fortunately, over the water’s horizon – for me it will be the horizon of the Baltic Sea, whereas for you it may be the horizon of the Pacific Ocean, South China Sea, Aegean or Black Sea – the sun starts to rise. On one hand, the sun is the symbol of infinity – we can see that wars were, are and, will be waged. I hope, however, that never again – after a century of the two totalitarianisms our museum talks about – will we come back to the worship of war which Friedrich Nietzsche wrote about, unwittingly providing philosophical foundations for German Nazism. Let’s remind Nietzsche’s scary words about the war which is necessary, indispensable and anticipated. About the war in whose flame the overman was to be born:

For the time being, we know of no other means to imbue exhausted peoples, as strongly and surely as every great war does, with the raw energy of battleground, that deep impersonal hatred, that murderous coldbloodedness with a good conscience, that communal, organized ardor in destroying the enemy, that proud indifference to great losses, to one’s own existence and

to that of one’s friend, that mutal earthquake-like convulsion of the soul.

Sunrays contrast even further with the cruelty of war, death or passing of time, which was described, apart from Nietzsche, by Charles Baudelaire – one of the precursors of the Decadent Movement, whose literature is full of images of evil and even tasteless profana-
tion – in his iconoclastic works.

Our sun, however, is the symbol of wisdom, truth and reason: it tells us how to teach about history, about places where two poles – two opposite value systems – clashed, in order to prevent armed conflicts. The rising sun sheds here the light of truth on battlefields, illuminates soldiers’ sacrifice, leads them again to the pantheon of fame, and becomes a symbol of hope – you may think naïve hope – that their sacrifice will teach us how to discuss wars, but live in peace.

Let me close the theme of the sun with a fragment of a poem written by one of the most eminent Polish poets – Jan Kochanowski (song 9, Second Books, Don’t Give up Hope).

Nie poruszaj nadeszłe,
Jakoś će kolwiekhać dnia,
Bo nie już losu owatsze złachodzi,
A po slaj chweli piękny dzis przychodzi.

It’s neither the place, nor the time to delve into the concept of “memory”, as used in the title, itself, or discuss the etymology of the word. To remember simply means to be able to assimilate and recon-
struct. Memory tries to preserve the past in service of the present and future. It’s worth pointing, broadly, out that the basic structure of memory which refers directly to history can be divided into individ-
ual and collective memory. In our everyday work we are, naturally, preoccupied with the category of collective memory, and shaping it on the basis of the circumstances arising out of the history written in battlefields. French historian Pierre Nora has defined collective memory as “what remains of the past in the lived reality of groups, or what these groups make of the past”2. We will be mainly interested in this area, but will not confine ourselves only to the discussion about important stories, scientific research, archaeology and reconstruc-
tion – we will also devote time to the problem of commercialisation of memory, its ethical and mechanical financial and business capa-
bilities, etc. After all, all of us are not only custodians of memory and take care of state or state-private institutions of culture and museums, but we also take care of individual companies which operate in the market reality. According to Peter Drucker, the theory and practice of management directly say that if a business enterprise is an organ of society, then its purpose must lie in society itself, and that “there is only one valid definition of business purpose: to create a customer”. Drucker says that “markets are not created by God, nature or eco-
nomic forces but by businessmen”. Although we don’t manufacture anything, but marketing plays a specific role in our activity: we sell tickets, products, gadgets and... memory. Our “customer” has been created by history itself. The battle dust, split blood, thousands of bodies... We can’t add anything to or deduct anything from what businessmen will call “the product”, but the point of the complex task is the fact that we also have to skillfully coordinate the technical operation of our institutions. To coordinate them in such a way as to stay profitable, but not to disturb the gravity of memory, the saur packages... Memory constitutes one of the basic components of the national identity. However – as Jacques Le Goff wrote – collective memory “goes beyond the limits of history as science and as a public cult [...]. It constitutes part of an important stake in the game of societies [...] in the game of dominating and dominated classes, as they fight for power or for life, for survival or advancement”3. American philoso-
pher William James wrote, and Polish historian Piotr Kostyło trans-
lated and provided a commentary that what appeals most strongly to human consciousness is heroic fight with adversaries in the name of lofty ideals. James wrote – “[...] once we confine ourselves only to consuming fruit of victory, things become mediocre”. Kostyło con-
cluded – “we need long-term objectives, risk as well as determination, mystery and metaphysics”. Another American philosopher, Isaiah Berlin asked directly “we have gained liberty in the negative sense, but do we know what it’s supposed to look like in the positive sense”4.

Moving from wise words directly to the practice of the 21st cen-
tury and our tasks as custodians of places of memory, we have – I hope – no doubts that articles aimed at the general public, as well as state-of-the-art and high-tech museums shape the national and international consciousness to a bigger extent than historiography which – although being the core of breakthrough observations – for various reasons doesn’t constitute the optimal means of commu-
nication with the public within a given country, and is even less effective for communication with the international environment. And I’m saying this as a historian. It’s good news for us, as it means that we have influence on the phenomenon of collective memory, and, at the same time, bad news, as the responsibility for telling this story in the best possible way rests with us. We must not become the 21st-century embodiment of Max Stirner’s “Ego”. The ego, which is egoistic, subjective and demonstrates claiming attitude towards the whole world. And, at the same time, all of us together and each of us individually must – as we try to do at this Forum - tell the story of our nation, our sacred place which we look after, which is why we have gathered here. However, the freedom we enjoy while telling the story is more demanding. What is required in order to manage it in terms of memory is increased effort, research courage, ability to keep the identity of the place and respect for those we talk to. It requires a lot of interdisciplinary research and face gathering, because what is supposed to become the point of reference and analysis of us is a structural course of facts, rather than an outline of impressions. It’s also worth reminding the public of armed conflicts of the past, in order to draw constructive conclusions so that the terror of war can serve as a warning, make us more alert to dangers resulting in

5 J. Le Goff, Historia... p. 117.
imperialist wars, civil wars or religious ones. The memory about battles should serve as a shocking warning for the following generations, as history which has been misunderstood or forgotten will come back and have its say.

At the same time, all of us are aware of the fact that there are two approaches to history: there is critical, academic history to which only a narrow group of specialists have access, and equally true one – presented to a more general audience. The latter, i.e. the historical narration in the non-scientific discourse, in particular in the form of exhibitions, is similar to watching a photo album. Photos show only a fragment of the past reality; they come close to the objectivism of the past, but are unable to present all of it. All photos record facts – although they reflect truth, we spend more time looking at some of them, whereas in the case of others we abandon them faster. A photo album will tell us about true events, but will not tell us the 5- or even 10-hour speech. I believe the places you represent – in our case Westerplatte – are our world, to ensure your museums are economically viable, profitable and, at the same time, don’t have to face the problem of commercialisation of the national sanctuary. I’m using the word “sanctuary”, because I believe the places you represent – in our case Westerplatte – are our sanctuary on earth. Although the place is available to everybody, it’s saddled as a symbol of values important to the whole nation. These places are part of your national canon of historical tradition. The knowledge and social emotions you represent are within the sphere of responsibility of your sates and governments.

For this reason, a battlefield is primarily a place of memory, worship, research interest, a centre of numerous observation, but also a place of exploration of historical objects, source of collections which are closely connected with the operation of the storage as well as the fight in September 1939. On the other hand, an argument of those who oppose any reconstruction at battlefields is quite often used in the public debate. Their main argument is the provisions of the Venice Charter. Consequently, a question arises: can we reconstruct on a battlefield buildings which weren’t damaged during historic fight? Which have never become relics of an armed clash, but have become ruins post factum as a result of other actions which weren’t connected with that particular story. Or what may become an alternative to those places is “designer” new architectural forms which are often distant from the story about the place’s history. The question remains unanswered. At the same time, it needs to be pointed out – as has been recently mentioned at a conference about archaeology of the present by Jakub Wrzosek, the representative of the National Heritage Board of Poland – that archaeology of armed conflicts is quite a flourishing although a relatively new sub-discipline of archaeology. It covers the period between the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest (Roman Empire vs. Germanic Tribes, a. d. 9) and the Battle of the Little Bighorn (civilisation of the white man vs. Native American Indians, a. d. 1876). Interestingly, both battles were the clash between – to put it in broadly – a high civilisation and a civilisation which was apparently less advanced and, in both cases the more advanced ones were defeated. For many years a group of specialist from various fields have been interested in battlefields, and for at least a few years the scientific debate about them has also been conducted as part of a series of international conferences Fields of Conflict.

Ladies and Gentlemen! In this context, our Forum is supposed to be not just another version of a scientific conference, but a contemporary agora, a forum for exchange of thoughts, observations and experience of institutions which have a lot in common, and I hope that after these days they will have even more shared plans and observations.

To confirm it, let me mention that all of our today’s guests have come from places which are historical milestones and indicate the beginning (e.g. Marco Polo Bridge, Westerplatte, Marathon, Pearl Harbor) of great conflicts, were turning points in them (Waterloo, Gettysburg, Verdun), or are important for the history of individual nations (e.g. Hussite battlefields, Raszki Bystrica). All of them are living testimony to the past, and all of the led to the death of the soldiers who took part in them, so they are also the space of memory about the fallen, and the cradle of war, which is such a disgrace to the humankind. However, they were battles which didn’t result only from the craving for power, conquest and annexation of land, but also an attempt to protect positive values.

What we also have in common – and I’m saying this as a representative of the nation which has the great pleasure to entertain you – is Poles’ participation in the battles whose museums and battlefields you represent. As well as participation of your compatriots in Polish armed struggle. In fact, I don’t know anything about Poles’ participation, on hand, in the Battle of Marathon, or, on the other hand, in the Japanese attack on the Malo Polo Bridge. After all, Wrapping fortresses, where the war between Japan and China started in July 1937, perfectly demonstrates the phenomenon of – I don’t want to say sacralisation – but certainly elevation of ordinary, provincial corners of the world to the role of places-symbols which all of us will discuss today. As Rana Mitter wrote in one of his books about the Asian war from: “Wrapping does not look like the sort of place where the destinies of nations are decided. Even today, it is unremarkable village about 15 km southwest of Beijing. Back in 1937 it was practically countryside”. Doesn’t this – with just a few exceptions – refer to all our battlefields?

Coming back to the shared experience, I’m sure that one of the leaders of Hussite battles, Jan Žižka, took part in the Battle of Grunwald, which is so important to Poles! Great Polish master of painting, Jan Matejko, has immortalised Žižka in one of his paintings commemorating the battle. The Polish involvement in the battle of Varna is all too obvious, as this place is important in the history of not only Bulgarians, but also Hungarians and Poles. The same is the case with the Battle of Berestechko. Poles’ participation in the Napoleonic epic, which came to an end at Waterloo, is generally well known. What is less known, but very suggestive in the context of our today’s conference, is the words of Arthur Wellesley, better known as the Duke of Wellington, who shocked by the sight of a battlefield said “Nothing except a battle lost can be so melancholy as a battle won”. General Włodzimierz Bonawentura Krzyżanowski fought at Gettysburg, the defenders of the Shipka Pass included numerous Poles from the territory of the Russian partition, Poles also fought at the Dardanelles during the Battle of Gallipoli – unfortunately on both sides of the front-line. One of the Poles fighting at Gallipoli – Włodzimierz Syer – was in charge of defence of nearby city of Hel against Germans in September 1939, when the Second World War broke out. The battle of Verdun – the symbol of the First World War – in 1916 was awarded by the Marshall of Poland Józef Piłsudski silver medal of the Virituri Militari – the highest Polish military decoration. A few hundred Poles fought in the Slovak National Uprising on the insurgents’ side, and, finally, there are many beautiful stories which connected the Polish and American nations during the Second World War. One million American troops who took part in that conflict had Polish roots. Among them there were those who started their adventure at Pearl Harbour, and, unfortunately, finished it there. John Stanley Malinowski, for instance, enlisted in the US Navy in October 1940 to provide income for his family, who were rather poor. He was one of the youngest people on board at only 17 years old. He remains on duty on USS Arizona, as he perished in the attack. Henry S. Kalinowski already became a hero when he saved his little brother from immi- nent death in a car accident. He later enlisted in the navy in 1942. On the night of the attack, Henry traded his coveted Saturday night in Honolulu with his friend, who was going to marry his sweetheart ashore. So he stayed on board the vessel and he did not manage to get himself out in time the morning the attack began and so went down with the ship. His body was never recovered.

All of these stories from all over the world, battlefields, their relics, innocent victims and perpetrators need to be commemorated in the best possible way – however, for different reasons. Because the one who doesn’t know history is doomed to repeating it. The numerous narrations which will soon be presented from this rostrum, started by me with the Polish narration, will not change, Ladies and Gentlemen, the truth, but all of us have the same objective – to preserve memory. I wish you all a fruitful discussion!
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THE BATTLEFIELD OF MARATHON: DEALING WITH HISTORY

IRENE CHARITAKI, LABRINI SISKOU
ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM OF MARATHON
In September of 490 BC, on the plain of Marathon in NE Attica, 10,000 Athenians and their 1,000 allies from the small city of Plataea in Boeotia, under the command of Miltiades, fought and defeated the army of the mighty Persian Empire¹.

The battle was the culmination of the first attempt by Persia, under King Darius I, to subjugate Greece. At that time, the Persian Empire covered most of southwest Asia and Asia Minor, reaching as far as the easternmost boundaries of Europe. The pretext was the help offered by two Greek cities, Athens and Eretria, to the insurrectionists in Ionia. The Persian army, 25,000–30,000 strong – despite the exaggerations of historiographers, under the leadership of Datis and Artaphernes, reached the coast of Marathon and encamped on the southern edge of the Big Marshes. The coastal plain of Marathon was an ideal bridgehead: a long, flat coastline suitable for disembarkation, plenty of space for the army and cavalry, as well as abundant water and crops to sustain the troops.

On hearing the news of the Persian landing at Marathon, the Athenians decided to confront the enemy invaders on the spot. They encamped in the sanctuary of Herakles, to the north of the small Marsh, thus blocking the narrow coastal pass to Athens. Their force was 10,000 men, to whom 1,000 from the city Plataea in Boeotia were added. Spartans, who had promised to send aid after the end of their Campaign in Ionia, arrived in Athens after the battle was over. The Athenian Miltiades, in agreement with the polemarch Kallimachos, took command of the operations.

The battle commenced in the morning of 14th or 15th September 490 BC. It is not certain whether the enemy forces were aligned parallel or perpendicular to the coast and how far inland. It is most likely that the Persian army lined up northeast of the spot where the Tumulus now stands, at a distance 1.5 km from the Greeks. To meet the larger invading force, Miltiades weakened his centre and reinforced his wings, hoping that his hoplites could hold the middle, while his flanks broke through the Persian infantry. The Athenians made the first move, running swiftly for the last 150 m, so as to escape the Persian arrows. In fact, the Athenian centre broke, but it held long enough for the Athenians to rout the Persian wings and then surround the centre, causing a general panic among the invaders.

During the retreat to their ships, many of the Persians lost their way and were drowned in the Big Marshes. Almost 6,400 Persians fell in battle. The rest of the Persian force sailed for Phaleron, but they did not come ashore, since the victorious Athenian army had already arrived.

The landmark of the great battle of Marathon is the large mound of earth (Stonos) (9 m high and 50 m in diameter) raised on the spot where the clash reached its climax, over the 932 Athenians who died in this historic battle.

The dead must have been cremated separately or in ten pyres, according to the ten tribes of Athens⁴. When the pyres had died down, the relatives gathered the remains of the corpses and deposited them on the site of the Tumulus together with vases as funereal offerings. Earth was heaped upon them, creating the knoll we see today. Stelae inscribed with the victims’ names, arranged by tribe, were erected on the top of the mound⁵.

According to Herodorus, at another spot in the plain, the Plataean dead were buried. The Plataean Tumulus, smaller at around 3 m, was identified and excavated in 1910 by Spyridon Marinatos, 3 km west of the Tumulus of the Athenians, at Vranas, in the area where the Archaeological Museum of Marathon was later set up. Eleven burials were revealed, ten were of adult males and one was of a 10-year old boy, probably a messenger, as Marinatos assumed. Over the burial vases had been deposited as grave goods and a tumulus composed entirely of river pebbles was raised⁶.

There is a dispute about the identification of the Tumulus of the Plataeans, because of its distance from that of the Athenians and because of the variety of burial practices (cremations, inhumations).

Some years after the historic battle, the Athenians set up a Trophy to commemorate their victory at the spot where the Persians were finally defeated and buried in a massive grave, at the edge of the Big Marshes. Parts of this Trophy were incorporated in the medieval tower close to the church of the Virgin Mesopotirtissa.

The Trophy is in the form of a smooth column shaft, 10 m high, with Ionic capital. On its upper surface, it supported a statue, probably depicting the goddess Nike (Victory), who took the form of a dressed young woman with wings⁷.

The victory at Marathon inspired confidence in the Greeks. It gave them the time to prepare themselves in order to repel the oncoming invasion of the Persians (480 BC). It proved that democracy could designate capable politicians and military officers and averted the danger of the comeback of tyranny in Athens. It also designated Athens as a new powerful state after Sparta, while the Marathon warrior became the immortal model of the freedom-fighter. There were many memorials to the battle, most of which made at the days of Kimon, Miltiades’ son, echoing the message of the victory and at the same time displaying the magnificence of the classical art and culture.

¹ Π. Βαλαβάνης, Ανασκαφές της μάχης της Μαραθώνας και στην ενήργεια των Μαραθώνων άναμεσα στη Βαρθολόμωις του 490 π.Χ. και τον Ριχτέρ του 1970, Παλαιοκαλλιέργεια, Αθήνα 2010, p. 79–86.
² Παναγιωτόπουλος, Αρχαιολογικά ΑΜΑ, Αθήνα 1999, σ. 151–152.
⁴ Β. Βαλαβάνης, Περιήγηση στο Μαραθώνο, Πανεπιστημιούπολη Αθηνών, Αθήνα 1970, ττ. 1–2.
⁵ Π. Βαλαβάνης, Ανασκαφές της μάχης της Μαραθώνας, Περιοδικό της Ανασκαφής, 1970, ττ. 27–30.
Virgin Mesosporitissa Product of those visits were various and numerable descriptions and images on books, giving us valuable information about the region. The traveler Edward Clarke (1789–1821) visited Marathon and locates the Tumulus of the Athenians and the Trophy near the church the Virgin Mesosporitissa.

Lord and Lady Elgin attempted to excavate the Soros, but mostly they searched for weapons, following the collecting frenzy for Marathon memorabilia.

Robert Walpole (1780–1846), gives us a full description of the battlefield. At a point he comments: “At this day may be seen towards the unauthorized excavations in the plain got significantly out of hand. On 12th May 1836, the Greek Government prohibits any unauthorized excavation:

From the spoils of the battle, the Athenians constructed in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi the so-called Athenian Treasury. On the Acropolis of Athens, the bronze statue of Athena Promachos, a great work of Phidias, is said to have been made from the booty of the battle. Another statue, that of Iris, the messenger of the gods, was also set up on the Acropolis in memory of the polemarch Kallimachos, who fell in battle. In 460 BC, the battle was depicted in a large mural in the Stoa Poikile in the Agora of Athens. Besides, the frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis of Athens contained a cavalry scene from the battle of Marathon.

The archaeologist and painter Edward Dodwell (1767–1832), made the first etching of the Tumulus. By that time there had already been an unsuccessful attempt at its excavation in 1788 by Louis Fauvel, an archaeologist and tourist, pilgrim of the glorious battlefield, or researchers.

The English philosopher John Stuart Mill, (1806–1873) makes this claim: “The battle of Marathon, even as an event in British history, is more important than the Battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different, the Britons and the Saxons might still have been divided by the same differences which have divided France and the British ever since.

The British poet Lord George Gordon Byron (1788–1824) dedicated his poetry as well as his life to the Greek fight for liberation. Byron was informed that foreign travellers passing via Marathon were wandering in the woods”. The German officer, von Eschenburg visited the battlefield of Marathon.


E. Dodwell, A classical and topographical tour through Greece during the years 1818, 1820, and 1821, vol. 1, London 1823, p. 129–160.

THE BATTLEFIELD OF MARATHON: DEALING WITH HISTORY

From the spoils of the battle, the Athenians constructed in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi the so-called Athenian Treasury. On the Acropolis of Athens, the bronze statue of Athena Promachos, a great work of Phidias, is said to have been made from the booty of the battle. Another statue, that of Iris, the messenger of the gods, was also set up on the Acropolis in memory of the polemarch Kallimachos, who fell in battle. In 460 BC, the battle was depicted in a large mural in the Stoa Poikile in the Agora of Athens. Besides, the frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike on the Acropolis of Athens contained a cavalry scene from the battle of Marathon.

The archaeologist and painter Edward Dodwell (1767–1832), made the first etching of the Tumulus. By that time there had already been an unsuccessful attempt at its excavation in 1788 by Louis Fauvel, an archaeologist and tourist, pilgrim of the glorious battlefield, or researchers.

The English philosopher John Stuart Mill, (1806–1873) makes this claim: “The battle of Marathon, even as an event in British history, is more important than the Battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different, the Britons and the Saxons might still have been divided by the same differences which have divided France and the British ever since.

The British poet Lord George Gordon Byron (1788–1824) dedicated his poetry as well as his life to the Greek fight for liberation. Byron was informed that foreign travellers passing via Marathon were wandering in the woods”. The German officer, von Eschenburg visited the battlefield of Marathon.


E. Dodwell, A classical and topographical tour through Greece during the years 1818, 1820, and 1821, vol. 1, London 1823, p. 129–160.

The archaeologist and painter Edward Dodwell (1767–1832), made the first etching of the Tumulus. By that time there had already been an unsuccessful attempt at its excavation in 1788 by Louis Fauvel, an archaeologist and tourist, pilgrim of the glorious battlefield, or researchers.

The English philosopher John Stuart Mill, (1806–1873) makes this claim: “The battle of Marathon, even as an event in British history, is more important than the Battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different, the Britons and the Saxons might still have been divided by the same differences which have divided France and the British ever since.

The British poet Lord George Gordon Byron (1788–1824) dedicated his poetry as well as his life to the Greek fight for liberation. Byron was informed that foreign travellers passing via Marathon were wandering in the woods”. The German officer, von Eschenburg visited the battlefield of Marathon.


E. Dodwell, A classical and topographical tour through Greece during the years 1818, 1820, and 1821, vol. 1, London 1823, p. 129–160.

The archaeologist and painter Edward Dodwell (1767–1832), made the first etching of the Tumulus. By that time there had already been an unsuccessful attempt at its excavation in 1788 by Louis Fauvel, an archaeologist and tourist, pilgrim of the glorious battlefield, or researchers.

The English philosopher John Stuart Mill, (1806–1873) makes this claim: “The battle of Marathon, even as an event in British history, is more important than the Battle of Hastings. If the issue of that day had been different, the Britons and the Saxons might still have been divided by the same differences which have divided France and the British ever since.

The British poet Lord George Gordon Byron (1788–1824) dedicated his poetry as well as his life to the Greek fight for liberation. Byron was informed that foreign travellers passing via Marathon were wandering in the woods”. The German officer, von Eschenburg visited the battlefield of Marathon.


E. Dodwell, A classical and topographical tour through Greece during the years 1818, 1820, and 1821, vol. 1, London 1823, p. 129–160.
In 2004, on the occasion of the Olympic Games in Athens, improvements were carried out at the sites of Marathon. In the Tumulus of the Athenians, the new pathway for visitors encircles the Tumulus and includes vantage points for viewing the monument and its surroundings. In a specially arranged space there are information panels with texts relating to the battle, while the topography of the wider region is presented in a scale model of the plain, on which the archaeological sites of Marathon are marked.

Moreover, at the archaeological site of the Trophy, the column has been reconstructed of marble in the location where it was probably set up. The Archaeological Museum of Marathon, built in 1915 and renovated in 2004, houses antiquities from excavations in the wider region dating from the prehistoric times until the late antiquity.

In one showcase finds from the Tumulus of the Athenians are exhibited. Most of the vases are black-figured, with different representations and motifs, dating from the years around the battle. The most striking of these is a globular vase which contained the bones of a general, perhaps Kallimachos or Stesilobos, and a black-figure hydria with a Dionysian scene as well as some lekythi and a lekanis.

Exhibited in the Museum are also the finds from the Tumulus of the “Piataros”, such as black-figured vases, vases, a black-figure kouros and others.

Last but not least, the surviving parts of the Victory Trophy are placed in the central gallery: two drums of a marble column about 10m high and its Ionic capital, on top of which a statue of Nike (Victory) once stood.

Additionally, the Municipality of Marathon runs the Marathon Run Museum, which tells the story of the Marathon race from 1896 until today through a collection of rare objects and thematic sections dedicated to the global movement of the Marathon race.

In 2010, in commemoration of the 2,500th anniversary of the Marathon Battle, a number of events and activities were organised in Athens and in Marathon. A special Flame Lighting Ceremony took place at the site of the Tomb of the Athenians.

That year’s Marathon run was also dedicated to the memory of the great scientist and politician Gregory Lambrakis and the Pacific Movement of his time, which organized in 1960 the First Pacific Rally from Marathon to Athens.

In the framework of that anniversary the Greek Archæological Service designed an educational program related to the famous battle. In collaboration with our colleague, Mrs Pelly Fotiadi, we have been running this program for 8 years, directed at students between 9-16 years of age with the aim of teaching them about the importance of this battle. A battle, through which the Greeks won the first European victory against Asia, steering the tide of despotism and creating preconditions for the unrivalled development of democracy and civilization.

I would like to conclude by translating the words of the great philosopher Plato that the victory which Marathon warriors gained over the barbarians, first taught other men that the power of the Persians was not invincible, but that hosts of men and the multitude of riches alike yield to valour. And I assert that these men are the fathers not only of ourselves, but of our liberties and of the liberties of all who are on the continent.
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Uphold Justice and Strive for Innovation –
A Review of the July 7th Incident and the Development of the International World War II Association

Li Qinghui
Museum of the War of the Chinese People’s Resistance Against Japanese Aggression
TWO QUESTIONS ABOUT THE JULY 7 INCIDENT

On July 7, 1937, Japan’s “garrison army in North China” used the opportunity of military exercises to shoot at the Chinese garrison in the Lugou Bridge area, and bombarded Wangping Fortress. This is the July 7 Incident that shocked the whole country and the world. It is also called the Lugou Bridge Incident.

The July 7 Incident marked the beginning of the Japanese imperialist war of full-scale invasion of China and the starting point for the Chinese nation to carry out the nationwide war of resistance.

Speaking of the July 7 Incident, many foreigners, including the Chinese, may have two questions: How could the Japanese army be stationed in China’s Beijing at that time? How to construed the July 7 Incident as the starting point for the Chinese nation to carry out the nationwide war of resistance?

The first question is easy to answer. Since the Opium War in 1840, many colonial countries invaded China one after another, sending China into the abyss of semi-colonial and semi-feudal society. In 1900, the eight-nation alliance of the USA, Russia, France, the UK, Italy, Japan, Germany, and Austria launched the war of aggression against China. China was defeated and signed the “Boxer Protocol” that brought humiliation to China.

The Protocol stipulated that these countries had the right to station troops at the Legation Quarter in Beijing as well as at 12 places along the route from Shanhaiguan to Beijing. Japan had 1,650 soldiers stationed and the command was stated at Haiguang Temple in Tianjin, called “Qing Dynasty garrison”, also known as “garrison in North China”.

By 1936, Japan’s “garrison army in North China” was expanded to 5,774 soldiers, and continued provocative military exercises in China, and eventually triggered the July 7 Incident. It can be said that Japan had forcibly stationed troops in China for 36 years to prepare for the subsequent full-scale invasion of China.

The second question troubled many people. It is difficult for them to understand the difference between the local war of resistance and the nationwide war of resistance against the Japanese aggression. As we all know, the German invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939 marked the beginning of the Second World War. But as early as six years ago, in 1931, the outbreak of the September 18 Incident marked the beginning of the Chinese people’s war of resistance against Japan.

The Chinese people carried out 14 years of arduous war of resistance against Japanese aggression until Japan was defeated and surrendered in 1945. The Chinese people’s war of resistance against Japanese aggression is an important part of the world’s Anti-Fascist War and the Chinese battlefield is the main battlefield of the East. It can be said that the 14-year war of resistance against Japanese aggression includes two periods of the local war of resistance and the nationwide war of resistance. The 6-year period from the September 18 Incident in 1931 to the July 7 Incident in 1937 is the local war of resistance. The 8-year period from the July 7 Incident in 1937 to Japan’s defeat and surrender in 1945 is the national war of resistance.

The 14-year war of resistance is a whole. The local war is an inseparable component of the war of resistance against Japanese aggression, and also played an important role in launching the national war of resistance. For the Chinese people, the 8-year national war of resistance was a mortal war. The war is unprecedented in terms of breadth, depth, scope and influence. The local war of resistance was the foundation and preparation for the national war of resistance, while the national war of resistance is the continuation and development of the local war of resistance.

THE MUSEUM OF THE WAR OF CHINESE PEOPLE’S RESISTANCE AGAINST JAPANESE AGGRESSION OVER THE PAST 31 YEARS

The Museum of the War of Chinese People’s Resistance Against Japanese Aggression is located in Wanping Fortress, Fengtai District, Beijing, where the July 7 Incident broke out. It was built on July 6, 1987, and officially opened to the public on July 7 of the same year (50th anniversary of the outbreak of the Lugou Bridge Incident).

It was named one of the top ten buildings in Beijing in the 1980s. This Museum has undergone four renovations in 1997, 2005, 2010 and 2015. It covers an area of over 35,000 m² and has the usable area of more than 36,100 m².

This museum is China’s only comprehensive theme memorial hall that mirrors the history of the great Chinese people’s war of resistance against Japanese aggression. It is the national first-level museum, the national outstanding patriotism education base, the national defense education base, and one of the first national education bases for building a clean government. It is also the seat of the International WWII Museum Association. By 2018, this museum had 31 million visits from Chinese and foreign visitors.

Since its establishment, this museum has built four large-scale basic exhibitions. In addition, more than 100 thematic exhibitions have been held. These thematic exhibitions not only complement and deepen the basic display, but also play an important role in strengthening patriotism education.

The collection is mainly based on various historical documents and related objects during the War of Resistance Against Japanese Aggression from 1931 to 1945. It also collects various cultural relics on the Japanese invasion and occupation of Taiwan since 1874. Up till now, the museum has collected more than 30,000 pieces of cultural relics, including more than 100 pieces of national first-level cultural relics.
The Museum of the War of Chinese People’s Resistance Against Japanese Aggression is an important window for people all over the world to understand the history of China’s war of resistance. In the past 31 years, the museum has received leaders from more than 15 countries (including well-known World War II museums from China, Russia, the United States, Canada, South Korea, Japan, Belarus, Ukraine, Italy, the Netherlands, Brazil, Malaysia, Mongolia, Slovakia, and the Philippines).

Since its inception, the Association has edited and published the “Guides on International World War II Museums” (Chinese, English and Russian), and has mastered the basic information on more than 240 World War II museums around the world. The Association organized and participated in international events many times. In July 2016, the Association organized a delegation to participate in the International Council of Museums Milano 2016. In October of the same year, the Association arranged 31 member units and non-member units from 9 countries to hold the 2016 annual meeting of the Association in Moscow, Russia, and to hold the international exhibition group on “World War II Anti-Japanese War Battlefield”. In July 2017, the “Forum of Directors of International World War II Museums” was held in Beijing to Commemorate the 80th Anniversary of the Outbreak of the Chinese Nation’s War of Resistance”. More than 70 people, including directors and representatives of 36 World War II museums and World War II history experts from 13 countries, including Russia and the United States, attended the forum events. The Association has been actively building an international academic exchange platform and establishing the academic exchange and cooperation brand for international World War II museums.

On 27 July 2018, the Director of the Museum of the Second World War, Karol Nawrocki, met with the Deputy Director of the Museum of War of Chinese People’s Resistance Against Japanese Aggression in Beijing, Xu Dan Dan.

Karol Nawrocki also hosted the Director of Internal Communication Department, Ouyang Min, and the Secretary of Internal Communication Department, Bin Weici, as well as representatives of cultural institutions and other Chinese museums.

Karol Nawrocki welcomed the delegation before noon. The main one of the meeting between the Museum management and the representatives of the Chinese institution was to establish cooperation between the two facilities. In the subsequent part of the meeting, both sides signed an agreement on cooperation.

“We are very happy to welcome the representatives of the Museum of War of Chinese People’s Resistance Against Japanese Aggression as well as other museums from China and we hope that our contacts will result in joint endeavors in the near future that will allow Western visitors of our Museum to learn about the Asian issues related to the events of World War II that have not been well known in our culture, and the society of China and countries of the Far East will be able to learn about the Polish narrative of the most tragic conflict in the history of the world,” said Karol Nawrocki.

“Even 73 years after the Second World War, the conflict still plays a great role in our thinking about the future and affects our present. Thanks to the cooperation between our Museums, the citizens of China will be able to learn about your sensibility – we hope – real your country’s increasing power. Thanks to our cooperation, the people of China will be able to better understand the people of Poland. I would like to invite you to visit our Museum, where the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk will honor a chance and opportunity to present an exhibition dedicated to the Polish memory of the Second World War,” said Lee Cuckling.

After the meeting, the guest viewed the Museum’s main exhibition as well as its temporary exhibitions. It was the first official visit by representatives of Chinese museums to the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk. The Delegation was showed around the exhibition by the Manager of the Exhibition Department, Bartłomiej Garba.
SESSION 1 • BATTLEFIELDS AS SYMBOLIC PLACES OF COMMENORATION

WESTERPLATTE: THE SYMBOL, HISTORY AND REMEMBRANCE

FILIP KUCZMA, KAROL SZEJKO, WOJCIECH TUREK

THE WESTERPLATTE AND 1939 WAR MUSEUM - WWII MUSEUM BRANCH
Westerplatte, a tiny peninsula in the north of Poland, is a symbol dear to all the Poles, part of European and world heritage. It is here that on 1st September 1939, WWII began in Europe. For European and worldwide public opinion it is primarily remembered on account of 220 Polish soldiers who for seven days, out-gunned and outnumbered, valiantly defied overwhelmingly superior German forces. The site is visited by more than half a million tourists a year and still has potential to attract even more domestic and international visitors.

In the 18th and 19th centuries Westerplatte was a battleground for the French, Russian, and Prussian armies, an important, fortified landmark for seizing control over the Gdańsk Port and the mouth of the Vistula river. In the spring of 1754 it witnessed fighting between invading Russian forces and French troops that had arrived to defend Gdańsk, a city then loyal to the Polish King, Stanisław Leszczyński. In May, the French attacked Russian positions but were soon beaten and surrendered. On 23rd June 1754, the Russians seized Westerplatte and a day later, the Wisłoujście fortress. The Polish King had to flee from Gdańsk.

In 1807, Westerplatte was yet again involved in a conflict of international importance. In that year, after three months of constant fighting, the Prussians surrendered Gdańsk to the French army of Marshall François Joseph Lefebvre. A few years passed, and as Napoleon’s army froze to death in Russia, Russian and English armies again laid siege to Gdańsk. This time (during which fortified Gdańsk was referred to as the Gibraltar of the Baltic) the siege lasted ten months. On 16th September 1813, a major battle was fought on Westerplatte over control of the mouth of the Vistula river. Although the French put up fierce resistance, after a few weeks, they had to withdraw and yield the city to the Russians.

After 1918, in 1918, Poland wins back its independence. The 1920 Versailles Treaty grants Poland the narrow strip of sea-coast with no sea ports, however. Gdańsk becomes The Free City of Danzig, a quasi-independent city-state, under predominantly German influence. But the compromise concerning Gdańsk satisfies neither Poland nor Germany.

With lessons learned from Polish Bolshevik war of 1920, where problems with shipping of military materiel into Poland persisted and with the port of Gdynia in its early stages of construction, Poland desperately needs access to the sea. In 1924 The League of Nations grants Poland Westerplatte for shipping, unloading and storage of military supplies. While the German authorities try to impose numerous hindrances on transit of Polish goods via the Free City of Danzig, Westerplatte becomes Polish Military Transit Depot, a tiny piece of Poland surrounded by hostile German population, and a thorn in the side of the Danzig Senate.

In the late 1930s anti-Polish protests escalate, nazi fanaticism rages in Gdańsk. “Danzig is a German city and wants to rejoin Germany”, said Adolf Hitler in The Reichstag in April 1939. The war seems imminent. In the meantime, Westerplatte is secretly being strengthened. Modern fortifications and barracks are erected, along with the defensive ring of six fortified guardhouses and a system of fortified trenches and foxholes. From 1933 to 1934, five guardhouses were built on Westerplatte (in secret, additional efforts were made to arm and reinforce them) and, from 1934 to 1936, a modern barracks was constructed to house the crew. Shortly before the outbreak of the war on 1st September 1939, an additional chain of defensive positions had been erected at the guardhouses’ forefront named “Prom (Ferry)”, “Wał (Floodbank)”, “Fort (Fort)”, “Deika”, “Łazienki (Baths)”, “Elektrownia (Power Station)” and “Przystań (Port)”. Soldiers, arms and ammunition were smuggled into the Depot by land and sea. The cat-and-mouse game between the German police and the Depot’s crew goes on until the very last minutes of 31st August 1939.

On 1st September 1939, the Polish Garrison on Westerplatte is ca. 220 men strong. On 30th of August battleship Schleswig-Holstein arrives in Gdańsk and anchors in the canal opposite Westerplatte. The Germans in Danzig cheer. On 1st of September, at 4.48 am, in the morning Schleswig-Holstein begins shelling Westerplatte and the Depot is attacked by elite German troops and Danzig Police, with a devastating Luftwaffe air raid on 4th September. Westerplatte is flooded by hail of steel and fire.

The Second World War breaks out all across Poland. Poland’s losses suffered during the war are shocking even by today’s standards. Almost six million Polish citizens perish in this atrocious, inhumane war – bombed, executed, or murdered in German concentration camps.

At Westerplatte, the Poles, physically and psychologically exhausted, surrender the Depot after a seven-day siege. The Germans are in awe – they had never expected to come up against such fierce resistance on such a narrow strip of land. Later Westerplatte begins to be called “Polish Thermopylae”. Miserably, some of the Depot’s buildings escape undamaged in the bombing. The commanders of the depot, Mjr. Henryk Sucharski and his deputy, Cpt. Franciszek Dąbrowski, stand up to the challenge, the latter refusing to capitulate despite no chances for victory.

Just hours after the fighting ceases, on 8th September, Polish civilian prisoners, under the supervision of German soldiers, begin to dismantle most of the Depot’s buildings. They also bury the bodies and clear the landmines. The bricks and timber are shipped to what is soon to become an infamous Stutthof German concentration camp.

After the war, Westerplatte becomes an instrument of communist propaganda. It is gradually deteriorating and over the years changes beyond recognition. As tonnes of soil are moved across Westerplatte, burying what’s left of the heroic defense, a monument is erected on a mound at the tip of the peninsula, vaguely connected with Westerplatte’s defence in 1939.

As part of the project to restore the Historical Monument “The Battlefield of Westerplatte Peninsula”, Museum Westerplatte and 1939 War (currently the branch of the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk) has developed a research programme for the years 2016–2019 involving archaeological work in the area of the Military Transit Depot. The several seasons-long research programme strives to document the state of the ruins of the Military Transit Depot and of the field fortifications erected in anticipation of the German attack, as well as uncover artefacts related to the Polish soldiers stationed on Westerplatte and to the battles fought during the siege of the Depot.
In 2016, as a prologue for a wider reconstruction project, the very first in the post-war history broad-scale archeological excavations on Westerplatte begin. They yield an exceptional range of artefacts – over 4000 items, also those related to earlier periods, are found and documented. The second stage of archeological research was completed in 2017 and the third stage will run until December 2019.

The peaked cap eagle crest is among the most precious, most heart-breaking artefacts with a strong emotional context – it belonged to one of the defenders and was damaged when the soldier died under the rubble. The artefacts are a tangible trace of the past, a missing piece of a puzzle in Westerplatte’s history, a unique record of the life, the struggle and the death of the Polish heroes.

Today when these heroes are no longer among us, Westerplatte needs our care more than ever. It rests entirely upon us and our children to preserve the memory of those tragic events. Brave deeds performed with sacrifice and a sense of duty, despite bleak chances for victory, must be remembered by future generations. Sadly today, there exists a shocking contrast: between the current, neglected state of Westerplatte and its significance as a major battlefield in world history.

As a landmark of international importance the vision of Westerplatte’s future must meet strict criteria of a memorial, outdoor museum, and a historical tourist attraction – all in one. Our Museum’s goals for Westerplatte include extensive changes and certain renovation activities, such as reconstruction of selected historical objects; broad conservation activities; creation of modern exhibition, cultural and education spaces; recreation of the Depot’s historical pathway layout, and, finally, building infrastructure that would meet modern historical tourism standards. All these planned activities are in need of wider public consultations and require a broad discussion regarding the form and scale of the reconstruction involving historians, planners, architects, and local conservators and restorers.

At the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk we are fully aware of the complexity and the scale of the project. Creating a modern museum is a difficult challenge, perhaps nothing short of “blood, toil, sweat and tears”, as Winston Churchill once said when Britain joined the war. We are ready to undertake this challenge and we see “an opportunity in this difficulty”. A unique opportunity to preserve true history for the generations to come after us and to remember and honour our heroes to whom we owe our freedom today.
PACIFIC HISTORIC PARKS:
HONORING THE PAST, INSPIRING THE FUTURE

AILEEN UTTERDYKE,
JACLYN BALAJADIA
PACIFIC HISTORIC PARKS
The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor helped shape America and its role in the world. Out of the smoke and flames of Pearl Harbor a new nation emerged— one that would actively confront threats to world peace. The shock and rage of the attack ignited a fighting spirit in America never before seen. This outrage led to the adoption of the slogan “Remember Pearl Harbor” as the nation rallied to the war effort. Volunteers flooded recruiting centers and America’s industrial might geared for war.

The site today represents a pivotal moment in the US and world history. In December 2008, an Executive Order established World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument and the National Park Service was directed to manage World War II sites in Oahu, including the USS Arizona, USS Oklahoma and Utah Memorials and Visitor Center.

The USS Arizona Memorial honors the 1,177 crewmen who died as a result of the attack. The hull is also a tomb for more than 900 sailors who remain within. The 144-foot-long memorial structure spans the mid-section of the sunken battleship and consists of three main sections: the entry room; the assembly room, a central area designed for ceremonies and general observation; and the shrine room, where the names of those killed on the Arizona are engraved on a marble wall. The USS Arizona Memorial grew out of wartime desire to establish a memorial at Pearl Harbor to honor those who died in the attack.

Today, roughly 2 million people from all over the world visit the memorial every year. This memorial at this former battlefield embodies the lessons of our past and our vision for the future. Its legacy is the assurance we will never forget Pearl Harbor.

**Tangible Connections to the Past**

There is no admission charge to enter World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument. Since the park does not generate funds from admission fees, one of the greatest challenges Pacific Historic Parks faces is offering a variety of quality education programs that are accessible to all visitors. Pacific Historic Parks must fund education programs through donations, grants, and fee-based activities.

Pacific Historic Parks recognizes that youth are the key to perpetuating the history and memory of Pearl Harbor. This article will highlight a few of the educational components that are offered to children so that they can observe this battlefield as a symbolic place for commemoration. Essentially, through ed...

**Keiki Ranger Activity Book**

A booklet was designed to help children understand the history of Pearl Harbor. The word, “keiki” means “child” in Hawaiian and this book was designed for the youngest visitors in mind. The booklet prompts youth to visit specific memorials and artifacts to understand their significance at the site. For example, they are directed to the large map at the site and asked to find Hawaii’s location in relation to the continental United States and Japan so they can get a better sense of how geography was a factor in determining the attack.

The Shrine Room, photo by National Park Service

USS Arizona Memorial and Battleship Monument, photo by National Park Service
Pacific Historic Parks promotes literacy while educating about the impact of war through a book written by Eleanor Coerr titled Sadako and the Thousand Paper Cranes. The story follows the life of a young girl named Sadako Sasaki, who becomes gravely ill and eventually dies from the aftereffects of the atom bomb that was dropped on her hometown of Hiroshima, Japan. We host an education program that involves reading this book and folding a 1,000 paper cranes in Sadako's honor. Paper cranes are a symbol of peace and healing and in 2012, the Sasaki family graciously offered to donate one of the last paper cranes folded by Sadako before her death.

Punahou School became involved with the fundraising for the Sadako exhibit at Pearl Harbor after the crane was donated. The students raised more than $6,000 in dollars, which became part of the funds used to build the new exhibit in Pearl Harbor. Masahiro Sasaki, Sadako’s brother, visited the memorial and placed a wreath with Lauren Bruner, a USS Arizona Survivor, during a ceremony that unveiled the paper crane. It is very significant that this crane is now exhibited at Pearl Harbor, the site where the Pacific War began for America with the attack on Pearl Harbor by Japan. Showing this unique front to promote peace touched the community and inspired our youth. Today, Punahou students and faculty continue to share Sadako’s legacy and her message by visiting Pearl Harbor almost every month of the school year with student volunteers and several Japanese language teachers to tell park visitors about Sadako’s story and teach other visitors how to fold paper cranes so they can be collected and mailed to Hiroshima.

Guided Fieldtrips: A Witness to History
School groups visit the USS Arizona Memorial as a way to help educators achieve ongoing objectives in their school curriculum. We collaborate with local teachers and meet students at their schools to give a presentation that shares the stories of what happened at Pearl Harbor. Students then visit the memorial and focus on specific themes. The biggest obstacle that prevents the Hawaiian PreK-12 grade schools from coming to the memorial is transportation. In 2018, Pacific Historic Parks received a grant from the National Park Foundation that will allow us to bus in over 1,000 students from the local underserved areas of Waianae and Nanakuli. We are continuously looking to find grants and raise donations to eliminate the barrier of transportation for students to visit their park.

Pearl Harbor Survivors
Beyond the memorial are the people who witnessed the Pearl Harbor attack. Pacific Historic Parks and the National Park Service have nurtured a close relationship with Pearl Harbor survivors. They are dedicated and have supported education by volunteering to come weekly and sometimes daily to the memorial to sign autographs and share their stories with visitors.

Their stories, such as the ones told by Pearl Harbor Survivor Jimmy Lee who was only eleven years old and living on Oahu when the attack happened, must be passed down to the next generation so children understand the personal side of the event.

Pearl Harbor Virtual Reality Center
In sustaining the programs we described here, Pacific Historic Parks has had to find ways of funding in order to offer free programs. In 2016, Pacific Historic Parks developed an app that can be used from a smart phone and a virtual reality (VR) headset. Youth will be able to relive the events of December 7, 1941 by engaging in virtual reality experience at Pearl Harbor.

With the use of VR, children can walk the main deck of the USS Arizona and meet a few of the sailors aboard the battleship, witness the attack on Battleship Row, and venture aboard the USS Arizona Memorial itself. By offering a mix of free and fee-free programs, Pacific Historic Parks seeks to perpetuate its mission while being sustainable at the same time.

HONORING THE PAST AND INSPIRING THE FUTURE
As a non-profit organization whose mission is to educate the next leaders of our country about the important stories found at World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument, we encourage other organizations that maintain and preserve important battle sites to consider the following points:

Symbolic Places of Commemoration
The meaningful setting of Pearl Harbor provides unique opportunities for reconciliation among former Pacific War combatants. The memorials serve as icons of enduring peace and reminders of the healing that is still ongoing. In providing a variety of educational experiences that commemorate our past, we must have an awareness of the story that we are trying to convey. It is important to take note of the physical things that are in the battlefield, such as the memorials, plaques, statues, sculptures. These objects help tell the main parts of our enduring message. As organizations that protect battlefields and develop education programs, we need to ask ourselves:

• who or what do these memorials commemorate?
• who created these memorials?
• to whom are the monuments dedicated?

What do these memorials tell us about what we value in our society?

• Answering these questions can give us greater awareness of the message and the stories we are passing on to future generations.

Find Relevancy
In Pearl Harbor, there is a marble wall in the Shrine Room of the Memorial engraved with over 1,000 men who died onboard the USS Arizona that tragic Sunday morning. While the room is haunting and powerful, we have to also be cognizant of the fact that simply visiting the site is not enough to tell the story to our visitors. There must be continual efforts of engagement between the visitor and the resources found at the site.

As leaders in organizations that commemorate the past, we have to continually find ways to make the sacrifices of the people before us relevant and meaningful. We have to help visitors answer the question: what does this story mean to me?

In revamping our education programs in Hawaii, we intent to add more stories that resonate with local youth. We hope to use themes that align with curriculum standards within the Hawaii State Department of Education Benchmarks and Standards. We will spend this year focusing on the meaning of legacy how the events of Pearl Harbor affected the people of Hawaii.

Showcase Multiple Perspectives
Battlefields have thousands upon thousands of stories to tell. There are a multitude of perspectives that can be presented.

• what would a Japanese pilot have been thinking as he reached Pearl Harbor from above?
• what might a young child living in Oahu have felt on the morning of the attack?
• what would a Japanese American have felt when they were forced to an internment camp at Honouliuli in Hawaii?

When looking at an event, there is always more than one perspective or approach or point of view. It is a good exercise to spend time thinking about why different groups may see the same event in different ways. Oftentimes a different story emerges when those multiple perspectives are put together. The result is an enriched historical understanding.

Foster Stewardship
A key component in educating about the past and for the future involves opening up avenues for individuals to take action and be part of the preservation of the site. It might take the shape of being a docent at the visitor center, showing others how to fold paper cranes, or manning a donation table. Stewardship or volunteerism is education in action. It is the culminating goal of education because it opens doors for people to donate their time and energy to honor this final resting place.

When stewards from the community are inspired to honor by playing an active role to protect and preserve their national treasure, we are ensuring the stories are passed down to the next generation.
Grzegorz Berendt: The first question we ask ourselves about Westerplatte and other Polish battlefields is how to treat these places. Should we leave them as they are, or should we add something – as has been suggested, for example, by a branch of our Museum? Karol Szejko has already spoken about this issue. Could you explain how battlefield preservation is approached in your country? To what extent should we be allowed to change the appearance of battlefields?

Labrini Siskou: As I said in my speech, since 2004 there has been an attempt to try to do the best we can for the preservation and promotion of the battlefield in order to teach the current generation, the next generations, and the whole world how significant this battle was. We have tried ways to make the site more educational, so to speak.

Irene Charitaki: But we don’t build anything new on the battlefield itself. We leave it as it is; we only have some maps and text there, for educational reasons.

Grzegorz Berendt: So, the whole educational work is carried out in new buildings outside the battlefield, is that right? Or are you having anything done at the battlefield?

Labrini Siskou: We try to promote and show the tumulus and the trophy (there has been a reconstruction of the trophy), but we don’t want to do anything else that would devalue these monuments. We try to show their significance.

Grzegorz Berendt: I have another question. Many vessels were sunk in the port of Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941, and many people were killed during the Japanese air raid. What happened to all these vessels and to the bodies of the sailors and soldiers?

Aileen Utterdyke: Some of the ships that could be preserved and rebuilt were raised, so they were able to try and restore them as best as possible, and the vessels were put back in the fleet. Some, like the USS Arizona, had sunk, and nothing could be done. Some of the sailors were still on board and died on the ships. Some bodies were retrieved, some were not. The ships were a mechanism, but the bodies are still there: it is therefore not only a memorial but also a cemetery.

Grzegorz Berendt: But are all these sunken ships still there, or have some of them been removed?

Aileen Utterdyke: There are a few ships there. The USS Utah is still there and the USS Arizona is still there, yes – but the Oklahoma is not.

Grzegorz Berendt: Mr Szejko, based on the experience you have gathered about the way old artefacts and memorial sites are treated elsewhere in the world, what do you think should be taken into consideration in what you are doing now at Westerplatte and when suggesting solutions for the future?

Karol Szejko: I think the first important fact we have to realize is that it is a very important question to answer: what should happen at Westerplatte regarding its complicated history, and whether to rebuild, reconstruct, conserve, preserve, or take any other actions. I think we have to remember about one important thing that goes beyond just reconstructing or preserving the buildings – we have to remember that today we are facing a unique chance of telling the story of Westerplatte, which has been left untold for the previous 70 years. What makes the question about rebuilding and reconstruction even more important is the fact that it must be a full-scale project; it requires funding from state authorities and from the museum. Another thing is that we now have a chance to preserve the memory and to make this place meaningful again for the future generations, and for remembrance as well. So, following the wide consultations with conservators, architects, and historians, we believe that there is one major goal ahead of us, which is to tell the story and pass it on, as was also mentioned in the presentation from Pearl Harbor: to pass on the story and to mark the importance of the site.

Grzegorz Berendt: Our session is titled “Battlefields as symbolic places of commemoration”. All these places are symbols commemorating breakthrough events. We are trying to pinpoint the lesson we can draw from the past. Could we now sum up, again, without going into detail, in what way we can do this? What do you want your museums to pass on to the next generation? In Marathon, of course, we have no eyewitnesses. The situation is different in Westerplatte, but in several years Westerplatte will change beyond recognition. What symbols do we want to transfer to the next generations relating to the story of the events that happened there in the past? It was very interesting for me to find out that you present Marathon as the first battle of Europe against Asia – a very original point of view; what is more important for me is
that it was an act of defence of the European polis, local democracy, against Asian despotism. Am I right or not?

Labrini Siskou: You are right, because with this battle the Greeks created the preconditions for establishing Athenian democracy, and therefore it is a symbol of democracy, apart from being a symbol of peace or freedom. Before that time there was a phase of tyranny in Athens, and hence the great danger: if the Persians had conquered Athens, history would have taken a completely different course. That is why not only did we prevent the Persians from conquering us and from moving further into Europe, but we also prevented tyranny from being established in Greece.

Grzegorz Berendt: And what about the tragedy of December 7th in the Pacific? What information is passed on to the young generation? Was it a terrible thing – this is obvious, and nobody among us here wants to promote war. But we want to learn something from the past and to teach something to our younger generations and to the next generations. As far as I understood, the meeting of American and Japanese people within a teaching program is meant to be a way to learn to coexist in peace. This is wonderful, but do you also use the story of the tragedy of December 7th to build the American community?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think the events of December 7th have a lot of aspects that teach people many things. They can teach people about leadership, they can teach people about relations, they can teach people about differences among us. I think as you delve into the history and the many things that happened you can draw on all of these aspects. You can teach the next generation how to coexist in a more peaceful manner, and that there are consequences when you don’t. And you can do this in many forms. The education process, to us, is not something that starts in high school or upper education; we believe that it starts from the youngest kids; it starts in a kindergarten class or a first-grade class, because they learn how to work together, how to play with each other, and that they are not necessarily the same as the person sitting next to them, but that’s okay. And so there are a lot of messages that can be taught to people of all ages. This is the challenge that I think we are trying to take on: using what happened at Pearl Harbor and applying it to different people of different ages.

Serdar Davran: I am an Honorary Consul of the Republic of Turkey and a Polish citizen of Turkish origin. I also have a Greek family. I would like to make a comment about Marathon. We know the story of the battle and everybody knows it, many people are fascinated by it, but how is it related to Turkish occupation? I don’t understand this. That was before Jesus Christ, but you spoke about Turkish occupation. Also, I don’t agree about Asian terrorism against Europe, because we could say many things about the Dardanelles or about the Crusaders’ first attack upon the Asian side. So, I would just like to draw your attention to this, and I think you could reconsider these words about Turkish occupation.

Labrini Siskou: I only referred to Lord Byron, because he commented in his poems on the sites that he liked to see. And one of those was the tumulus of the Athenians. This is the only reference I made and it has nothing to do with the Turkish occupation. I referred to the occupation because Byron lived in Greece in that period of time.

Grzegorz Berendt: I have a very specific question to Dr Qinshui – maybe a technical one. You mentioned in your presentation that you had items or objects in your museum that were classified differently. Could you explain to us what it means that among more than thirty thousand objects in your museum you have one hundred exhibits of the “first level”? What does this mean? This is interesting for us as people working in museums.

Li Qinghui: What I meant was that among the thousands of exhibits, those one hundred of them are of the greatest value. Many of them are personal belongings of soldiers who took part in the fighting on the Marco Polo Bridge and in the battle for the Wanping Fortress. They include helmets of Chinese soldiers who fought there at that time.

Grzegorz Berendt: What is the process behind classifying these exhibits into these two categories?

Li Qinghui: The decisions are made by a board of historians. The museum’s exhibits are objects from the entire period of war and resistance against Japanese aggression – as shown in the presentation, that was a very long period. The objects classified into the special category are soldiers’ personal belongings: they are notes, they are bullets fired at the Wanping Fortress or at the Marco Polo Bridge, which means they are objects strictly related to the beginning of the Second World War in China.

Karel Szejek: Artefacts were mentioned in the context of the Chinese museum, and I would like to say is that the strength of Westerplatte for telling the story and preserving the story for the future generations lies in artefacts. We are now into the third stage of archaeological dig: we have excavated more than 30,000 artefacts, and these artefacts can tell the story. In order for these artefacts to tell the story, we need exhibition spaces, we need a line of narrative to display these artefacts. What we need to do is, first of all, make sure we have somewhere to display these artefacts, and where best to the display them if not at Westerplatte? So, the question about reconstruction, conservation, and rebuilding is still valid, and it has to be answered – the sooner the better, because time is running out. If we achieve the goal that we are aiming at as a museum, we will then be able to present a full narrative to the tourists who come to Westerplatte. Sadly, today the narrative is virtually non-existent: tourist leaves Westerplatte with a feeling of something they have not experienced, and we want to give them a feeling of experiencing something and give meaning to the place. This is why we think the story of a symbolic site like this needs to be told by these artefacts. The truth is there, the truth is in the ground; we need to bring it out and have spaces or outdoor spaces – because Westerplatte is also an outdoor museum – to display what we have excavated.

Grzegorz Berendt: All the museums represented here are devoted to battles. Some of those battles were lost in the first phase, like the Battle of Pearl Harbor, some of them were lost, like Westerplatte, and others were victorious, like the Battle of Marathon. But what is common to all those places or events from the past is people who wanted and were able to risk their lives for values that were very important for them: the independence of their country and their right to decide for themselves. This is also the message we want to pass on to the next generation: that it is necessary and crucial to defend the values we are attached to.

Karel Szejek: I would add something, just to finish – it will be quite fitting. A few days ago we spoke to an elderly man, who remembers that when he was a child in 1939 he heard a broadcast on the Polish Radio with the “Westerplatte still fights on” message. He told us that this message was extremely important for the Poles. He remembers hearing it as a young boy, and he says: “How it lifted my spirit to hear this message on the radio day after day”. I think this is quite important about places like Marathon, Pearl Harbor, Westerplatte, or China: the fact that these places have a lot of meaning to common people – not only to soldiers fighting and clashing and dying, but to the common people involved in the pandemonium of the Second World War.

Grzegorz Berendt: Thank you very much for your participation in this session.
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HUSSITE BATTLEFIELDS.
FROM GLORY TO BETRAYAL

JAKUB SMRČKA, ZDENĚK VÝBÍRAL
HUSSITE MUSEUM IN TABOR
It is appropriate to introduce the paper by some facts about the Hussite Movement in Bohemia. The beginning of the Hussite Movement is linked with reform efforts at the end of the 14th century. They were concentrated in Prague at the time of Charles IV and Wenceslas IV and primarily at Prague University. However, we shall not disregard the influence of monasteries as centres of knowledge and culture. Monasteries active in the reform movement included the Cistercian monastery in Zbraslav near Prague and the Carthusian monastery in Prague neighbourhood of Hrad which had close relationships with the royal court. As for orders operating in the urban environment we shall mention Augustinian canons whose monastic house in Roudnice nad Labem was an intellectual basis of the Prague Archbishopric. Austrian preacher Konrád of Waldhauser, who was invited to Prague by Charles IV, was a member of the Augustinian order. Konrád Waldhauser started the sequence of Prague reform preaching by his activity in 1645 which culminated in the Bethlehem Chapel where Jan Hus preached. Konrád did not work at university, however, his preaching in the Church of Our Lady before Týn in the Old Town of Prague presented in Latin and German was attended by university students, members of the wealthy class and noblemen, i.e. laymen outside the academic sphere.

Having been influenced by Konrád’s preaching, peculiar theologian Míčil of Kroměříž who used to work as an officer in Charles’ royal office picked the career of a reform preacher. He left his social status including his title of the canon of the Prague Chapter and started an ascetic life of a Czech preacher. And above all he established a social facility to rectify prostitutes whom he would buy out from pimps. These women lived in a community organized according to rules similar to monastic orders. They lived pious lives full of penance, attended preaching every day and participated in the celebration of the Most Holy Eucharist daily which was very unusual at that time. Míčil also established a male student community which had a similar spiritual programme. It was the Czech form of devotio moderna and the whole facility, called The New Jerusalem, was funded through contributions in which devout burghers and members of the royal court contributed money.

Míčil influenced another Prague reform theologian, Master Matěj of Janov who lived in Prague since the 1380s after having completed his studies in Paris. Master Matěj preached in Czech as well, he supported the idea of frequent receiving the Most Holy Eucharist and criticized exaggerated and magically perceived respect to holy relics and pictures frequently linked with simony. He was suspected of heresy for these opinions and he was deprived of his right to preach. At the same time, in the early 1490s, people from the Prague University became familiar with some treatments of English reformers and philosopher, Oxford University doctor, John Wycliffe. Thanks to the foundation of Vejříček of Jelín students from Prague University travelled to Oxford and brought back copies of Wycliffe’s works which caused turmoil in the reform environment in Prague. The most significant of Wycliffe’s radical thoughts were the ones about poverty of the Church, about unacceptable property gathering and power accumulation by clergy members, about prevailing authority of secular power over Church power in secular issues, and about superior authority of the Bible over traditional councils and the Pope. Student Jan Hus from the artistic faculty ranked among students who found Wycliffe’s teaching interesting. He became a chief advocate of Wycliffe’s preaching in Prague at the beginning of the 15th century when he lectured at university and also preached in the Bethlehem Chapel. Therefore, he presented his theological opinions not only at university disputations and essays, but also in preaching presented in Czech to non-academic audiences. His thoughts focused on the same issues as Wycliffe’s, i.e. he emphasized the authority of the Bible and the importance of understandability of the Holy Writ to every Christian. The Christian Church is an invisible body of Christ and its visible terrestrial form is not identical with it. Hus referred to St. Augustine’s of Hippo teaching on predestination: the visible Church comprises both the predestined, i.e. those about whom God in his foreknowledge knows that they would achieve justification and eternal salvation, and the presented, i.e. those about whom God knows in advance that they would be damned forever. The concept of renovation requires that every member respects the ethical standard of the Law of Christ and the person who remains in the state of sin loses his authority no matter how significant his authority used to be.

Hus’ dispute with the Church culminated at the council in Constance where this man who criticized secular rule of the Church, indulgences and evil in religious and social practice was burnt at stake as a heretic. However, the group of supporters of social change connected to the Church reform was very large not only in Prague but all over Bohemia. Hus’ pupil Jakoubek of Stříbro introduced communion under both kinds for laymen in Prague already at the end of 1414. This practice started spreading and a huge dispute developed in relation to its introduction and suppression during the coming years; the dispute resulted in street riots and a violent attack against the anti-Utraquist New Town council in summer 1419. Rural folk reform movement developed simultaneously; it was led by eager and radical preachers, former Hus’ pupils and listeners. Supporters of the reform gathered at various places in central, south-western and eastern Bohemia at mass gatherings. During these so called “pilgrimages to mountains” Hus’ preaching was frequently quoted, and apocalyptic and Adventist topics of approaching arrival of Christ to the Earth and of the turn of ages were included in speeches. The new intense religious experience of participants to these gatherings where songs were sung, everyone including little children, celebrated the Holy Communion under both kinds, and listened to enthusiastic words of preachers, was very far from the formalized participation in the Christian cult and from practices common in medieval religious institutions. In many aspects it even exceeded the ideas of former reformers. And these laid the basis for future Hussite communities of towns and military field settlements.

Hus’ thoughts were taken over by a powerful movement of religious and social change. The current social distribution and barriers between social classes were overcome. The reform movement was able to unite the poorest people, serf peasants, reform clergy, yeomen, knights and wealthy patricians including the top class noblemen. The Four Prague Articles (1420) became the most famous shared programme of this movement; their wording resulted from long negotiations between radical and moderate fractions of the Hussite revolution. Their requirements included: 1) freedom to preach the word of God all over the country, 2) the reception of the Holy Communion under both kinds (bread and wine or in other words the body and blood of Christ) by believers, 3) rejection of secular power of the clergy (such as ownership of villages and farms and application of feudal authority over these settlements), 4) equal treatment and punishment for deadly sins for everyone, i.e. fair and immediate execution of justice towards all people disregarding their social status. This fairly compromising programme was advocated by Jan Žitka of Trocnov, the captain of united Hussite field troops and his followers in disputes with domestic enemies and also during four crusades coming from abroad (1420, 1421, 1422 and 1424).

It was the military success that enabled the survival of the movement and the enforcement of at least some of the reform ideals. Repeated victories over more numerous and better equipped enemy established a tradition of Hussite military competence. During the era of formation of the modern Czech nation the Hussite tradition was linked with the awareness of national excellence and pride. After all the whole Europe had to respect the skills and ideas of a small but brave nation. The Hussite movement became a part of historic memory and its traditions became apparent in all fields of the national culture. The tradition was primarily based on famous battles.

This paper focuses on three most significant Hussite battles – Sudoměř, Vítkov and Lipany. First we shall explain historic facts and then focus on the significance of battles in historic memory and on symbols related to sites where the battles took place. We shall also ask what the battlefields mean today.
The battle took place on 30th May 1413 on a hill near Kutná Hora. It was the first successful battle of Hussite Bohemia. The battle was attended by political elites led by President T. G. Masaryk. A decision was made that Vítkov would become the site of a ‘memorial of national liberation’ with emphasis on the role of Czechoslovakia. It was no coincidence. Czechoslovakia was not a large country but it was the largest picture in Bohemia and has remained the most stunning presentation of Hussite battles and especially of the battle of Vítkov – unless we consider film works. The current Vítkov battlefield has lost the importance of a site of national demonstrations. The battle has been commemorated by a folk festival in the living-history style. A medieval market is held, and especially of the battle of Lipany – unless we consider film works. The current Lipany battlefield has lost the importance of a site of national demonstrations. The battle has been commemorated by a folk festival in the living-history style. A medieval market is held,
MÉMORIAL 1815 AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS COMMEMORATING BATTLE OF WATERLOO
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MÉMORIAL 1815 W WATERLOO
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THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The Battle of Waterloo put an end to an uninterrupted period of wars lasting over twenty years, which involved the major European powers. This battle also marks the uprising of the European nations united against the Empire, the idea of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution and most of all, against the hegemonic ambitions of the one nicknamed the “Ogre” throughout Europe.

In a Europe where France had such an important influence, the events that took place in 1815 had a huge resonance. This revolutionary heritage, the spread of the Enlightenment ideas and the constant battles between 1792 and 1815 disrupted the European continent politically and ideologically. The people, often guided by intellectual elites, dream of being liberated from the Old Regime and of creating a united nation inspired by the French model. This national sentiment is exacerbated by the French occupation: the Napoleonic domination only reinforces the conquered people’s awareness of their identity. They dream of freedom, equality and advocate the principal of self-determination.

After the failure of several tragic campaigns, including the one of Russia in 1812, Napoleon abdicates on 6th April 1814 and instigates the fall of the Empire. Gathered together in September 1814 at the Congress of Vienna in order to redistribute Napoleonic Europe, the Austrian, Russian, English and Prussian monarchs wish to restore civilisation. In other words, to erase the developments introduced by this excess of popularity. Access to the site, trampled on by curious tourists, is impossible to construct buildings or plant trees over its 500 hectares. This is an unprecedented measure in the classification of a battlefield.

This major place of remembrance has just entered into European heritage.

THE DAY FOLLOWING THE BATTLE

For both Napoleon and Wellington, it is their last battle. It leads one to forfeiture and exile and the other to glory.

This battle marks the beginning of these two men’s myths. On return, Wellington is welcomed back to the United Kingdom as a national hero after his great victory. From 1815 to 1818, he is the supreme commander of the occupation troops in France and makes it an ally of England. In 1819, as prime minister, he holds a conference with all the European powers to arrange for the independence of Belgium. He dies on 14th June 1852 at the age of 83 and a grand state funeral takes place in his honour. He is buried in great pag- eantry at Saint-Paul’s Cathedral in London. The fallen Emperor, Napoleon, is exiled on the island of St Helena, 7,000 km away from France. During his captivity and with the benefit of hindsight, he has a justification for his politics and campaigns written. The “Memorial of St Helena” published only after his death portrays him as a fundamentally liberal and democratic man. At this same period, a Napoleonic “black legend”, as distorted and outrageous as the one that circulated abroad before the fall of the tormentor, develops amongst the royalists in France.

Some ardent writers such as Mrs de Staël, Chateaubriand or Vigny depict the prisoner of St Helena as an “ogre”, an “Attila” or a “Nero”.

Not long after the battle, the site and the name of Waterloo itself will also become myths. This battle marks a turning-point in European history. From the following day onwards the site becomes a major place of remembrance.

The number of deaths and injuries in one day give the Battle of Waterloo its sacred dimension. Pilgrimages devoted to the heroes of the battle are organised and commemorative ceremonies take place every 18th June. Most regiments set up commemorative plaques, traditions are kept and the site becomes a major tourist destination.

By slipping into the collective memory, the Battle of Waterloo runs by this excess of popularity. Access to the site, trampled on by curious tourists, is impossible to construct buildings or plant trees over its 500 hectares. This is an unprecedented measure in the classification of a battlefield.

This major place of remembrance has just entered into European heritage.

THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO, A SOURCE OF ARTISTIC INSPIRATION

According to Victor Hugo, “the epic is history heard at the doors of the legend”. It is maybe because he had foreseen that the Battle of Waterloo would become a true legend and so he used the epic genre to write Le Mémorial.

The battle inspired a large number of artists in the 19th century. The Romantic Movement has indeed felt a real fascination for the dramatic and emotional dimensions of this event. Many artists painted the battle (Ernest Crofts, Théodore Géricault, Sir William Allen, Félix Philippetoups…) and numerous works described it (in particular Le Châtiment by Victor Hugo and Le Chantre d’Armure by Stendhal or even Lord Byron or Sir Walter Scott on the British side). In the 20th century, cinema follows on and takes up the subject. Today, the fame of the battlefield has spread far beyond the borders of Europe and around the whole world. Some villages have adopted its famous name, such as the one of the victor himself, Wellington! Today, the battlefield is open to visitors and rich in various attractions that bring visitors closer to the events of 1815.

THE LAST HEADQUARTERS OF NAPOLEON

This building filled with history is still located at the same place today, very close to the Lion’s Mound. It now houses a museum dedicated to the events of that night.

The owner of the site, the province of the Brabant Wallon, confronted Napoleon re-ignite the Napoleonic offensive against the coalition allies. It is the Belgian campaign that leads to the Battle of Waterloo.

18TH JUNE: THE BATTLE OF WATERLOO

The Battle of Waterloo, formerly also called the Battle of Mont-St-Jean or the Battle of the Belle Alliance took place on the Mont-St-Jean plateau, where the communies of Braine-l’Alleud, Genappe, Lasne (Plancoët) and Waterloo now lie. It owes its name to the Duke of Wellington who established his main headquarters there.

At the end of the day, the Prussians arrive en masse on the battle- field. The French retreat defeated, except for two squares of the Regiment of the Imperial Guard who were on foot.

The owner of the site, the province of the Brabant Wallon, confronted Napoleon re-ignite the Napoleonic offensive against the coalition allies. It is the Belgian campaign that leads to the Battle of Waterloo.

The park and the orchard outside offer a nice area for visitors to take a precious break. In a now peaceful environment we can imagine the terrible conditions inflicted on the First Hunter Regiment of the Imperial Guard who were on foot.

With the help of orientation tables showing the positions defended at different times during the battle, you will be able to picture the entire battlefield and follow the progress of the operations. The owner of the site, the province of the Brabant Wallon, confronted Napoleon re-ignite the Napoleonic offensive against the coalition allies. It is the Belgian campaign that leads to the Battle of Waterloo.

The audio-visual guide immerses the listener in the heavy atmosphere of that night as they hear the loud, brave voices of the aides-de-camp, valets, marshals and surgeons and their gripping anecdotes. The entertaining interactive activities allow visitors of all ages to gain a better understanding of the soldiers’ lives and of the Emperor’s strategy.

The park and the orchard outside offer a nice area for visitors to take a precious break. In a now peaceful environment we can almost imagine the terrible conditions inflicted on the First Hunter Regiment of the Imperial Guard who were on foot.

THE FOUR MAIN ATTRACTIONS OF MEMORIAL 1815

1. The Memorial

Buried at the foot of the Lion’s Mound, it allows you to experience one of the most turbulent periods of our history. Guided by a soldier of your favourite army, you will discover the unfolding events that inexorably led to the battle: the European context in the 19th century and the New Ideas illustrated by spectacular objects and figures.

The museum elegantly presents its collections of period pieces in contemporary showcases. The audio-visual guide immerses the listener in the heavy atmosphere of that night as they hear the loud, brave voices of the aides-de-camp, valets, marshals and surgeons and their gripping anecdotes. The entertaining interactive activities allow visitors of all ages to gain a better understanding of the soldiers’ lives and of the Emperor’s strategy.

The park and the orchard outside offer a nice area for visitors to take a precious break. In a now peaceful environment we can almost imagine the terrible conditions inflicted on the First Hunter Regiment of the Imperial Guard who were on foot.

2. Panorama of the Battle

This gigantic painting was created in 1912 by Louis Dumoulin in preparation for celebrating the Centenary of the battle. Its spectacular dimensions are worthy of its eminently dramatic subject: 110 m in circumference and 12 m high.

You are literally immersed and surrounded by scenes of the combat with the visual illusion almost bringing life to the characters depicted on the 360° wall. The perspective and the 3D sensation are exceptional. The movement and the emotion are painted with a lot of realism. The sounds of the swords, the charges of the cavalry, the firing of the cannons, the bugles and the cries of the infantry plunge the visitor into the heart of the battle.

This panorama has been renovated and constitutes a piece of rare historical heritage, considering it is one of the few which survive to this day. These historical re-enactments were very common in the beginning of the 20th century but little by little they disappeared.

3. The Lion’s Mound

This 40 m mound was erected by the Kingdom of the Netherlands at the location where the Prince of Orange (1793-1840) was shot to have been wounded in the battle before becoming King of the Netherlands in 1840. It took three years from 1831 to 1834 to construct this huge cone of earth. The lion that is perched at the summit symbolises the victory of the monarchs. As its architect wrote, by having a paw on the globe he is “announcing the peace that Europe conquered on the plains of Waterloo”.

From the top of the mound we are able to survey the whole of the battlefield. You can fully appreciate what the square infantry formations must have looked like, as well as the cavalry deployments… It faces on a plain featuring many ridges and a significant slope. With the help of orientation tables showing the positions defended at different times during the battle, you will be able to picture the entirety of the field and follow the progress of the operations.

4. Hougoumont farm

This fortified farm was the setting of bloody combat. Its advanced location protected the right flank of the allies and it is here that Napoleon’s brother triggered the action.
What was only supposed to be a diversionary manoeuvre in the beginning became one of the most violent flashpoints of the battle. Throughout the whole day, the French assaults were terrifying but in vain. The framework of the farm was burned down. The house we see today is, in fact, the gardener’s old house. Victor Hugo dedicated two chapters of Les Misérables to it.

A shuttle bus is available to bring visitors from the Memorial to this last authentic witness of the battle of 18th June 1815. This castle-farm houses an original scenography: four showrooms and an amazing multimedia show.

THE LION’S MOUND – THE HISTORY OF A NEW SITE

On the site of the Memoire 1815, the old Museum Hotel has been renovated and is the main catering facility of the site. The Buvosac de l’Empereur allows a visitor to recapture the spirit of Napoléon’s taverns. A huge chimney from the era sets the scene and transports the visitor back to the heart of the grumblers and their canneens. The groups and companies are able to organize seminars or conferences for 500 people on the first floor of the building.

THE LION’S MOUND - THE HISTORY OF A NEW SITE

The battlefield is a true landmark for Wallonia on a global level and it receives hundreds of thousands of visitors every year! It was time to give it a memorial of a size appropriate to its history for its tourists.

Wallonia as well as the local and municipal authorities took on the project of modernising the site. This was begun in the years 2000 by successive ministers of tourism. They proceeded to acquire several properties on the Lion’s Mound site in order to take over the man and his headquarters. Today it serves as a museum.

The building covers 5,700 m² of which 5,000 m² is for the exhibition room and reaches 10 m in depth. The structure of the building is made of reinforced concrete and steel. The interior and exterior finishes are made of transparent glass, walnut wood and blue stone. The roof of the Memorial follows the topography of the land just as it was in 1815, and is covered in prairie grass.

The building incorporates the criteria of a durable architecture respectful of the environment: the building is very well insulated and ventilated via geothermal technologies favouring efficient and sound management of energy.

There are two ways to access the Memorial: a gently sloping ramp going from the new car parks and a staircase adjacent to the Panorama of the battle.

The access ramp is parallel to the Memorial Wall honouring all the regiments of 18th June 1815.

A tunnel runs between the Memorial and the Panorama. Visitors either use the double spiral staircase or the lift to access the Panorama. At the exit, visitors proceed towards the Lion’s Mound from the outside.

THE WELLINGTON MUSEUM

In front of the church a big building which had been built in around 1050 was turned into an inn by Mr Humbert Oliver, a paving contractor. It had 12 bedrooms, a laundry room, a well, a stable, a shed, a furnace, a farmyard, a garden and a bakery. In 1815, it was judged to be big enough to serve as the headquarters of the Duke of Wellington and his aides-de-camp. Today it serves as a museum standing in the heart of the tragedy.

The rooms of the museum lead you back into the battle.

The room in which the Duke of Wellington spent his nights of 17th and 18th June has a great historical value. In fact, it is here that he wrote his victory report that was published on 22nd June 1815 in the London Times. He started with “Waterloo, 18th June 1815.” The adjoining room contains the bed of Wellington’s aide-de-camp, Sir Alexandre Gordon, who was wounded and had his leg amputated. He died here during the night after learning of their victory. The room also contains the articulated prosthetic leg of Lord Uxbridge, commander in chief of the English cavalry. His leg was amputated in a house not far from the present museum. This prosthesis, one of the first of its kind, answers some questions visitors have about health care and surgical operations during the Empire wars.

Each room in the museum is dedicated to one of the other nations that participated in the battle: Belgium, the Netherlands, Prussia and France.

The items collected throughout the years describe the Belgian Campaign of 1815:
- the collection of weapons, some of which were found on the battlefield;
- the trunk belonging to the Baron of Constant Rebecque, the chief of the Batavian army;
- several porcelain items given to the Duke by European monarchs to thank him for his victory;
- a French cannon, “La Suffisante”, confiscated from the French army on the battlefield;
- a British Congreve rocket, fore-runner of the mortar.

THE WATERLOOS OF THE WORLD

The announcement of the Waterloo victory spreads throughout the whole world, especially the Anglo-Saxon parts.

With the return of peace in Europe, many demobilised soldiers migrated across the world. It is only natural that they wanted to commemorate the victory by re-baptising a location or giving the name Waterloo to new foundations.

There are more than 125 Waterloos in the world, grouped together in a very dynamic association.

A space in the museum presents maps, films and testimonies of all the different Waterloos of the world.

MONT-JEAN FARM

The historical site of the Mont-Saint-Jean farm is situated at the heart of the battlefield of Waterloo, a rifle shot away from the Lion’s Mound.

Certain historians consider the farm to be the best place to understand the strategic issues of the field during the combat.

Known as the British Ambulance during the battle of 1815, the farm’s origins are in the Middle-Ages. Known as the British Ambulance during the battle of 1815, the farm’s origins are in the Middle-Ages.

Built in squares, the wings of the Farm are the location of various activities that combine together to propose to you an original visit full of new discoveries.

Other meeting rooms in the attics of the farm will be accessible soon.

The BEER OF WATERLOO

You will find the micro-brewery within the farm that opens its doors for guided visits followed (of course) by a tasting. Joined by master brewers you will discover the authentic originality of this top fermentation beer. Brewed in the 18th century near Mont-Saint-Jean, this beer is the one that gave the necessary courage to the soldiers of both camps to launch into the battle.

A MUSEUM IN THE FARM

If the many historical anecdotes dispersed in the four corners of the courtyard have made you even more curious, do not hesitate to pass through the threshold of the farm museum. You will discover a very nice exhibition about the British Ambulance where Wellington installed himself in 1815. More than just a presentation of the British Ambulance, this space is intended to pay tribute to the “little hands”, the women of the shadows whose names have been forgotten by history books, but thanks to whom a large number of soldiers survived.

A FUN SPACE FOR SMALL CHILDREN

Where the adults have fun, the children do too! There is a big themed playground in the orchard that will welcome your children so that the educational visit is also an entertaining one. At Mont-Saint-Jean they will learn while playing and a detour through the pottery and the matcha blacksmith workshops will give them a good idea of these forgotten professions.

A WELCOMING PLACE FOR VARIOUS OCCASIONS

Restored in an authentic manner in 2015, this important site welcomes your professional and private events of any kind. They will take place within the historical 410 m² barn of the farm that is adaptable to your wishes: conference, seminar, business show, end of year banquet or gala. All of this in an unfamiliar and relaxing setting.

Other meeting rooms in the attics of the farm will be accessible soon.
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Original Wade House
Gettysburg is the site of the major battle in the history of North America, with more than 51,000 casualties over three days. The battle happened in Gettysburg quite accidentally: marching armies stumbled onto each other and converged on a small town because ten different roads led into it.

In terms of scope, about 90,000 Union men from northern states led by General Meade defeated 75,000 Confederates from southern states led by General Lee. Underlying this battle, and indeed, the entire Civil War, were issues related to states’ rights and especially slavery of African-Americans.

One regiment fighting on the Union side to help set other people free was the 58th New York Volunteer Regiment. Mostly immigrants from Poland living in New York City, and sometimes called the Polish Legion, this regiment fought bravely at Gettysburg.

* The battle itself is easily explained: Union soldiers retreated through town on day one, repulsed Confederate attacks on high ground on day two, and held the center of the battle line against what is called Pickett’s Charge on day three, sending the defeated Confederates back to Virginia.

Gettysburg was the turning point of the American Civil War. Just to offer perspective, the American Civil War had about 620,000 casualties in the 1860s, or about 2% of the total U.S. population at the time. Most soldiers died of disease, not combat.

Remarkably, at Gettysburg, in stark contrast to so many battlefields, only one innocent civilian was killed during the fighting. A woman named Jennie Wade was accidentally killed while baking biscuits in her home.

Gettysburg National Military Park sits on 24 km² of land. It has about 1,400 monuments to the soldiers who fought, and each year is visited by 1 million people – about 3% of whom are international visitors.

The Gettysburg Foundation works as a partner supporting the National Park Service to preserve the Gettysburg battlefield and the Eisenhower National Historic Site, and to educate the public about their significance.

An obvious way is that many Americans are descendants of the more than 610,000 soldiers who fought there. Current American families are woven by ancestry into this historical narrative.

Gettysburg is America’s best-preserved battlefield – and just like so many other battlefields discussed at this conference – is a place that transcends its historical era.

Three days of fighting will always be the signature storyline. But we are now working to broaden the narrative after the battle because for the last 155 years Gettysburg has been less a place of conflict than a place of healing and kindness, remembrance and reconciliation, forgiveness and redemption.

Remember that Gettysburg was a civil war, not a fight with other nations, like most of the conflicts discussed at this conference. Here’s one slice of a remarkable story.

Immediately after the battle, residents offer food to the hungry, water to the thirsty, and help for the injured, much like the Good Samaritan in the New Testament. Not everyone was kind, but much kindness was shown.

Elizabeth Thorn, six months pregnant, helps bury over 100 men, which is why there is a monument to a pregnant woman at Gettysburg.

Lydia Hamilton Smith – African mother, Irish father – starts her daily trips on a wagon into the countryside, explaining the carnage at Gettysburg, and returning with donations for people in need.

A tent hospital called Camp Letterman is hastily erected, where wounded of both armies are treated. Doctors and nurses stream into Gettysburg from neighboring towns to care for the wounded.
Convincing Confederates write letters home telling loved ones they’re being cared for just as well as Union soldiers.

Five months after the battle, President Abraham Lincoln arrives by train and stays at the home of local attorney David Wills, who invited him to Gettysburg to make “a few appropriate remarks”.

Lincoln delivers the Gettysburg Address, the most famous speech by an American president. He offers both resolve and a spirit of healing. He commemorates the sacrifice of soldiers, while avoiding the temptation to be triumphant. In his remarks, Lincoln neverloats about the Union victory, nor does he malign the Confederates. In fact, he never mentions either side.

And Lincoln speaks about nurturing democracy. He starts the Gettysburg Address out with the birth of the nation in 1776, in the spirit of equality found in the American Declaration of Independence. He ends the Address with the fervent hope that governments of, by, and for the people will not perish from this earth. He seeks a “new birth of freedom” for those who are not yet free.

Lincoln blends humility, compassion, thoughtfulness and resilience, which is why his speech endures.

Healing continues for decades through veteran reunions. The 50th in 1923 brings 50,000 soldiers; President Woodrow Wilson characterizes them as enemies no longer, but as generous friends, the quarrel forgotten.

The high point of reconciliation comes when the Confederates reenacting Pickett’s Charge – their final attack on the third day of the battle – are met with cheers and handshakes from Union men, and of African-Americans, both before and after the battle, thus telling a more inclusive story.

We’ve launched what we call a “Recruits Program” that brings Gettysburg’s lessons to younger audiences by trying to interest them in sustainability and battlefield preservation.

We are partnering with the Park Service in what we call Museum Mondays – running brief video clips featuring one museum artifact and telling the human-interest story that accompanies that specific artifact.

Great Conversations at Gettysburg is our umbrella to have conversations on the premises about the Civil War and related issues, such as democracy, sustainability, civility, and reconciliation.

We have just participated in the Big History Project – supported by Microsoft Founder Bill Gates – engaging with teachers around the globe to discuss this more expansive understanding of Gettysburg.

Finally, “Gettysburg Revisited” is the umbrella name of our Foundation’s efforts to bring the lessons of Gettysburg out to the American people to improve political civility in the United States. We’ve held 22 events in 11 of our 50 states, mostly at universities and service clubs. Our hope is that the spirit of conciliation at Gettysburg will help improve the tone of our public discourse.

In closing, the battles represented at this conference must always be remembered because they teach us so much about human nature – our inexplicable mixture of cruelty and compassion, determination and resignation, denial and acceptance.

One goal of telling stories of human conflict is to commemorate sacrifice, to honor those who gave their lives for the safety and freedom of others.

But beyond that, another goal must be to encourage peace. Only a month before the Civil War ended, Abraham Lincoln was inaugurated the second time as president. He might have loudly proclaimed the imminent Union victory in the Civil War, but instead Lincoln uttered these magnificent, restorative words: “With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the nation’s wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan, to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations”.

The bottom line: Gettysburg is appropriately remembered as a battlefield, but its full meaning runs much deeper, with profound relevance for today, for long has it been a place exhibiting what Lincoln so famously described as “the better angels of our nature”.

*
THE GALLIPOLI BATTLEFIELD: WAR AND MEMORY

UĞUR CENK DENIZ İMAMOĞLU
TURKISH HISTORICAL SOCIETY
The region of today’s Çanakkale, namely the Dardanelles, or Hellespont to give it its historical name, played a significant role throughout the history. Studies show that life began in the Dardanelles in the 6th millennium BC. The Dardanelles is a narrow body of water, and at certain points it is only 1.5 km wide. Generally, it is 60 km long and between 1.5 and 6 km wide.1

As a strait between Marmara (and Black) Sea and Aegean Sea, Dardanelles can be considered a boundary between Asia and Europe. The campaign of Xerxes in the 5th century BC against Greek city-states and also the attack of Alexander the Great on Persia in the 4th century BC clearly show the importance of this strait. After the Lydian, Persian, Greek and Roman administrations, Turkish campaigns to the region began in the 13th century and Ottoman Turks conquered it in the 14th century.2

From the 15th century onwards, the Dardanelles had greater significance, since defending Istanbul was critical to the defence of the Dardanelles. Therefore, after the conquest of Istanbul, the fortification of the region started. Mehmed II built two fortresses in the narrowest point of the strait, one on the Anatolian side and one on the European side, facing each other. The one on the European side is called Kilitbahir (The lock of the sea); and the one on the Anatolian side is called Kale-i Sultanıye (The Sultan’s Fortress). These fortresses were strong and their artillery was so effective that they could close the strait to enemy ships. In the 17th century, two more fortresses were built, again one on the European side (Seddülbahir—barrier of the sea) and one on the Anatolian side (Kumkale). In the following centuries, the fortresses were strengthened and many bastions were built to defend the strait.3

Towards the end of the 19th century, the leading powers in the world had gone into a big rivalry over colonies in Asia, Africa and America. There were also working industries whose powers had to feed, and thus they needed large quantities of raw materials. This rivalry compelled them to seek alliances with different powers at different times. Germany established an alliance with Austria-Hungary and Italy. The Ottoman Empire had to fight against different powers on different fronts. The struggle against Russians in the Caucasus, against Britain in Palestine, and also against Britain and Arabs in Yemen were keeping the Ottomans busy over a large area. However, that was not all as the Allied Forces had even more reasons to expand military operations.

British Lord of the Admiralty Winston Churchill advocated an attack on Dardanelles as it would bring many strategic, diplomatic, military and economic benefits, he believed. For him, after a victorious campaign, Istanbul would fall under the control of the Allied Powers; and the connection of Turkish corps with their European allies would be cut. Accordingly, the Russians in the Caucasus would relax; the Allied forces would support Russians by passing Istanbul straits; and Russian grains would be carried to Europe.4

According to a British military historian, General Aspinall Oglander, in order to overcome the enemy, they needed to use the Russian population. Accordingly, they required an army, arsenal and money to support the Russians. Thus, they could win against Germany. All this forced them to pass the Dardanelles. Apart from these, there was also a competition between the British and the Russians regarding seizing the control of Istanbul Strait. Whoever arrived at Istanbul first would hold an advantageous position. All these conditions led to the decision to attack the Dardanelles.5

For these reasons, the Allies opened the Gallipoli front. They decided to attack first with naval forces. The commander of the fleet was British Admiral Carden. The fleet of the Allies included 14 battlehips, 5 cruisers, 6 destroyers, 1 flattop, 5 submarines, 21 mine crafts from the British side; 4 battleships, 6 destroyers, 1 flattop and 2 submarines from the French side. On the Turkish side, Cevad Paşa was the commander. They planted approximately 400 hundred mines in the Straits. They also fortified the bastions and fortresses along the Gallipoli Peninsula, on the Anatolian side and the Straits.

The attack of the fleet started on 19 February 1915. They bombarded the south of the Gallipoli Peninsula and the Anatolian side of the Dardanelles. From February to mid-March, the Allies bombarded; but Turkish fortifications could not be destroyed. On the contrary,

---

6 Ibidem, p. 37.
7 N. Rubinczoglu, Çanakkale, İstanbul 2017, p. 25-27.
Turkish artillery damaged the Fleet, and the resistance of Turkish corps was remarkable. On 8 March, the Fleet of the Allies launched a huge attack to the Strait. The destroyers would demolish Turkish mines. In the afternoon, the French ship Bourget and British ships Irresistible and Ocean sank after hitting mines in the Strains. The Fleet lost an important part of its power and also psychological advantages. They had to retreat. It was the Turks’ victory.

After the defeat, the Allies understood that the naval force alone would not be successful in this operation and they had to carry out an amphibious operation with naval and ground forces. So, they started recruiting soldiers from Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand and Southern Asia. They moved them to Egypt and Lemnos Island for preparations. There were almost 75,000 of them. The Turks established the 4th Army for the defence of the Dardanelles. German General Liman von Sanders was appointed as the commander. Turkish forces comprised 6 divisions.

On 25 April, the Allied invasion started. They mainly focused on the west of the Peninsula (Anzuruni) and the south (Seddülbahir). There were also secret operations in various parts of the region. Turkish divisions and brigades also concentrated on Anzuruni and Seddülbahir. The infantry and the artillery resisted despite insufficient reinforcements. Mustafa Kemal also fought well with his brigade. Therefore, the Allies were unable to succeed in this attack.

After the 25 April invasions, the Allies and Turkish Forces engaged in constant combat in various parts of the Peninsula from April to October. Trench warfare followed and in some parts the Turkish forces comprised 6 divisions. Trench warfare followed and in some parts the Turkish forces comprised 6 divisions.
VERDUN: FROM YESTERDAY TO TODAY

THIERRY HUBSCHER
MÉMORIAL DE VERDUN
History gives us some extremely singular paradoxes. The Battle of Verdun is a shining example. From this conflict between brothers, which was one of the most terrible in our recent past, arose a symbol which stands in stark contrast with the political ambitions of the leaders who caused it to happen. The name of Verdun was already associated with a key episode in Europe's history because of the Treaty of 843 which shared out Charlemagne's empire between his three grandchildren.

Today it is associated with a much more peaceful image of reconciliation between peoples.

I will avoid going back over the origins of the First World War, a topic which many works have dealt with, so that I can focus on the single episode of Verdun 1916.

It was a terrible battle. The front spanned both banks of the Meuse, and the strongly positioned German troops were determined to “bleed” the French army dry. The policy of the French, meanwhile, was based on a military strategy of “They shall not pass”. Verdun became a symbol of national unity for the French, who did everything they could to resist the German enemy and halt its advance.

Although Verdun’s position was not of strategic military importance, the government felt that public opinion needed to be rallied around a focal point and made the defence of Verdun a national objective. The military staff implemented a turnover system whereby all fighting units were called to serve in Verdun. In rotations, each lasting 10 to 15 days, within less than 10 months, three-quarters of fighting troops passed through Verdun. The Battle of Verdun became a national issue for all French families.

At the time, French servicemen used to say that “if you haven’t been to Verdun, you haven’t fought in the war”. Under this rotational system, practically every family gave France a son, a brother or a father, so every family was able to pass on the memory of the atrocities in the fighting.

Verdun was the most terrifying combat experience of the First World War, with a total of 200,000 men from both sides being killed or injured (863,000 French fatalities and 143,000 German fatalities). 1.2 million Germans fought there, 1.1 million Frenchmen fought there. 300,000 men died in the space of 300 days between 21 February and 19 December, making an average of 1,000 deaths per day. 60 million shells were fired across an area of 12 km², and nine villages were completely destroyed. It was the first battle of a new kind: industrial-era combat.

Verdun was not the deadliest battle in the First World War. On the Western Front, the Battle of the Somme killed many more men, over 1,000,000 in the same year. But it showed the strength of the artillery deployed by each of the protagonists. It was a battle in which areas of territory were taken and taken back many times. The village of Fleury was recaptured on 17 occasions.

The forts of Douaumont and Vaux were seized at the beginning of the battle and taken back in the autumn. The most fortunate of the soldiers lived in trenches, while others were holed up in shellholes where they suffered from hunger, thirst, cold or heat. The ground was bombarded so heavily that it lost its structure and consistency, everything was pulverised and turned into powder into which men sank with the rain: this was the famous mud of Verdun.

However, on 20 December 1916, the date that is regarded as marking the end of the Battle of Verdun, the positions that were held were virtually identical to what they had been when they began fighting on 21 February during the Caures Wood offensive.

At the end of the war, the bruised soil of the Verdun battlefield was given protected status across an area of 200,000 ha. Nine villages had disappeared, leaving behind a scene of moon-like desolation which was devoid of vegetation and contained the bodies of hundreds of thousands of servicemen together with a huge amount of shrapnel. This was why the French state decided to preserve the historic site of the battlefield by planting trees from the beginning of the 1920s onwards and banning all reconstruction in the area.

From the beginning of the 1920s onwards, the bishop of Verdun, Bishop Ginisty, raised funds to build Douaumont Ossuary to house the bones of the servicemen whose bodies regularly emerged from the ground and give them a burial place that would be worthy of the soldiers from both sides. The remains of 150,000 French and German men are kept there, closely intermingled in its crypt.

It is estimated that over 80,000 other bodies still lie buried on the battlefield. The paradox that I talked about at the beginning of my speech is that over time, this place of fierce conflict between the nations of France and Germany became a place of reconciliation and then friendship between the two countries.

This turnaround came about in several stages. It began with the wishes of the veterans, even before the war had ended. They came to gather in memory of their brothers-in-arms. The veteran movement came into being within a few years, many veterans joined the Comité National du Souvenir de Verdun (National Verdun Remembrance Committee). But it was only thanks to the forcefulness of their leader Maurice Genevoix, the permanent secretary of the Académie Française, that they introduced subscriptions and raised funds to build a memorial to the veterans of Verdun at the place where the fighting occurred. The first stone was laid in 1963. It was inaugurated in September 1967, more than 50 years after the battle. The veterans were already elderly.

Time is probably the most critical factor in the creation of memory and the process of reconciliation. Already, in this Memorial which was created with donations from the veterans’ families, the presence of both sides was apparent. The fact that Germans visited it was also significant. At the same time, the work of General de Gaulle and Chancellor Konrad Adenauer bore fruit. They were the first
Franco-German “pair”. Their first talks took place at La Boissière in Colombey-les-Deux-Eglises. They later met in Reims in 1967.

A speech was given by de Gaulle during the ceremonies marking the 50th anniversary in 1966. Successive events strengthened the reconciliation between the two nations. The statue of Notre-Dame de l’Europe was added in 1979 (the year of the first European elections) to the façade of the chapel of Fleury-devant-Douaumont (one of the destroyed villages on the battlefield).

On 22 September 1984, Kohl and Mitterrand stood hand in hand in front of the Douaumont Ossuary, and very recently the ceremonies marking the centenary of the Battle of Verdun were attended by Hollande and Merkel on 29 May 2016. All remembrance activities in Verdun are now planned from a Franco-German perspective. French, German and European flags fly over Douaumont Fort.

The aim of Maurice Genevoix, who oversaw the construction of the Verdun Memorial, was to build an edifice to commemorate the veterans at the scene of the fighting. I will quote Maurice Genevoix’s words: “This Memorial was erected by the survivors of Verdun in memory of their comrades who fell during the battle so that those who will come to reflect and contemplate at the place of their sacrifice can understand the ideal and the faith that inspired and sustained them”.

The very idea of a Memorial was a novelty in the 1920s and 1930s. It came from the veterans who wanted a temple of commemoration, a place of remembrance, to be built at the place where they fought, in the exact location where they lost some of their comrades. The veterans entrusted this idea to Maurice Genevoix.

The veterans eventually chose the site of Fleury-devant-Douaumont, at the location of the former railway station where the fighting between the French and the Germans was at its fiercest and most violent.

The Memorial was inaugurated in 1967 by Minister Duvillard with a speech by Maurice Genevoix who became extremely famous and was given before more than 3,000 people, 2,000 pupils and 300 standard-bearers. Little by little, the museum which essentially contained photographs, plans and maps giving a clear explanation of how the Battle of Verdun was waged, expanded as various collections were added to it.

In the 1970s, and education department was created with history and geography teachers seconded by the Ministry of National Education, with the aim of passing on the memory to the younger generations.

40 years after the Memorial was opened to the public, the building was showing signs of dilapidation and non-compliance with regulations which became increasingly demanding for the public. There was an urgent need to carry out modernisation works. In addition, the collections that were on display, most of which had been donated by veterans’ families over the years, no longer conveyed a clear message. It had become necessary to rethink the exhibition design. At the same time, the Meuse Department was thinking about building an interpretation centre dedicated to the Battle of Verdun as part of the efforts to commemorate the centenary of the Great War.

In the end, the two projects were merged into a single project to ensure that the memorial could address a new era with the same emotional intensity and teach the young generation about this chapter in our history.

The renovated Memorial has retained its original spirit in line with the veterans’ wishes; the men who fought in Verdun, whatever their nationality, still constitute the essence of the place. The Scientific Advisory Board of the Memorial which is made up of historians of various nationalities (French, German, British, American), oversaw the process. The building’s identity was preserved in the process of expanding it: the very contemporary exhibition design speaks to young people with its language without distorting the history and spirit of the place.

Our task is to bring to life and pass on the veterans’ message from its definitively Franco-German perspective. There was no difference between the suffering of the fighters on both sides.

When it was reopened to the public in February 2016, the French state wanted the Memorial to be run, managed and developed in a different legal context in order to guarantee its influence and continued existence.

It was thus transformed into a Public Institution for Cultural Cooperation in order to implement a bona fide cultural project across the entire Battlefield in conjunction with other remembrance sites (Douaumont Ossuary, Douaumont Fort, Vaux Fort) so that this Battlefield could become a beacon of remembrance of the Great War with Europe-wide influence.

The main goals of the Institution are to stage ambitious cultural events of all kinds, both within and outside it (temporary exhibitions, music, theatre, conferences, film discussions, etc) and run an educational programme aimed at the widest possible audience in order to reach out to the young generation in particular.

The Education Department has therefore designed online course (Massive Open Online Courses) with assistance from the University of Lorraine, the Ministry of Education and the Scientific Advisory Board. These courses are free and can be accessed on the Internet.

In November, we will put the third cycle of these courses online. We have also developed a digital application which can be downloaded from the Apple Store to enable our younger visitors from higher grades of primary school education (10-11 years old) to have a more fun experience when they visit the museum. We must also now start thinking about what will happen after the centenary and look beyond the stage of the commemorations in order to plan historical tourism.

Today’s visitors do not behave in the same way as the pilgrims who came here 50 years ago. If Verdun wants to go on generating as much interest, it needs to think about not only modernising its remembrance sites by using modern technologies, but probably also diversifying what it offers to tourists, for example by staging events with a broader popular appeal.

This year, therefore, we have just held a gathering of historical re-enactors of the armies of 18 nations which fought in the First World War.

Although the Battle of Verdun was fought solely between France and Germany, it embodies the Great War all by itself. It is also the symbol of reconciliation, and hosts the World Centre for Peace and Human Rights. As such, it is perfectly suited for this kind of event.

We have also forged international links with other museums. We have just staged an exhibition with assistance from the National WWI Museum and Memorial in Kansas City. Together with the International Committee of the Red Cross in Geneva, we are preparing for an exhibition about prisoners of war to be held in 2019. We have a plan to work together with a small town in Belarus from which a delegation recently came to visit us.

The partnership agreements will be signed in October. We are planning to create an international network of the main museums dedicated to the Great War, and its first meeting could take place in October 2019 in Kansas City.

Our approach is attracting interest from other countries which are thinking about the issue of reconciliation. We have been approached by Indian associations which want to build a Memorial devoted to the partition of India and Pakistan in 1947. They are curious about our experience – how were we able to progress from the terrible battle to reconciliation within the space of 100 years?

It is really an issue for which Verdun could be regarded as a kind of testing ground. Although every situation is unique, it nonetheless seems to me that time plays a dominant role.

Since the Battle of Verdun in 1916, we have moved from memory to remembrance, and then from remembrance to history. The passing of time allows us to do things which, in my opinion, were unthinkable when there were still enough survivors of this conflict.

So this is how I would sum up this vast topic. It is at the cost of all these changes that Verdun will continue to exist after the commemorative ceremonies, and that Verdun will retain its power to attract a public which is curious to experience, on a single site, a cultural offering which will immerse it with emotion, in an essential chapter of its history.
To begin with, I would like to ask our colleagues from the Czech Republic the following question: what do you think is left of Hussitism in the contemporary Czech Republic?

Zdeněk Vyhlídal: This is quite a complicated question because the Hussite movement is only a part of today's historical memory. The feeling or identification of contemporary Czech people, their national idea, is linked not only to the Hussite or late medieval chapter of our history: it has other levels and is based on other events or affairs, such as the Battle of White Mountain or the nineteenth-century national movement. Czech people consider the Hussite movement a matter of national glory and pride first of all because of the military success and skill. There is also the question of national heroes, which I mentioned in my presentation: a small nation needs either many heroes or a few big heroes. Jan Žižka, whom I spoke about, is such a big European hero. He is one of the key personalities in our history, and it is through these personalities that contemporary Czech people identify themselves as a nationality group.

Tomasz Szturo: And probably he is also connected with our Polish history...

Zdeněk Vyhlídal: Yes, of course.

Jakub Smrčka: There is one more thing. The Hussite movement was also a symbolic point of reference for the modern twentieth-century armies of Czech or Slovak – Czechoslovak – Legionnaires during the First World War and also for the Czechoslovak army during the Second World War. As we can see, the symbolism of chalice, Jan Žižka, and other Hussite warriors was very motivating.

Tomasz Szturo: So...I can see that the military or national aspects of Hussitism are stronger than the religious aspect.

Jakub Smrčka: Yes, that's right.

Tomasz Szturo: Mr Claude, I would like to ask you a slightly provocative question. I would like to know your opinion: is it good or bad that Napoleon was defeated? Was it good or bad for Europe?

Etienne Claude: It's difficult to answer... For me it was good that the war ended, because this meant development. The 19th century was interesting: you lived in the Europe of kings, then the French Revolution arrived, with hopes for the citizens (expressed in the first charter of human rights). At the same time, there was the war, slavery, hunger (which affected most of the population), I think, and blockades in the north, and all of these had an impact on the entire population. And I think that the people that were waiting for changes. You know, there is a very special kind of independent movement in Europe, and this movement was important for the citizens. In my opinion, it is important not to have in constant fear of an invader. After the battle of Waterloo there were approximately a hundred years of peace, even if there were conflicts between one or two countries in Europe. Life went on, the development of arts or industry progressed, and it was important for the evolution of Europe at that time.

Tomasz Szturo: I asked this question because Napoleon has a very strong position in our history. We had very strong hopes connected with his power.

Etienne Claude: I think Napoleon was also effective, for example, in the evolution of schooling or urban life, or in the field of law, and this impact was very important. So, you cannot see Napoleon only as a fighter.

Tomasz Szturo: That's right: not only as a military leader. Dr Moen, I would like to ask you a difficult question too: can you see any traces of divisions dating back to the Civil War in contemporary America?

Matthew Moen: The answer is yes: the issues that Americans fought over internally about a hundred and fifty-five or so years ago are still with us – we continue the struggle. One manifestation of that is the removal of statues to Confederate soldiers around America. For the most part, that has not affected us at Garrycy, people understand that the hundred- or so monuments to Confederate soldiers at Garrycy were largely put there as that generation of veterans was dying out. And we put them there in that spirit to commemorate their sacrifice also as Americans. Where in the United States is gets more problematic is that we also had a lot of Confederate statues go up during civil rights struggles of the 1950s and 1960, not on the battlefields but in public squares, in towns. And so, as America becomes a more diverse society, what is called into question is the propriety of those monuments – not the ones on the battlefields so much, but those in cities. And there we are, having vigorous discussions and conversations, and occasionally, including this last week, a Confederate monument is toppled in North Carolina on a university campus. North Carolina had one of the highest percentages of Confederate soldiers killed in the entire American Civil War, and now a Confederate statue has been pulled down. It may be relocated to a different part of campus, but it gives you some sense of how the issues that resonated then still continue to trouble Americans. We still continue to try to work our way through them.

Tomasz Szturo: Thank you very much. Now I would like to ask our colleagues from Turkey a question. In your slideshow, one of the first slides we could see was a monument representing two soldiers – could you tell us something more about that monument?

Uğur Cenk Deniz: Yes, sure. Actually, the monument in that picture is one of the most important sites of the Gallipoli campaign, because despite the heavy losses, despite the brutal and bloody combat, today the Gallipoli campaign is associated with humanity, conscience, tolerance, and help. That monument today at Gallipoli, shown in my slide that you asked about, is based on a true historical event. During the campaign, during heavy bombardment and heavy gunfire, an Australian and New Zealand Army Corps soldier – an Anzac soldier – was shot in the leg and could not go anywhere; because of the heavy bombardments nobody could help him. Suddenly, a Turk came from his trenches: the monument represents the Turkish soldier carrying his wounded enemy to his trenches – this, I think, is the importance of Gallipoli. Besides, when we read soldiers’ diaries or when we read about the events of the war, we always see that there are two sides fighting each other but there is also a humanitarian side to it. Where the trenches were close enough to each other the soldiers even threw cigarettes between themselves. They helped and respected each other. This is the meaning of the monument.

Tomasz Szturo: That was two years before the end of the war, so we say that the Battle of Verdun lasted 200 days but continued for two more years: 1917 and 1918. It is a symbol of resistance. It is well known in every French family because of the military strategy that was developed by the state, but now Verdun is very important not as a symbol of the horrible battle but as a symbol of peace. This may be the first time in history that, in 100 years, we have transformed the site of a terrible battle into a city of peace; Verdun is known at present as the city of peace.

Tomasz Szturo: I think a very constructive conclusion of our meeting is that despite the experience of the horrible, bloody battlefields we are drawing lessons from those events, moving towards reconciliation. Now, time for our audience: do we have any questions from the audience?

Piotr Felkier: What lessons can we draw from the history and battlefields we are looking at? As far as I know, later on the allies recovered to try some parts of the ships. But to be honest, I have not specifically researched the issue of what happened to them, or when they were totally or partly removed. These three battlefields were sunk, and several others did not sink but were heavily damaged: they returned to their harbours to be repaired.

Piotr Felkier: And is it possible to dive near the wrecks of the vessels that are still underwater and see them, or is it forbidden?

Uğur Cenk Deniz: Yes, there are some diving activities along the Gallipoli Peninsula, in the strait, as far as I know.

Tomasz Szturo: I think this is exactly one of the subjects between memory and the tourism business. Thank you very much for your attention.
BATTLEFIELDS – BETWEEN THE SACRED AND A TOURIST ATTRACTION
I think you tell a better story of what really happened here at Westerplatte, because the Slavic National Uprising was spread, in the beginning, over an area of 20,000 km², so there are many battlefields on that large territory. Today there still are some structures scattered over that area, but we cannot rebuild or revitalize anything the way this can be done in Westerplatte, where there are many structures in one place. Anyway, because we cannot do this, the Museum of the Slavic National Uprising was built and there is an exhibition, but we came up against the problem of how to commemorate the historical events and bring them to the people as truthfully as possible. Of course, a permanent exhibition is not so emotional as historical reconstructions or historic buildings. Our solution was not just to try to attract people to our exhibition but also to bring our exhibitions out to the people: we devised a mobile exhibition. We revitalized an armoured train which fought during the uprising, restoring several train cars as they were in their historical period. On that train, we travelled to tens of cities in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic in order to bring part of our exhibition to the people from other parts of the country who would not normally visit Banská Bystrica.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think the recreation of a park or a battlefield is important as long as it’s done historically accurately. I think if we do justice to history as we recreate it, it does bring a lot more meaning and it brings much more education and understanding of what happened in the past. So, we all have a responsibility of making sure that it is historically accurate. This is my belief.

Aleksander Masłowski: Are you making investments to recreate the structures that were there? Were they somehow removed after the events of the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor?

Aileen Utterdyke: At World War II Valor in the Pacific there are a number of buildings that are historically preserved. They have not been restored yet, but they are a subject of conversation every year as to whether or not they should be — and if they are, how to ensure that historically accurate renovations are done. So, we do have the same challenge. For us, the biggest challenge is also financial: renovation takes a lot of money, and so that is one of the challenges we face.

Aleksander Masłowski: My Koperkiewicz, you were the Director of the Historical Museum of Gdańsk for many years, and so you had to answer this question many times. What do you think about battlefields should their historical form be recreated, or should they be left as we inherited them from the past?

Adam Koperkiewicz: This is always a very difficult question, because at Westerplatte, for instance, we encounter something between the sacred and the profane. We have not only a typical battlefield there, but also one that includes the remains of the structures where people got wounded, fought and died, so we must remember about the troubles, disasters, and unhappiness of those people. It is therefore interesting what to do? Not far from here there is another famous building significant for our Second World War history: the Polish Post Office in Gdańsk. We can see that today the building has no fence. During the fighting on 1 September 1939, the fence was very important: the distance between the fence and the building made it difficult for the Germans to attack the building, because it was difficult to throw grenades, to use flame-throwers, and so on. But after the war the fence disappeared, and now it is very difficult to understand what difficulties the Germans encountered during the attack, what the defenders felt like, what the attackers felt like, and what the situation was. Another problem is that when people — tourists — look at old photos, they can see both the building and the fence, whereas now only the building is there. And maybe some of them cannot find the building or recognize that they are looking at the same historical monument. The problem is the same at Westerplatte, I think. Visitors can see the battlefield devoid of the typical military installations and fortifications. This makes it difficult to find your bearings there: to feel that you are inside the battlefield and understand the battle, and to understand the 1939 siege of Westerplatte. In my opinion, it is very important in the first place to do everything to enable tourists and everyone else to read the battle: to make investments and carry out reconstruction, but only to make necessary changes to alter the place in such a way as to show the 1939 situation more clearly and to make it possible for visitors not only to read the situation but to read the battle — to imagine what was actually happening during the battle. Without the characteristic structures this is very difficult, because the terrain is flat there, without former fortifications. For me as a historian, and probably also for tourists or visitors, it is difficult to feel the climate of the battle and realize the problems faced by the defenders. It is absolutely essential that we do everything to show the situation of 1939 more clearly.

Aleksander Masłowski: Your museum takes care of many battlefields in the area of Banská Bystrica. Do you face the same dilemma with recreating structures in the battlefields? If so, how do you solve it?

Maerz Syryn: I don’t know if we are in a better situation or in a worse situation than you are at Westerplatte, because the Slavic National Uprising was spread, in the beginning, over an area of 20,000 km², so there are many battlefields on that large territory. Today there still are some structures scattered over that area, but we cannot rebuild or revitalize anything the way this can be done in Westerplatte, where there are many structures in one place. Anyway, because we cannot do this, the Museum of the Slavic National Uprising was built and there is an exhibition, but we came up against the problem of how to commemorate the historical events and bring them to the people as truthfully as possible. Of course, a permanent exhibition is not so emotional as historical reconstructions or historic buildings. Our solution was not just to try to attract people to our exhibition but also to bring our exhibitions out to the people: we devised a mobile exhibition. We revitalized an armoured train which fought during the uprising, restoring several train cars as they were in their historical period. On that train, we travelled to tens of cities in Slovakia and in the Czech Republic in order to bring part of our exhibition to the people from other parts of the country who would not normally visit Banská Bystrica.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think you tell a better story of what really happened on that day or on other days if you have historically accurate artefacts, buildings, and areas. I think it helps tell the story. When you don’t have them, I think you are at a disadvantage, and I think that makes a difference. It is not that you can’t tell the story without these objects; I just think it is much more difficult to do so. It is harder to get people to understand what truly happened when they have to imagine it a lot. If we all, sitting here, were challenged to imagine one item, such as a ball, each one of us would imagine a different ball, but when you have something that is tangible in front of you when telling a story, they can attach themselves to what they see. And I think that helps people understand. I think it helps the story and the way the story is processed and told. I think it is beneficial.

Aleksander Masłowski: This leaves us with the conclusion that we do reconstruction work for someone. We do it for the visitors. My next question will be a little provocative: why do people come to battlefields? Mr Koperkiewicz, what draws people’s attention to places like battlefields? There are many other sites, many interesting objects and monuments. Why do people come to see battlefields?

Adam Koperkiewicz: In my opinion, they do it because they have heard dramatic stories about the struggles. People like to delve into something important, great, or dramatic and look for some emotion there. But people would also like to know something. They would like to gain much more knowledge than they could gain from books or from the family, and in every Polish family you could hear something about Westerplatte. Battlefields attract visitors because they offer an opportunity to develop your own interest in war, in conflicts, and in weapons especially. Many people collect weapons. Maybe this is the reason why people come to see battlefields.

Aileen Utterdyke: In the Slovak National Uprising Museum, do you research the reasons why people visit your museum and the battlefields you take care of?

Maerz Syryn: This is a difficult question. I’m not sure if there have been any plans to do this kind of research, but I think that visiting museums and memorial sites is an important for individuals as it is for the nation. Individuals know that there have been
important events and turning points in their lives. So, if they are taught national history at school, they realize that historical events are important both for national history and for their ancestors, for their grandparents, great-grandparents, and the rest of their families who lived at that time – and so I think they realize that these historical events are important for them too, and that, in some way, history has affected or influenced their present lives.

Aleksander Masłowski: What draws visitors’ attention at Gallipoli?

Uğur Cenk Deniz İmamoğlu: For Turkish citizens, Gallipoli may mean the awakening of the national sense of identity and the beginning of the nation-building process. In the early 20th century Turkish nationalism started to grow, and Gallipoli can be considered the starting point of the nation-building process, because the Turks had been defeated several times in past centuries until Gallipoli. The period after Gallipoli was a remarkable time in Turkish history; it was then that we started resistance and started our national struggles that continued into the 1920s. This makes Gallipoli crucial for the making of our nation and for our national sense of identity, but also citizens of other states involved in the war – British, Australian, or French citizens, for instance – can visit Gallipoli today to experience a sense of belonging and to find national heroes in their histories. This is not necessarily the case when it comes to visiting a different battlefield. For example, when I visited Westerplatte yesterday, as a Turk I feel no relationship between that place and Turkish history. In such cases, we cannot speak about nation building, national sense of identity, national belonging, and so on: the visit is just cultural and intellectual activity. Anyone visiting places of this kind for intellectual reasons would like to be informed about what the event was, what kind of place it is, and what happened there.

Aleksander Masłowski: So, there are intellectual reasons, family reasons, and patriotic reasons. And have you ever witnessed so-called dark tourism? Dark tourism means travelling to places because they are associated with tragedy, blood, and death. Have you ever met anyone with this kind of motivation, Ms Utterdyke?

Aileen Utterdyke: No I don’t think I have. This is not to say that people haven’t come with that motivation in mind. I think we prefer to look at the brighter side; we prefer to see people coming with respect, for remembrance and valour, not necessarily for darker motivations. But it is possible.

Aleksander Masłowski: Gentlemen, have you ever met anyone who travelled to places associated with blood and death – so-called dark tourists, or grim tourists? Never? It is nice to hear that, because as far as I know it is a growing area of tourist business, and the motivation for visiting places marked by tragedy is something I find hard to understand. But I can imagine that there are people who look for places like that, and I think to some extent battlefields would be a natural target for this kind of tourism. This leads us to another question. Battlefields are not only places where battles took place. Usually, especially in the case of relatively modern battlefields such as Pearl Harbor, they are also cemeteries. In your opinion, should the tourist business be allowed into such battlefields or should it remain on its outskirts?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think there is a place for it. When you apply the business aspects of tourism to a battlefield, one of the advantages that this brings to the table is that it opens the door to anyone who would visit your park; you may not have the opportunity of being able to share your message with a number of people without the mechanism of tourism. So I think tourism can be used in a positive way. I do also believe, however, that – if not checked properly – it can be used in a negative way. So it’s a matter of balance to me, a matter of being able to utilize tourism to further the mission of the park and the battlefield, I think there is a place for it.

Alekander Masłowski: Professor Syrny, how do you feel about letting tourists into the battlefield?

Marek Syrny: I think we need to find a middle way. We want people to visit these places, but we also want to preserve these historic sites for the future. So, for example, we have a big problem with the outdoor exhibition in our museum. There are some vehicles, tanks, and cannons; we cannot stop people from approaching and touching them, but on the other hand our custodians and conservators said it was not good to allow people to get on top of these structures. Anyway, so far we have not found a solution that would allow people to come near those objects and at the same time prevent these exhibitions from being damaged. I’m not sure if it is a good solution to have exhibitions such as cannons placed as if in a showcase, away from people, so that visitors cannot approach them. We temporarily allow people to go inside the armoured train that we have revitalized: it is not open to visitors all year round, but when there is an anniversary of the Slovak National Uprising, plus maybe two or three times a year, we do allow people to go inside. Of course, the train is very old; we have to take care of it, we are afraid that people may damage something, but I think it is good to give people an opportunity to feel this piece of history by coming in close contact with it.

Aleksander Masłowski: Mr Koperkiewicz, what is your opinion? Should tourist infrastructure be built at the battlefield or should it remain on its outskirts?

Adam Koperkiewicz: It depends on the tour guide – an excellent leader who provides tourists with the right sort of information along the way. In my opinion, it’s absolutely essential to interact the group of tourists before they go near a monument. It is absolutely essential for tourists to have at least a little knowledge. Of course, more knowledge is much better than just a little, but the point is that if you visit the battlefield without any knowledge, then your relationship with this place will be limited to a brief contact only. In my opinion, it is necessary to instruct visitors, and this is the battlefield administrator’s responsibility: if the administrator treats the matter seriously, then the programme for visitors to a monument or a battlefield is well prepared, but if a battlefield is understood as business run for profit only, without a moment of reverie, then I think it is better to give up visiting the battlefield altogether. In Poland, we are currently between two kinds of tourism business: one is of the right kind, consistent with our wishes, but the other is purely commercial, and I am against it.

Aleksander Masłowski: This brings us to another question – should we, as institutions responsible for battlefields, run the tourist business ourselves, or should we leave it to the free market? Mr İmamoğlu, what is your opinion?

Uğur Cenk Deniz İmamoğlu: If possible, I would like to give brief information about the previous question. When we talk about Gallipoli, we need to say that, apart from tourists, there are local inhabitants living at the historical site: almost 10,000 people live within its borders, because the war took place in a populated area, not far away from it. Actually, there should be life in the historic site; both inhabitants and tourists, because to show the past as it was would be impossible without letting them inside. On the other hand, protection rules, other established rules, and the maintenance of the site under control should be treated seriously, of course. As far as the other question is concerned, think museums should run the tourist business themselves: an external company might succeed in attracting visitors, but if the museum does it, the cultural aims will prevail.

Aleksander Masłowski: So, what kind of tourist attractions would you accept or allow at the battlefield? Tourists need more than seeing or touching; sometimes they need to experience more, to
So, once again, we come to the conclusion that we, as the people responsible for battlefields, should supervise the tourist business, too. Mr Kasperkiewicz, you know you have a strict opinion about the way souvenirs and other things should be accessible at Westerplatte, we talked about it some time ago. Would you share it with us?

Aleksander Masłowski: So, on the one hand, we have the re-enactment group in Gdańsk presenting the attack on General Kutschera as an event that took place in Warsaw. The re-enactors actually travelled around the country and staged the attack on Kutschera in other Polish towns, which was a little odd. Of course, if re-enactments provide knowledge about history, about soldiers’ equipment and uniforms, they are good for the education of young people: the Second World War was a long time ago, and knowledge about uniforms and soldiers is less and less common, so maybe this is an interesting way of doing something to promote it.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think we have a responsibility to teach the history. I think that’s given for all of us. That, at a minimum, needs to happen. Is it so we should take another step and perhaps teach leadership, provide the opportunity to see how people make decisions and whether children or adults would make the same decisions? I think there is an opportunity there. You have to, at least in my opinion, be a little cautious that you are not pushing opinions on others or encouraging a message that is not potentially being derived. I think there is a fine line there. But I believe there is an opportunity, if done correctly.

Aleksander Masłowski: Mr Kasperkiewicz, what is your opinion? Should we try to convey a message or just teach historical facts at the battlefield?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think the story that you can tell should be remembered, and it should be accessible at Westerplatte; we talked about it some time ago. We cannot stop people from visiting them, but there are very few ways to get them there. There are Kisskis, markets, and things like that; when there is some historical re-enactment going on, it is the only temporary, which means it is all removed after the event is over – this is not a problem. During the celebration of the Slovak National Uprising in Banská Bystrica, which is held on 29 August every year, there are about 10,000 visitors in the museum. This, of course, means that a lot of people want to buy various things, so we have to regulate the number of free market entities. Anyway, as I have said before, there are only temporary stalls and activities. After two or three days the whole place is empty and ready until next time. Sometimes there is a problem when we need to find alternative ways to get funds, because there is not enough money from the state. In such cases we rent out our premises for business activities which are thematically distant from ours and unrelated to the Uprising. But again, these are temporary entertainment activities, such as the Day of the City. This is not a big problem for us, because all of these free trade activities only last a few days.

Aleksander Masłowski: Ms Utterdyke, unlike the Museum of the Slovak National Uprising, your Pacific Historic Parks are permanent in nature. How do you solve the issue of supervising commercial activities, for example? How do you select the tourist attractions in your area, bearing in mind that the Pearl Harbor battlefield is still also a large burial place of the sailors who died there?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think our focus is on making sure that anything that we sell in our museum store is as historically accurate as possible. It has to have interpretive value to the park itself. We don’t really focus on anything outside of that, so we would not allow other types of merchandise to be sold in our store, as we work with the National Park Service, who runs the parks. I think there is a level of respect that we need to show each other; we need to show that we respect the property, the grounds, and the fact that it is a memorial. So, when you walk that line you have to ensure that in all aspects of your business you continue to provide that respect. Applying that to what merchandise we would sell is a very serious, about a year process of selecting literature, magnets and anything else to be sold. To us, there is value in those types of merchandise if a visitor could purchase it, take it home, and be able to continue the process of interpreting, understanding, and remembering what they saw at the park and what they learned. So there is value to that. But it is a fine line and you have to very diligently walk it; you have to always keep your mind on “is this the right project, is it sending the right message, does it convey what we are trying to convey at the park?” It is a process that you go through, at least for us, every time we look at any merchandise.

Aleksander Masłowski: So, once again, we come to the conclusion that we, as the people responsible for battlefields, should supervise the tourist business, too. Mr Kasperkiewicz, you know you have a strict opinion about the way souvenirs and other things should be accessible at Westerplatte, we talked about it some time ago. Would you share it with us?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think we have a responsibility to teach the history. I think that’s given for all of us. That, at a minimum, needs to happen. Is it so we should take another step and perhaps teach leadership, provide the opportunity to see how people make decisions and whether children or adults would make the same decisions? I think there is an opportunity there. You have to, at least in my opinion, be a little cautious that you are not pushing opinions on others or encouraging a message that is not potentially being derived. I think there is a fine line there. But I believe there is an opportunity, if done correctly.

Aleksander Masłowski: Ms Utterdyke, what is your opinion? Should we try to convey a message or just teach historical facts at the battlefield?

Aileen Utterdyke: I think the story that you can tell should be remembered, and it should be accessible at Westerplatte; we talked about it some time ago. We cannot stop people from visiting them, but there are very few ways to get funds, because there is not enough money from the state. In such cases we rent out our premises for business activities which are thematically distant from ours and unrelated to the Uprising. But again, these are temporary entertainment activities, such as the Day of the City. This is not a big problem for us, because all of these free trade activities only last a few days.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think our focus is on making sure that anything that we sell in our museum store is as historically accurate as possible. It has to have interpretive value to the park itself. We don’t really focus on anything outside of that, so we would not allow other types of merchandise to be sold in our store, as we work with the National Park Service, who runs the parks. I think there is a level of respect that we need to show each other; we need to show that we respect the property, the grounds, and the fact that it is a memorial. So, when you walk that line you have to ensure that in all aspects of your business you continue to provide that respect. Applying that to what merchandise we would sell is a very serious, about a year process of selecting literature, magnets and anything else to be sold. To us, there is value in those types of merchandise if a visitor could purchase it, take it home, and be able to continue the process of interpreting, understanding, and remembering what they saw at the park and what they learned. So there is value to that. But it is a fine line and you have to very diligently walk it; you have to always keep your mind on “is this the right project, is it sending the right message, does it convey what we are trying to convey at the park?” It is a process that you go through, at least for us, every time we look at any merchandise.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think our focus is on making sure that anything that we sell in our museum store is as historically accurate as possible. It has to have interpretive value to the park itself. We don’t really focus on anything outside of that, so we would not allow other types of merchandise to be sold in our store, as we work with the National Park Service, who runs the parks. I think there is a level of respect that we need to show each other; we need to show that we respect the property, the grounds, and the fact that it is a memorial. So, when you walk that line you have to ensure that in all aspects of your business you continue to provide that respect. Applying that to what merchandise we would sell is a very serious, about a year process of selecting literature, magnets and anything else to be sold. To us, there is value in those types of merchandise if a visitor could purchase it, take it home, and be able to continue the process of interpreting, understanding, and remembering what they saw at the park and what they learned. So there is value to that. But it is a fine line and you have to very diligently walk it; you have to always keep your mind on “is this the right project, is it sending the right message, does it convey what we are trying to convey at the park?” It is a process that you go through, at least for us, every time we look at any merchandise.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think our focus is on making sure that anything that we sell in our museum store is as historically accurate as possible. It has to have interpretive value to the park itself. We don’t really focus on anything outside of that, so we would not allow other types of merchandise to be sold in our store, as we work with the National Park Service, who runs the parks. I think there is a level of respect that we need to show each other; we need to show that we respect the property, the grounds, and the fact that it is a memorial. So, when you walk that line you have to ensure that in all aspects of your business you continue to provide that respect. Applying that to what merchandise we would sell is a very serious, about a year process of selecting literature, magnets and anything else to be sold. To us, there is value in those types of merchandise if a visitor could purchase it, take it home, and be able to continue the process of interpreting, understanding, and remembering what they saw at the park and what they learned. So there is value to that. But it is a fine line and you have to very diligently walk it; you have to always keep your mind on “is this the right project, is it sending the right message, does it convey what we are trying to convey at the park?” It is a process that you go through, at least for us, every time we look at any merchandise.

Aileen Utterdyke: I think our focus is on making sure that anything that we sell in our museum store is as historically accurate as possible. It has to have interpretive value to the park itself. We don’t really focus on anything outside of that, so we would not allow other types of merchandise to be sold in our store, as we work with the National Park Service, who runs the parks. I think there is a level of respect that we need to show each other; we need to show that we respect the property, the grounds, and the fact that it is a memorial. So, when you walk that line you have to ensure that in all aspects of your business you continue to provide that respect. Applying that to what merchandise we would sell is a very serious, about a year process of selecting literature, magnets and anything else to be sold. To us, there is value in those types of merchandise if a visitor could purchase it, take it home, and be able to continue the process of interpreting, understanding, and remembering what they saw at the park and what they learned. So there is value to that. But it is a fine line and you have to very diligently walk it; you have to always keep your mind on “is this the right project, is it sending the right message, does it convey what we are trying to convey at the park?” It is a process that you go through, at least for us, every time we look at any merchandise.
is it that you really want to accomplish as you go down this path. And I would look forward to seeing the outcome.

Aleksander Masłowski: Hopefully, soon, Professor, what is your advice for us after visiting Westerplatte?

Marek Syroj: I cannot give you a ready solution because, fortunately, we are not facing the problems you are facing, and I know that there will be a difficult struggle over which vision is better, or whether to preserve the historic site or to enlarge the port which is important for the city. Anyway, I think it is possible to find some way that will be good for society or for the nation, for the nation’s historical memory and for the world’s memory, of course – at the same time an acceptable solution for the industrial development of the city. It is hard to say it, but I need to say it: if you cannot reclaim all of the area, it would be good to reclaim as much of it as you can. If you need to empty some part of Westerplatte for the port, it would be good if it were the sections of the park that are of lesser importance to national historical memory.

Uğur Cenk Deniz İnamoğlu: The advice I would like to give you will be practical rather than theoretical. As far as I understand from my visit yesterday, people could enter and leave the area at any part of the battlefield. I think there should be compulsory routes; each person should enter at the same place, they should pass the compulsory points, and they should leave at the same place. There should also be more points and plaques along the routes with information provided in writing.

Aleksander Masłowski: Thank you very much. Now it is time to hear questions from the audience.

Piotr Semska: When the wtc was attacked in 2001, the situation seemed similar to what had happened in Pearl Harbor in 1941. Did your memorial take up any activities aimed at uniting the American society because of that similarity?

Aileen Utterdyke: Yes, it happened, I think we honoured it. We did not have any activities that were specifically in memory of it. However, on that day, with the situation in the United States different than in former communist countries, where private capital and private resources are very limited. As far as I know, the tax system in the United States helps to support institutions of culture. To what extent you are able to raise money to run your institutions? Is it an issue in Turkey, for example, which was part of the normal capitalist world during our communist period?

Uğur Cenk Deniz İnamoğlu: As was shown in my presentation, donations are part of the budget of the Gallipoli Historic Site, but it is realized because the Gallipoli Historic Site is directly a branch of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism and gets its share from the national budget, so it does not need so much from donations. However, the issue you mentioned is linked with outsourcing the national parks; this is not the case at Gallipoli, but there are some other historic sites where trading companies erected buildings or monuments, thus helping the state. This is normal in Turkey.

Aileen Utterdyke: As for us, Pacific Historic Parks and cooperating associations in the United States, we have, basically, three methods of funding our activities. First of all, we do it from retail or tourism related with some merchandise, we promote tours, we do VR and audio tours, we don’t charge admission because we are a memorial. Secondly, we have the ability to write grants, which, basically, is a form of requesting funds for a specific project, and we write grants to foundations and other entities who are willing to fund that. Thirdly, we do have the ability to fundraise from a donation perspective. From my experience, that is an important aspect of financing an organization; it makes the difference. To me, fundraising is necessary because it does more than just bring money to the table in order to run your park. It brings the opportunity for us to talk donors and promote our park – to promote the history of what we are trying to perpetuate, and that opportunity is just as important as bringing in the money. So, I see fundraising and requesting or asking for donations as twofold, so to speak; it gives two kinds of opportunities, and they are both very important.

Grzegorz Berendt: I would like Adam Koperkiewicz to share with us his knowledge and experience gathered during his stay in American museums on the East Coast. You told me about your experience from previous decades and about the way people in some American museums do research to find out who can support or donate money to the museums. Could you share this information with us?

Adam Koperkiewicz: You are referring to the “banking” activity of museums. Yes, some of the big museums in the United States use money from people who deposit money in a museum rather than in a bank; the museum does banking operations, gathers interest, and later on returns the capital to the people. The point is why many Americans prefer to use museums rather than banks for that purpose. This is because they believe a bank could collapse, whereas a national museum in the United States could never go bankrupt.

Aleksander Masłowski: Ladies and Gentlemen, are there any more questions?

Questions from the Audience: It seems that the amount of money the government spends on a particular museum reflects the position of that institution in the collective memory or cultural system of a given country. So, could you say how much money, approximately, your institution obtains from the state? What proportion of your annual budget comes from government and what proportion comes from private sources? The United States is a powerful country, so it is very interesting how much money is spent there on institutions such as yours. You don’t need to quote the exact numbers, we are just interested in a rough estimate of the funding you receive.

Aileen Utterdyke: The National Park Service is funded by the US government; they are a government entity, and so they do have a budget and they are allotted a particular amount in dollars for each of their parks. I do not know their exact procedure of determining how much money particular parks get, but I do know that Valour in the Pacific gets over 3 million dollars. Is that enough money to run the parks? No. As the number of visitors increases, the wear and tear on the park increases, there are other fundraising requirements that need to be fulfilled with respect to programmes and mission-based activities, and so it is very difficult to fund all of that. I think this is where we, as a cooperating association, come to the table. How much we spend depends on the year, on the activity, and on the needs of the park. In some years we spend a million dollars and in others we spend up to 3-6 million dollars. It just depends on what are the activities of the park for that year, what we would like to accomplish, and how long it takes us to fundraise to achieve that goal – and so it just differs.

Aleksander Masłowski: Thank you very much.
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ARCHAEOLOGY OF THE BATTLE OF BERESTECHKO BATTLEFIELD

MARIANNA YUKHYMCHUK

NATIONAL HISTORICAL MONUMENT-RESERVE „THE BERESTECHKO BATTLEFIELD“
The review of the historical architecture starts with a visit to the St. Michael Orthodox Church, representing Ukrainian wooden architecture of the 17th century. It was built in the village of Ostriv in 1651. Legends have it that Bohdan Khmelnytsky and his Cossacks prayed there before the battle. In 1941, the orthodox church, a silent witness of these historic events, was moved to the Zzhuřička Island. It currently stores early-18th century iconostasis.

There's an underground passage between the St. Michael Orthodox Church and a tomb where the remains of the heroes – Cossacks killed during the Battle of Berestechko – are buried. There is also another underground passage which, according to plans, was supposed to connect the tomb with a bell-tower. However, the latter had never been erected due to the outbreak of the First World War.

St. George Orthodox Church from early 20th century is another attention-drawing historic building. It was designed by Vladimir Malisimos, a student of the Imperial Academy of Arts in Saint Petersburg, and built in the Ukrainian Baroque style. The construction of the temple was supervised by an architect of the Volhynia diocese, Vladimir Leontievich. Its interior is decorated with paintings by a famous Ukrainian painter Ivan Yushakveych as well as wall paintings by Alexander Korecki and Philip Pilipchuk. The uniqueness of the orthodox church stems from the fact that it has three levels, each being, so to say, a separate temple. The first level contains St. Paraskeva of the Balkans Orthodox Church, the second – St. George the Victorious Orthodox Church, and the third one – Boris and Gleb priests and martyrs Orthodox Church.

The Museum established in June 1967 is a great pride and achievement of the reserve, with numerous original, unique relics more than 500 years old. Some of them are one-of-a-kind and will not be found in any other museums either in Ukraine or any other country around the world. In total, the collection counts 4,000 relics, including artifacts from archaeological, numismatic and ethnographic collections. The main display is held in seven halls of the museum and is devoted entirely to the 1651 battle. All elements of the exhibition have been found during archaeological works on the battlefield. Moreover, the venue contains an exhibition devoted to the history of the Ukrainian land, starting with Kievan Rus’ up to the 1648–1657 Khmelnytsky Uprising.

Appreciating the historical, scientific and cultural quality of the Berestechko battlefield, the Cossack Graves were announced the National Historical Monument—Reserve “The Berestechko Battlefield” with a decree No. 154 of 29 July 1991 of the Ukrainian Minister of Culture. In 2002, St. George monastery located within the reserve was renewed. Meanwhile, on 10 September 2008, Viktor Yushchenko, the President of Ukraine, signed an ordinance granting the area the title of the National Berestechko Battlefield.
weaponry, uniforms as well as lifestyle of Ukrainian Cossacks and peasants who were killed on 10 July 1651.

Based on the research we can conclude that in mid-17th century all Cossacks were armed with Polish-Hungarian and Polish Hussars sabres, which were popular in Europe at that time. Cossacks weaponry included also small axes, horseman’s picks, battle hatchets, bows with arrows, and pikes. Firearm was also in use, including: muskets, arquebuses, rifles and bandoliers produced in Poland, the Netherlands, France and Russia.

Majority of the items found near the Cossack crossing were made of leather and wood: boots, belts, bags, shuraks for sabres and knives, tobacco bags, saddles, bridles, ladies, weaponry with wooden elements.

In the plethora of artifacts discovered, Sveshnikov distinguished several items belonging to the Polish gentry. They were found near the Cossack crossing so they constituted Cossacks’ spoils. Amongst the artifacts, the following should be listed: part of a sword, Catholic crosses, royal cavalry officer’s battle hatchet, Polish handshakes, can nonballs, horseman’s pick, Hussars’ sabre, Hussars’ leather boots, leather gun case, or parts of metal garments of Polish Hussars.

Igor Sveshnikov developed his own original method of restoration and preservation of leather and wooden products. Thanks to its simplicity and accessibility, it enabled him to efficiently and professionally preserve the artifacts after the research had been finished at the battlefield. Artifacts preserved by Sveshnikov still look authentic.

Anthropological material discovered during the excavation works provided foundations enabling the reconstruction of portraits of various participants of the battle. It was also possible to establish the directions in which the Cossack armies moved, which contributed to correcting the statements of Polish historians with regard to huge losses and defeat suffered by Cossacks.

In the wake of the historical and archaeological researches, Sveshnikov published numerous papers, delivered many lectures during scientific conferences, a published photo-guide entitled Museum – Reserve “The Berestechko Battlefield” (1990) and a comprehensive monograph The Battle of Berestechko (1990) which had taken him 10 years to prepare.

Thanks to his fluency in Polish, Igor Sveshnikov successfully co-operated with Polish scientists, and carried out researches in Polish archives. He participated in the 1st and 4th International Congress of Slavic Archaeology in Warsaw (1965) and Kiev (1965), International Congress of Frank Archaeology in Sofia (1972) and many more archaeological conferences in, inter alia: Levis, Kiev, Moscow, Piskov, Krakow, Torun. He also participated in scientific and theoretical conferences such as “The Battle of Berestechko in the History of Ukraine”.

An exhibition of artifacts from the Cossack collection was held in numerous cities, such as Radom (1991), Vancouver in Canada (1992) and Krakow (1993). The exhibition was based on the Polish-Ukrainian collaboration according to a programme adopted, which envisaged an exchange of delegations and exhibitions (including unique artifacts from Cossack times).

In the summer of 1995, professor Igor Sveshnikov was elected a foreign member of the VII Department of the Polish Academy of Learning in Krakow.

After years of archaeological research supervised by Sveshnikov between 1979 and 1991, research on the Berestechko battlefield was carried out successively by: Tatiana Biitkowska – emergency research and field prospection between 1992 and 1993 in the areas of inundation and floodplains of the Plashevka River (right tributary of the Styr River) between Ostriv and the mouth of the river; Sergey Bewsuci – archaeological works in 1996 in the sacred sites behind the Moat (Ostriv), Zarika and Makitra (Ostriv).

Moreover, S. Bewsuci carried out research in 1998 in the sacred sites of Monastirshchina, Behind the Moat and Banivshchina (Ostriv).

The above mentioned archaeological researches invariably aimed at searching for the second Cossack crossing as well as obtaining further valuable pieces of information and artifacts for the museum. Sadly, the second crossing was not found in the end and the number of artifacts was small. Additionally, they turned out to be less unique than the finds from earlier digs.

In the following years, archaeological works were carried out by: Bogdan Pryzyszek – in 2003 inundation areas and banks of the Plashevka River were examined between Ostriv and Plasha.va. Amongst artifacts discovered, the following must be named: working tools, items of everyday and personal use, weaponry and horse harnesses. The total of 15 artifacts were discovered. They were eventually included in the museum’s collection. Panagia – a travel icon constituting a small representation of Mary, the mother of Jesus, is one of the most interesting finds.

In 2013, Alexey Woytiuk, in cooperation with the employees of the National Reserve “The Berestechko Battlefield”, examined the sacred sites of Monastirshchina and Behind the Moat in Ostriv and the inundation area of the Plashevka River between Ostriv and Plasha. The artifacts found have an extensive chronology, spanning from the Chalcolithic (500 bc) to the First World War (1914-1918). Artifacts from the Chalcolithic included: household pottery and flint tools (including a well-preserved pike point). Moreover, pottery from early Iron Age (1st century bc), early Slavic pottery and pottery from Rievian Rue (1st century AD) were also recognised. Modern finds, identified with Cossack communities of the 16th-18th century included: silver buttons, musket bullets, stocks for musket lead bullets, Polish-Lithuanian coins (silver and copper), fragments of an axe, iron carpenters’ tools and other metal items requiring detailed analysis. Moreover, human bones and a few animal bones (probably belonging to a horse) were encountered. Most of the artifacts were well-preserved. Sharpetel, fragments of missiles and firearms bullets of Russian and Austrian armies constituted majority of the finds dating back to the WWII.
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NATIONAL MUSEUM OF MILITARY HISTORY IN SOFIA
BATTLEFIELDS AS PILLARS OF THE BULGARIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

Being the national military museum of Bulgaria, the institution is obliged to preserve the memory of all conflicts, battles and fights that happened in the past. And through the ages Bulgaria has witnessed lots of them. Since the very establishment of the Bulgarian state in 681, the country was forced to defend its territory and newborn identity in regular battles.

The entire medieval history of the Bulgarian state was dominated by its conflicts with Byzantium, the crusaders and the invaders from the North. Yet another invader – the Ottomans – led to a period of nearly five centuries during which the Bulgarian state and its armed forces ceased to exist. The Bulgarian identity, however, was not erased. The medieval battles were replaced with different forms of resistance of the Bulgarian population against the Ottoman authorities – riots, plots, rebellions and uprisings which unfortunately were unsuccessful.

It was the 12ᵗʰ consecutive Russo-Turkish War waged in the period 1877–1878 that resulted in the liberation of the Bulgarians and the restoration of the Bulgarian National State. This happened after a series of fierce battles between the Russians, the numerous Bulgarian volunteers and the Ottoman army. After the war, however, Bulgaria was only partially liberated. Large territories populated by Bulgarians were left under different forms of foreign government. Constantly driven by the impulse to unite all the people of Bulgarian identity, Bulgaria found itself caught in 5 consecutive wars in the 1885–1914 period: Serbo-Bulgarian War, First Balkan War, Second Balkan War, World War I and World War II.

Through centuries hundreds of thousands of Bulgarians lost their lives on battlefields fighting for the dream of free, independent and unified Bulgaria. Today while we read about past events on the pages of school books, the battlefields that remain tell the story of these turbulent pages of Bulgarian history.

This text focuses on three of these battlefields that span almost five centuries and are symbolical of the three stages in Bulgarian history – the period of the Ottoman conquest of the Balkan peninsula; the time of the Russo-Turkish War that resulted in the liberation of the Bulgarian state, and the Great War as it was waged by Bulgaria with a strive for national unification.

THE BATTLE OF VARNA AND PARK – MUSEUM OF MILITARY FRIENDSHIP 1444 VLADISLAV VARNENCHIK

In 1396, soon after the fall of Bulgaria under the Ottoman domination, the Turks headed to Hungary which was forced to find a way of defending itself. Understanding the fact that it was impossible to withstand the Ottoman pressure on its own, Hungary assembled a coalition with the idea not only to stop but to push back the conquers from the Balkans.

Headed by the Polish-Hungarian king Vladislav II Yagello, this mixed army consisting of Hungarian-Transylvanian regiments, led by the commander-in-chief – the Transylvanian ruler Yanosh Hunyadi, about 300 Polish volunteers, 400 Czech Hussites, 4,000 Wallachians, Ruthanians, (Old-Russians), a detachment of Croatians, Saxons, Lithuanians, German settlers from Transylvania as well as Slovaks, a detachment of the Roman Pope Eugene IV’s knights-crusaders and Bulgarian volunteers from the Sub-Danube region took part in this battle that remained in history as the Battle of Nations due to the numerous nationalities involved in it.

On 10 November 1444, near the city of Varna, the 55,000–60,000 people strong Ottoman army led by Sultan Murad II approached the European Christian coalition forces that numbered approximately 20,000 men. The two armies faced one another along a front spanning 3.5 km.

King Vladislav perished in the midst of the battle when he led his personal guard of 500 knights against the Janissaries of the Ottoman Sultan in an attempt to capture Murad II. While breaching the last lines of the Janissaries, the King was murdered and beheaded on the spot, and neither his head, nor his body could be saved during the remainder of the battle. The death of the king disorganized the Christian army and led to its retreat.

The battle of Varna was the last, the crucial one. Afterwards, the Balkans and South-Eastern Europe fell under the Ottoman domination for centuries. The defeat of the Christian coalition also marked the failure of the last essential opportunity for the Bulgarians to regain their freedom. However, the bravery, the sacrifice and the tragic end of this last Christian crusade and king Vladislav himself were not forgotten. Even during the period of the Ottoman domination the Bulgarians used to place wooden crosses in the center of the battlefield – the spot where the king had fallen.

It was several decades after the Liberation, however, in 1924, when the first modest monument with the inscription “Vladislav Varnenski. Vladislav Jagellonian, Polish and Hungarian king, was killed here on 10 XI 1444 together with the Christian knighthood, fighting for the faith and freedom of Bulgaria” was placed in order to mark and commemorate the battlefield.

11 years later, in 1935, a park was organized on an area of 30 acres of land stretching on the battlefield, and in one of the 20ᵗʰ century 97 Thracean mounds situated within the park boundaries a symbolic mausoleum of king Vladislav Varnenchik was built. A stone replica of the bronze original of the sarcophagus of king Vladislav from the Wawel Castle in Krakow was placed inside the building. The sarcophagus was empty since neither the head, nor the body of the king were retrieved after the battle.

The erection of the mausoleum was initiated by a public committee based on the idea “This mausoleum to be visited by Turks, Poles, Czechs, Bulgarians and Romanians”. Thus, “Former enemies on the battlefield will have the opportunity of extending a friendly hand to a peaceful future life”. The committee engaged a great number of foreign countries in the preparation of the mausoleum and its opening ceremony – predominantly Poland, of course, but also Hungary, The Vatican, Czech Republic, Turkey and Romania. We may say that this involvement of other countries is still unprecedented in the history of museums and memorials in Bulgaria.

After the implementation of the project the public committee was disbanded and the mausoleum was handed over to the Ministry of War.

Thirty years later, in 1964, in honour of the 520ᵗʰ anniversary of the battle of Varna, a monument of Yanosh Hunyadi – the commander-in-chief of king Vladislav’s army – and an entire memorial complex were inaugurated under the name Park-Museum of Military Friendship 1444 Vladislav Varnenchik. The museum exhibition was created on the basis of documentary materials about the battle of Varna and included weapons found on the battlefield and copies of objects donated by the military museums and some private donors from Warsaw, Budapest, Prague, Bucharest, Belgrade and Istanbul. Medieval coats of arms and flags, paintings and sculptures, knights’ armours and swords, chain-mails and maces, etc. depicted the dark and glorious epoch of the battle of Varna.

In 1968, with a decree of the Council of Ministers of National Republic of Bulgaria Park Museum Vladislav Varnenchik became a branch of the Military Museum which itself was given the status of a national institution. The complex is still part of the family of the National Museum of Military History and every year it is visited by tens of thousands of Bulgarians but also Poles, Czechs, Romanians, Hungarians, etc. as the major site of not only national but common European remembrance.

5 С. Пеникова, Войните във Варна на 10 ноември 1444 година, София 2001, p. 511.
6 Ibidem, p. 727.
7 Ibidem, p. 722.
When we speak of battlefields as places of national remembrance, however, the first association of each Bulgarian would probably be the Peak of Shipka (St. Nikola’s Peak). The defence of Shipka Pass was one of the most heroic and decisive battles during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878 and a place where the Bulgarians who volunteered to take part in the war managed to prove their strong identity and will for free Bulgarian national state. The fights that took place from 9th to 14th August 1877 between the defenders of the Pass and the Ottoman army remained in Bulgarian history as the Shipka Epopée.

The task of the small Russian-Bulgarian detachment under the command of gen. Stoltenov, about 7,500 people strong, was to prevent the army of Suleiman Pasha (approx. 27,000 people and a reserve of 10,000) from crossing the Balkan Mountains and joining forces with the Ottoman units in North-Eastern Bulgaria conducting a siege in Pleven. The Russian soldiers and the Bulgarian volunteers turned the pass into a fortified stronghold, and as General Radetzky said, with the sacrifice of many lives managed to close the door before the Ottoman advance towards Northern Bulgaria, and to open it for the victorious march of the Russian army to Tsarigrad (Istanbul).

Nowadays, the battlefield is a memorial complex – National Park-Museum Shipka. It includes 26 monuments, reconstructed batteries, trenches, marked positions, and common graves. The first monuments were erected immediately after the end of the war, and the rest during the following decades. But the most impressive of them all was the Monument of Liberty.

The most prominent Bulgarian author of Modern Bulgaria – Ivan Vazov immortalized the battle of Shipka in a poem from his cycle entitled Epopee of the Forgotten. Since the publication of the poem in 1883, the battle of Shipka became known as the Shipka Epopee.

As it has already been mentioned, the exploit of the Bulgarian volunteers and the Russian soldiers during the Russo-Turkish War lead only to partial liberation of Bulgaria. For decades to follow, the Bulgarian state searched for a means to unite all territories populated by Bulgarians as one domain. Those efforts were successful during the Unification of the Northern Principality of Bulgaria and the Southern province Eastern Rumelia in 1885, and quite unsuccessful during the First and the Second Balkan War when Bulgaria failed to adjoin the Macedonian lands populated by Bulgarians.

The idea to have such a monument placed on St. Nikola’s Peak and commemorating all the fallen for the freedom of Bulgaria dates back to 1879, shortly after the end of the war. A public committee was assembled under the name of “Committee for the erection of a monument for the revival and liberation of the Bulgarians”. On 26th August 1912, with a solemn ceremony, the Bulgarian Tsar Boris III placed the foundation stone of the monument. The same year the committee addressed the entire Bulgarian nation with a call for voluntary donations for the erection of the monument. It was more than ten years later, however, when on 26th August 1934 the monument was officially inaugurated with much greater festivity in the presence of the veterans – Bulgarian volunteers from the Russo-Turkish war, the Tsar, government ministers, army generals, foreign representatives, and about 100,000 citizens.

The Monument of Liberty was built with voluntary contributions of the entire nation and resembled a medieval Bulgarian fortress with 890 steps leading to it. A bronze lion, the symbol of the Bulgarian sovereignty, was placed above the central gate. The names of Shipka, Shoveno and Stara Zagora were inscribed on the other three sides of the monument – the 3 battlefields commemorating the feat of the Bulgarian volunteers. A marble sarcophagus housing some of the remains of the Russian and Bulgarian casualties was placed on the first floor and four other floors displayed paintings, weapons and other exhibits.

Nowadays, every year approximately 100,000 visitors enjoy the breathtaking view of the surrounding area, commemorating the feat and the self-sacrifice of the Shipka heroes.

After the Bulgarian defeat in the Second Balkan War in 1913 and the first national catastrophe that followed, the peace treaty of Bucharest decreed that the territory of South Dobrudja was to be given to the Romanian Kingdom. Romanian government invested allocated substantial funds for fortifying the new border and in the period between 1914–1916 transformed Tutrakan into one of the most...
powerful fortresses on the Danube, named by its contemporaries the Little or the Romanian Verdun.

Shortly after Romania entered the First World War on the side of the Entente, Bulgaria, being part of the Central Powers and driven by its desire to regain the territories populated by people with Bulgarian national identity, declared war on Romania on 15th September 1916. Part of the Third Bulgarian army under the general command of major general Daniele Kiselev stood against the mighty Romanian fighting forces and headed towards Tutrakan.

The attack began on the early morning of 5th September 1916. Despite the furious Romanian defence, the front line fell by the same night. On the following day the battle continued with the same impetus. At 4.30 p.m. the Romanian garrison surrendered. At 6 p.m. General Kiselev marched through liberated Tutrakan.

After the epic battle, the Bulgarian command decided to bury all the dead Bulgarian, Romanian, Turkish and German soldiers at fort of the Romanian fortification line of the fortresses, 8 km from the city of Tutrakan. These were 8,000 soldiers of which 1,764 Bulgarians that found peace in Tutrakan cemetery.

In 1917, the first national celebration of the Tutrakan epopee was organized. The newly established public committee named “6th September” in Tutrakan built an arch and a large stone cross of the Order of Bravery and welcomed General Kiselov, senior officers from the Chief Command, and representatives of the Command of the Allied forces to an official ceremony.

At the end of the First World War, however, South Dobrudja was once again given to Romania, alongside with Tutrakan and the military cemetery near it. Nevertheless, the Romanian society did not neglect the memorial and in 1921 the Romanian organization “Cult of the Heroes” erected a new monument with the inscription: “Honour and glory to those who knew how to die heroically for their homeland”, written in Bulgarian, German, Romanian and Turkish.

In 1940, according to the agreement of Craiova, Bulgaria peacefully got back the territory of South Dobrudja from Romania. Shortly after that the “6th September” committee was restored and started to raise funds for the expansion of the memorial complex in Tutrakan. On 6th September 1941, the mayor of Tutrakan and the Ministry of War organized the first national celebration of the Tutrakan Epopee in free Dobrudja. The impressive celebrations were attended by many surviving veterans of the battles. Since then, it was agreed that each year, on the first Sunday of September, the warriors would gather and pay tribute to the memory of the casualties of Tutrakan. This tradition continues today.

On the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Battle of Tutrakan, in 1996 the national state fund “13 Centuries of Bulgaria” conducted a major renovation of the memorial complex “Military Tomb 1916”. An Alley of Glory was built with the names of all the victims of the Tutrakan operation, gravestones were restored and the central entrance was redesigned. In 2001, a new spatial layout of the park area was approved with two 155mm Krupp cannons installed to be guardians at the entrance of the complex, and a new chapel “St. George the Victorious” was officially inaugurated in the spring of 2007. Nowadays, every day the memorial welcomes citizens and relatives of the departed who lay flower wreaths at the graves of the heroes of Tutrakan.

* * *

This short review of these three Bulgarian battlefields reveals the general mechanism by which battlefields are preserved and transformed into places of national remembrance in the form of various memorial complexes, monuments and museums. Usually, they are erected by the will of public committees on or near the places ultimately connected with the formation, development and most often with the defence of the national identity.

As the most complex and theory locations on the cultural-historical map, battlefields are quite often burdened with the confrontation between the concepts of the good, truly, and just Bulgarians and their vicious, flawed enemies. Even today, various political and civil associations exploit these constructs. Back in the past, however, our ancestors from the founding committees of these national memorials managed to rise above the inherent negativity of the battlefield and to establish institutions which serve not simply as pillars of national identity but also as a means of reconciliation.
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о A garrison of 39,000 people with 150 cannons and dozens of machine nests were placed inside the fort that was considered impregnable. It was the Romanian command General Mikhail Aslan who started to call it “My Little Verdun”.


SESSION 3 • BATTLEFIELDS AS PLACES OF NATIONAL REMEMBRANCE

SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING AND ITS MUSEUM AND PUBLIC PRESENTATION

MAREK SYRNÝ, MARIAN UHRIN
SLOVAK NATIONAL UPRISING MUSEUM IN BANSKÁ BYSTRICA
The Uprising in Slovakia broke out at the end of August 1944. Much like similar anti-Nazi operations in August 1944 (Romania, Paris, Warsaw), it had to manifest a completely different character of the country. Just as in the case of Romanian coup d'etat, its effort was to wash away the stigma of collaboration with Hitler, and like in the case of uprisings in Warsaw and Paris it was also a struggle for real national liberation from the influence of Berlin. In the Slovak case, things were even more complicated by the fact that it was also a struggle against the Ludak regime (the members of Hlinka's Slovak People's Party who ruled Slovakia from 1938 to 1945 were called Ludaks) and its Slovak state which became (similarly as in the case of Croatia) the product and the tool of German aggressive policy in that area.

The Slovak National Uprising took place partly as a consequence of the decision taken by Josef Tiso, President of the Slovak Republic, to concede to the German occupation of Slovakia on 28th August 1944 – the Uprising began the following day. It was also the result of long months of preparation and the political ambitions of the Czechoslovak government-in-exile in Great Britain, the Czechoslovak Communists in Moscow, sections of the Slovak army becoming an insurgent force, and the work of the pro-democracy and Communist resistance in the homeland.

Anti-Nazi uprising against Hitler's Germany and against home collaboration government in Bratislava was named the Slovak National Uprising several months after its outbreak. Mountainous central Slovakia with central Banski Bystrica became its centre. Part of anti-fascist oriented army, the partisans and civilian insurgent bodies fought there for two months against German units, which came to pacify Slovakia preventively not to repeat Romanian coup d'etat scenario. At first, insurgent armed forces had less valuable reserve units at their disposal. They remained in Slovakia outside the front service for the Germans. Only after two mobilisations did insurgent army reach the number of 60,000 soldiers, supported by 10,000 partisans, located within the insurgent territory. The insurgent army immediately became part of the Czechoslovak exile military forces and insurgent bodies declared incorporation of Slovakia into the democratic Czechoslovak Republic. Slovak National Council, which became the highest political body of the Uprising, partially consisted of representatives of the left wing (mainly the Communists) and civic-parties – democratic middle stream (later integrated into the Democratic Party). The Communists and the Democrats (mainly pre-war Agrarians) agreed that the political aim of the Uprising is not only the change of the side from pro-German to pro-Allied, but also the change of political regime of Hlinka's Slovak People's Party to a democratic system. They also enforced federalisation of Czechoslovakia with an equal position of the Slovaks with the Czechs.

The Germans gradually engaged 40,000 soldiers against Slovak National Uprising. Later, they managed to employ a significant amount of military technology and equipment to eliminate the insurgent army (with a few tanks, planes, or improvised armoured trains). American air help and mainly Soviet air and material help (or the transport of 2,000 members of the Czechoslovak Paratroopers Brigade from the Soviet Union) could not delay the military fall of the Uprising. After the unsuccessful coup d'etat and the complete occupation of Hungary by German soldiers, in the middle of October 1944 the general offensive of Wehrmacht followed and the surrounded insurgent units were forced to escape to the mountains. It happened a few weeks after the Red Army recaptured the first villages from the Germans in Eastern Slovakia, but the plans of the Soviets and the Nazis were in total contradiction. Also the to the insurgent territory was far from being fulfilled. After the fall of Banski Bystrica, thousands of former insurgent soldiers and the partisans fought in the mountains against the Germans and their allies for long months until the liberation in spring 1945.

Immediately after the liberation, the plans were born for a large scale commemoration of the resistance and the Uprising. Post-war Slovak national bodies used it also for political credit for the events of the Slovak National Uprising. Already several months after the war the first improvised and stable memorial of the Slovak National Uprising was established. Annual celebrations of the Uprising on 29th August were the most massive public-political action of its kind, during which the most important personalities of Slovak and Czech political life (the Democrats and the Communists) had their speeches. The celebration and commemoration of the Uprising became significantly different after full takeover of the power by the Communists after February 1948. At first, proscribed democratic politicians and resistance veterans disappeared from the tribunes, later, within the framework of inner party parleys, also leading insurgent Slovak Communists. Instead of particular personalities from the insurgent army or the Slovak National Council, who held merit for the entire operation, the celebration choirs were addressed to “working folk” which, under the leadership of the Communist Party, found its right place in the war alongside the proletarian leading Soviet Union. All this was retroactively changed in the sixties, when rehabilitated insurgent Communists like Gustav Husak gained political power again. He maintained and reinforced his power through practical support from Moscow also after the Soviet occupation of 1968. In the time of normalisation, Husak and his community restored the previous status of the Uprising, before the early post-Communist society became disaffected with it. The right of normalisation leadership of the Czechoslovak society by Husak was based on his position and activities in the Uprising, so the celebrations of the Slovak National Uprising became mass public-political campaigns, compared only to organized manifestations on 1st May – the International Workers’ Day.

In 1969, on the 25th Anniversary of the Slovak National Uprising, when Husak was nominally the strongest man of the Czechoslovak policy, the Memorial of the Slovak National Uprising in Banski Bystrica was ceremonially opened. Since then, tens of thousands of “workers”, pupils and students participated annually in the central national celebrations of the Uprising. In the atmosphere of organized mass activism it was not unusual when the Museum of the Slovak National Uprising (Memorial of the Slovak National Uprising) in Banski Bystrica (with tens of thousands of inhabitants) was visited every year by more than 300,000 visitors during the openings of new exhibitions (1974, 1984, ...). During this period, several local memoirals were built, in and outside central Slovakia, to commemorate and celebrate the resistance and the Uprising, partisan movement (introducted by the Communist propaganda as the compact supporter of the Soviet occupation) and the fight against fascism. Celebrations organised by the Party and the state, and forcing the only Communist interpretation of the resistance naturally considerably harmed the image of the Slovak National Uprising after the fall of the communist regime in 1989. The ruined image of the Uprising from the times of the Communist monopoly was gradually being refurbished but not without certain problems. The majority of the society changed its attitude towards the Slovak National Uprising to a positive one despite the fact that in the national circles it was often condemned as an attack against their own (Ludak) tradition and preference for the Czechoslovak one, or as an admission ticket of the Communists to the highest Slovak policy. In the times of integration of the Slovak Republic into the European structures the image of the Slovak National Uprising was often used to show the connection of modern Slovak antifascist policy to democratic traditions of the Western antifascist coalition, on which the development of the West has been based since 1945. The fact that the Slovak National Uprising (together with the renewal of democracy in 1989) is perceived by the public as the most positive event of the 20th century was influenced by several positive factors in the nineties and mainly after the year 2000. Governmental representation always officially recognised the Slovak National Uprising together with all political subjects except for extreme nationalisins. In parliament, 29th August (outbreak of the Slovak National Uprising) was adopted as a national holiday and is the most recognized national holiday from the political (participation of home and foreign representatives) and social point of view. Gradually, many military history clubs were created and similar volunteer societies which have been trying to attract (successfully) the interest of a considerable part of the Slovak society in this part of modern Slovak history during the celebrations of the Slovak National Uprising and during the events connected with World War II.

The Museum of the Slovak National Uprising, in cooperation with the partners and media, managed to turn the celebrations of the Slovak National Uprising at the end of August into socially fraught occasion. The reinforcement of marketing strategies, promotion of the Slovak National Uprising by more frequent publication of books, interviews, discussions, permanent and mobile exhibitions, films or recording of modern “insurgent” songs contributed to this*

The Slovak national uprising lasted for two months and during this period appeared lot of battles here. From many of them, we chose those, which were the most important or the most symbolic and nowadays we prepared some commemoration action there.

**Strečno**

The first insurgent fights started on 30th August and continued to 2nd September 1944 in the Strečno narrow passage where the insurgent units tried to stop the advance of German units from the Tatra Panzer Division. The fights were fought on 31st August 1944 directly under Strečno Castle, where the units of the Blažharti, Šepalský Battalion, French partisans and insurgent tankers stopped several attacks of German units.

There is a Memorial of French partisans in Strečno-Zvonica. In 2012 and 2013, re-enactments of the 1944 fights named Tisľovce (narrow passage 2012/2013) were organized between the villages of Strečno and Nezbudská Lúčka. Within the framework of these
actions, military history clubs presented to the visitors a re-enactment of the fights in the first days of the Uprising, when they warded off the first German attack and, consequently, under the pressure of the German armoured vehicles and air force, had to retreat deeper into the Strečno narrow passage. Approximately 3,000 to 4,000 spectators attended this event.

Stará Kremnická
At the beginning of October 1944, German units from 53-Kampfgruppe Schill infiltrated the insurgent defence in the direction from Staré Krížno towards the east. The situation was critical mainly in the defence sector near the village of Stará Kremnická. Tanks and, from 6th October 1944, also the Štefánik armoured train were used to support insurgent units. It was the first use of a train in the fights and the improvised armoured train provided of significant interference, as a result of which the German attack was stopped and defence was stabilized.

In 2009, to commemorate this event, the memorial tablet was installed in one of the tunnels in which the train was engaged.

Within the framework of the project entitled “We retrieved the Štefánik armoured train”, the Museum of the Slovak National Uprising organized a re-enactment of the 1944 fights in the authentic places at Pod Kečkoa. The military history clubs re-enacted the clash between the insurgent defence units and the attacking German units. An armoured train was moving in the same area between two tunnels as it had done in 1944. Due to the considerable interest, the event was repeated also in 2013 with more performers, technology, equipment and planes from the period before 5,000–7,000 spectators.

Dobrá Niva
At the end of October 1944, German units from the 53-Kampfgruppe Schill attacked from Banská Štiavnica towards Krupina and to the north to Zvolen. They threatened one of the centres of the Uprising and the Tri Duby airport. The command of the insurgent army used the units of the 3rd Czechoslovak Paratroopers Brigade, artillery and the Štefánik armoured train to defend the line near the village of Dobrá Niva on 21st-24th October 1944.

Within the framework of the project entitled “We retrieved the Štefánik armoured train”, in 2010 the Museum of the Slovak National Uprising organized a re-enactment of fights in the area of the Dobrá Niva railway station with the participation of military history clubs, technology, and equipment from the period, planes and the Štefánik armoured train. More than 10,000 spectators attended the event.

Banská Bystrica
The town of Banská Bystrica was the centre of the Slovak National Uprising, where the highest military and political institutions of the Uprising, economic and cultural centres were situated. Nationwide celebrations with the participation of the highest state representatives, foreign guests, World War II veterans and 5,000 to 10,000 visitors are organized every year in the area of the Memorial/Museum of the Slovak National Uprising. Many social and tourist events are organized during the celebrations. During the evening before the celebrations, a performance of the State Opera in the area near the Museum building is held.

The celebrations on 29th August start with a flyover of military fighters, laying of wreaths in front of the eternal fire in the area of the Museum, followed by speeches of statesmen. After this, the official programme of the celebrations starts with various local and foreign music bands, with different styles of music (folk, rock, pop, jazz). Sometimes a special program thematically linked to the Uprising is presented (for example modern musical interpretation of insurgent poets, etc.).

There is also a period military camp created by military history clubs (Germans, insurgents) situated in the vicinity of the Memorial. A field kitchen or historical vehicles are also displayed there. The contemporary Slovak army presents military technology and equipment, or training demonstrations. The armoured train is open to the public and the admission to museum exhibitions is free. There are also kiosks with refreshment, souvenirs, books about war, and attractions for children within the museum area.

Conclusion
In the Slovak Republic, 29th August is rightfully recognized as a public holiday. The significance of the Slovak National Uprising lies in the fact that the Slovak nation took up arms against the occupation of its own historical lands and succeeded despite the uncertainty of the outcome. The Uprising was spontaneous. It had not even been officially declared when the soldiers garrisoned in Zilina rebelled against the enemy. Following mobilization, recruits flocked to join the insurgent army. The army, the partisans and the civil administration were all helped by people living in the insurgent territory. Breaking the yoke of cooperation with Nazi Germany was an inevitable historical step for the Slovak nation.
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Hanna Mik: I would like to ask about the final part of your presentation. You said that “especially now that hard times have come for Ukraine, broadening knowledge about tradition and history as well as finding the roots is extremely important”. Could you elaborate on this idea?

Marianna Yukhymchuk: For us Ukrainians, hard times have come indeed. In the east of Ukraine, as we all know, there is war: we have been invaded by Russia. The site of the Battle of Brest recording is sacred for every Ukrainian. When people visit the museum, they can learn about their roots and about the heroism of the Cossacks, which gives them the strength to persevere in fighting and not to give in.

Hanna Mik: Has the number of visitors changed over the last four years?

Marianna Yukhymchuk: Of course it has. Previously, fewer people visited the museum, and those who did expected curiosities or something sensational. Now, children and young people come more often to learn about their roots and to hear about their history. They want to know more about Ukrainian history and about Ukraine’s struggle for freedom.

Hanna Mik: The last question I would like to ask you is connected with archaeology, because our museum has been doing archaeological research at Westerplatte. This is the first post-war research there on such a large scale. In your case, research has been done for a long time, but are you planning to continue with it? On whose initiative is the research conducted?

Marianna Yukhymchuk: Of course, we do want to continue research, because there are places where this can be done. We have a large battlefield, and so far only one of three Cossack water crossings has been found. There remain two other crossings to be located – the places where Cossack forces crossed the river and marched. We therefore intend to conduct new archaeological research towards the end of September; this will be a trial expedition, carried out together by the staff of the museum and archaeologists from Ryhove, including Alexey Voytik. Next year we plan to conduct even larger archaeological research, involving a larger group of archaeologists and covering a larger area.

Hanna Mik: About ten years ago, your museum hosted a huge conference about the similarities and differences between the Warsaw Uprising and the Slovak National Uprising. Could you comment on this, please?

Marek Sysyn: As you said, the discussion was about the parallels and differences between the two uprisings. Its conclusion was that there were more points of similarity than points of difference between the Warsaw Uprising and the Slovak Uprising. This is because the ultimate aim was liberation achieved on our own, with the nation’s own forces, without the influence of any superpowers – in this case, mainly the Soviet Union. In matters of political influence and political objectives there were certain differences, of course. To us, the Soviets were the only source of military support we could count on, and we had had no problems with the Soviets or the Russians in our history before. This made the situation different than in Poland, because you could not back the idea of Soviet support as directly and as radically as we could and did. The attitudes of the Soviets and Stalin’s attitudes to the two uprisings were different, but the insurgents’ motivation was the same or similar. They fought mostly for the same thing, though the outcomes of the two uprisings were pretty different. Although the Slovak National Uprising was a military defeat, the generation of politicians that took part in the uprising later played the leading role in Slovak politics after 1945. The Warsaw Uprising was badly defeated too, but after 1945 the insurgents or the leaders of the uprising were sentenced to death or ended up in Soviet camps. There were also differences regarding the situation after 1945.

Hanna Mik: In August 2018, our museum – the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk – out sourced a survey, in which the Westerplatte Peninsula was the most frequently mentioned place of special importance for the Polish memory associated with the Second World War (it was named as such by 27.5 percent of respondents). Is Banská Bystrica as important for the Slovaks today as Westerplatte is for the Poles?

Marek Sysyn: Banská Bystrica is important not as a battlefield but as the site of ceremonial commemorations linked with the national memory. It is not the original place where the insurgent army stopped the Germans or fought against them, but it is the site that was the centre of the uprising, and as I said in my presentation, for more than 30 years now there has been a main public holiday there, a ceremony that top state officials come to take part in: the prime minister, the speaker of the parliament, and many foreign representations. We have developed the image of Banská Bystrica and the ceremony commemorating the Slovak national uprising as the main historical event of the 20th century. Unfortunately, when I compare it with the commemoration of the Warsaw uprising, I must say there is too much politics there and too little about the insurance.

Hanna Mik: Thank you very much. My next question is to Ms. Deyana Kostova from the National Museum of Military History in Sofia. What was the role of the state in the creation, construction, and preservation of battlefield memorials?

Deyana Kostova: It is quite interesting, actually, because – as I mentioned in my presentation – generally all these memorial complexes were initiated by public committees, but the state also always took part in their creation. For example, during the construction of the mausoleum of Vladimir Varouchchen [King Władysław I of Poland] in Varna in the very committee there was a military man representing the Ministry of Defence. The Shipka Monument was erected with the help of voluntary donations from the entire society, but there was also a state budget, and there was also a huge effort of soldiers from the Ministry of Defence who actually built the monument: it is their labour that made it possible to complete it within relatively short time. The situation was the same in Tutrakan, where it was the military who decided to bury the dead soldiers from all the sites in fort no. 7 at the battlefield.

Some time ago I asked why I was speaking of the history institutions as representing another institution, and the reason is part of the answer to your question. In the 1920s there was a structure called the Department of Military Museums, Monuments, and Tombs (or Cemeteries) which was under the Ministry of Defence, and all the history memorials were part of this structure.

Hanna Mik: In the 1920s we were one, because what is now the National Military Museum was a kind of methodological supervisor of all these military institutions and memorials. So, the state took care of memorials in the 1920s, in the 1930s, and during the Second World War. It was in the 1940s that this department of the Ministry of Defence was dismissed and all these different structures went under different supervision. For example, the Park Museum of Military Friendship became a branch of the National Military Museum, and the Shipka Museum went under the supervision of the Ministry of Culture, while the Military Tomb 1916 Memorial Complex in Tutrakan went under the supervision of the Ministry of Transport and again, the Ministry of Culture. So, the state is part of the present protection of battlefields, and all kinds of budget institutions are part of it as well – it is the public participation in their preservation that has decreased nowadays, actually.

Hanna Mik: I forgot to congratulate you: today is the anniversary of the Unification of Bulgaria so I wish you all the best. Could you quote some examples of how Bulgarian people, ordinary members of contemporary society, are involved in any way in preserving the memory of past historical events that constitute national remembrance? For example, in Poland scouts often help public institutions to take care of national heritage sites.

Deyana Kostova: It is always easier to speak about ordinary people involved in the preservation of cultural heritage, including battlefields, on days like this, the Bulgarian Unification, because ordinary people are mostly inclined to take part in such holidays or anniversaries of important battles. It was also mentioned in the presentation that on the first Sunday of September each year people gather in Tutrakan – and these are ordinary people, not only relatives of the ones who fell in Tutrakan. They gather there and
they pay their respect to the fallen during the Battle of Tutrakan. On 3 March, which is our national holiday – the Liberation of the Bulgarians – tens of thousands of people come to see the Shipka Monument, to be there on that particular day and re-experience what had happened in order for Bulgaria to be free.

I don’t know if the involvement of contemporary Bulgarian society in the preservation of national memory is more active or more passive actually, because in our experience as an institution that takes care of and preserves military heritage it is very important for people to learn about the facts. This is people’s way of getting involved: they want to learn more, they want to get near to the exhibits from the past, for example. It’s not that they take some active measures, but, for example, on 3 March, on the national holiday, our museum displays a flag that is known as the Samara flag; and is the first combat flag of the Bulgarian volunteers who fought at Shipka. And there are queues of sweaty or thirty thousand people, standing there for two or three hours, sometimes in the rain, waiting just to get in front of this flag and to commemorate the victims of the Russo-Turkish war. So, as institutions, we are constantly looking for different ways to involve the people in this process. We have various educational programmes that are supposed to involve the children, to teach them that history is not only to be remembered as when you read it from the textbook and you remember it: you have to understand it, you have to try to experience it yourself. There are also many re-enactment groups in Bulgaria. They are voluntary organisations, and they are always active during official celebrations and national holidays – for example now, Plovdiv, which was the city where our unification was announced, is full of people commemorating it: ordinary people who are happy to have the free united Bulgaria now.

Hanna Mik: Thank you very much. That was my last question. And is there anyone in the audience who would like to ask a question?

Joanna Duda-Gwiazda: I have a question to the gentleman from Slovakia, concerning 1968. Slovak is not unfamiliar to us, and Slovaks is not unfamiliar to us, which is exactly why I would like to ask you about this. In 1968, during the Warsaw Pact’s invasion of Slovakia, all kinds of information reached us that we were able to get via the radio and in other ways: we climb and are able to get via the radio and in other ways: we climb and sand people, standing there for two or three hours, sometimes in the rain, waiting just to get in front of this flag and to commemorate the victims of the Russo-Turkish war. So, as institutions, we are constantly looking for different ways to involve the people in this process. We have various educational programmes that are supposed to involve the children, to teach them that history is not only to be remembered as when you read it from the textbook and you remember it: you have to understand it, you have to try to experience it yourself. There are also many re-enactment groups in Bulgaria. They are voluntary organisations, and they are always active during official celebrations and national holidays – for example now, Plovdiv, which was the city where our unification was announced, is full of people commemorating it: ordinary people who are happy to have the free united Bulgaria now.
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Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am faced today with a difficult task of summing up the World Battlefield Museums Forum. Within the framework of a science such as history, no summaries are accurate enough to describe the events from several hundred years back. It is therefore all the more difficult to recapitulate an event which has ended only recently.

There is one principal post-conference observation that I would like to make. This observation addresses a certain fact uniting all the institutions represented at the Forum, namely, that the battlefields we take care of still teach us a lot about military conflicts and tell us what the meaning of war is. It is quite natural that we protect battlefields and traces of armed conflicts, but I am convinced we do so, first of all, in order to prevent those tragic events from happening again. This common purpose was indeed often expressed during the conference lectures. It seems we are all aware of this purpose since the notions most frequently addressed in both the lectures and the general debate were “memory” and “education”.

The notion of reconciliation, in its turn, was particularly prominent in those lectures whose authors referred to the words uttered by various national leaders after tragic historical struggles. The first of the leaders thus quoted was President of the United States, Abraham Lincoln, who, following the battle of Gettysburg in 1863, delivered his world-famous Gettysburg Address, directed towards everybody rather than against anybody. I am convinced that this speech is still a significant point of reference for the American people, being a source of historical reconciliation in the bosom of the nation.

The second national leader quoted during the Forum was Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, the Turkish statesman and military commander, who, as President of an already independent Turkey, referring to the bloody battle of Gallipoli, addressed not only the wives and mothers of Turkish soldiers who had fought and lost their lives in that terrible struggle, but also the wives and mothers of the ANZAC soldiers – Australians and New Zealanders. Similar references also appeared in other lectures and pronouncements; therefore, the term “reconciliation” can surely be considered the third most important notion prominent in the overall message of our conference. And so, we have “education”, “memory”, and “reconciliation”.

No doubt, during our conference we did not solve the problem of war as such – after all, this was not the purpose of the meeting. Neither did we solve the everyday problems of our institutions, which is unsurprising, considering that this would require countless additional meetings and debates. Perhaps we shall return to this task in the future. Nonetheless, I am very glad that we have met here, in Gdańsk, at the Museum of the Second World War and held a discussion which, in my opinion, has already proved productive and profitable. The conference was, however, just the first step on a path we intend to follow. I would like to express my gratitude towards all the participants for taking the time and for their words of wisdom. I hope that similar meetings shall be held in the future, perhaps not in Gdańsk but elsewhere – in a location that we will choose together – and that we shall remain in close contact.

Karol Nawrocki, Ph.D.
Director
Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk
EXHIBITION OPENING

„SHOW NO MERCY, BE BRUTAL! DESTRUCTION OF POLAND IS OUR FIRST GOAL. AGGRESSION AGAINST POLAND 1939“
“Be ruthless, be brutal, destroying Poland is our first task” – these are Adolf Hitler’s words spoken in August 1939 during a meeting with the Wehrmacht officers. Nothing good could have followed after such words. The war unleashed on Poland and the entire Central and Western Europe turned out to be a true pandemonium. The war broke out in agreement between two equally terrifying totalitarian regimes – Soviet communism and German Nazism, and it started with the shots fired at Westerplatte on 1 September 1939. Already by autumn of 1939, German soldiers took more than 60,000 Polish lives – officials, women and men. Until this day, towns like Piątnica, Szepnowsk are grim symbols of these atrocities. Though it is near to impossible to describe the history of the Second World War by means of statistics, when we realise that nearly 6 million Polish citizens (including 3 million Polish Jews) lost their lives during the war (17% of all Poles inhabiting the Second Republic of Poland), we will be able to understand the sheer extent of the crime, the crime unlike any other crimes before.

One in five Poles lost their lives during the war. The war took its toll on half of Polish lawyers, 40% of university professors, and every second doctor. In addition, 900 Polish towns and villages were completely obliterated as a result of German military operations. The city of Wieluń remains a grim symbol of the horrifying Luftwaffe bombing raids of September 1939 when its citizens, sound asleep at night, were buried under the rubble. On 25 September 1939, 400 German bombers were destroying the Polish capital, Warsaw, for 11 hours. During the same, aforementioned meeting with the Wehrmacht staff Hitler said, “This war has to be a war of annihilation”. He was obviously aware of the fact that the Japanese had waged an inhumane war on China since July 1937, and that they had already bombed the enormous city of Chongqing. A few years later, the Japanese navy attacked the American base in Pearl Harbor and the war was unleashed also in the Pacific. Three war outbreaks in three different places: on 7 July 1937 in Beijing – the Japanese attack on Marco Polo Bridge (today we are joined by the representatives of the Chinese museum); on 3 September 1939 on Westerplatte; on 7 December 1941 in America, on the Pacific, in Hawaii – which I will later go back to. Three different beginnings of atrocities of the same terrifying extent of brutality in three different locations, the events that cannot be forgotten.

Three distinct dates, the same levels of killing and mass destruction of population, unheard of before 1942, except for China and Poland. Therefore, we have gathered here today to preserve the memory of 1 September 1939, because before the war started in Europe, Polish citizens had already been suffering on an unimaginable scale. The war atrocities also included the crimes of the Holocaust, which began on a mass scale in 1942 – three years after the outbreak of the Second World War in Poland. The war that was different than any other, previous conflicts in the history of civilization. As it went on, cemeteries were filling fast not only with bodies of strong soldiers and men as was the case with past conflicts, but also bodies of the sick, women and children, and innocent civilians.

At its core every war is the same. This is why I am glad that the opening of this exhibition – one of the seven currently running exhibitions in the Museum of the Second World War in Gdańsk – will serve as an introduction to extended discussions and exchanges of ideas during the World Battlefield Museums Forum. The exhibition vernissage presents the Polish tragic experience of the initial months of WWII. I sincerely hope that this exhibition will be the next step towards making the world realize that the war began not, as some persistently claim, on June 22, 1941, with Hitler’s attack on the Soviet Union, but on September 1, 1939 in Poland. It is therefore equally important to speak out loud and clear about the autumn of 1939, when the Germans and the Soviets set out on a bloody, mass extermination of the Polish nation. It was the Poles, after all, who were subjected to such terrible suffering first. Years ago, the eminent American historian, Richard C. Lucas, referred to this period as “the forgotten Holocaust”. Poles will never forget that tragedy. The whole world will also remember, I believe.

Kamil Nawrocki:
Ladies and Gentlemen, Representatives of Battlefield Museums,
Dear Mr. Director, Dear Guests,

It is my great pleasure to open today’s exhibition, which is, as always, an educational and historical endeavour that serves to teach the general audience, not only specialists, about an important period in our history. Everyone knows the date of 1st September 1939. This exhibition differs from other historical initiatives because it speaks of a turning point that, like no other, decided the fate of our country. As a person who on a daily basis deals with cultural heritage in the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in a city that was not supposed to be there, Warsaw – not a day passes without us remembering this date. Therefore, the 1st September 1939 is not only the date of the start of the war that brought enormous destruction, death of many soldiers, and gave rise to a series of battles that we have just heard about, but above all, it is the date inscribed in the history of every Polish family. I believe that each of us, while viewing today’s exhibition, will recall the history of their own family because we are all descendants of the people who miraculously survived the war.
Uniaxial limber for a French 75mm canon model 1897/16, designed to tow the cannon or the caisson with ammunition. In the interwar period, it was part of the Polish Army’s equipment as an element of a gun crew, comprised of one cannon, a caisson, and two limbers together with the crew and a means of transport (horse traction).

The limber consists of an ammunition chest, two equipment chests, a shelf for cannoneers’ backpacks, two wooden wheels, an axle, and a drawbar. The ammunition chest with an opening lid is made of steel sheet. Inside, there are four compartments for transporting 24 artillery shells. In addition, it was also used to carry boxes with fuses, maintenance equipment, a flashlight, spare horseshoes, and backup food rations. The chest has seating places for cannoneers. The limber also includes a folding wooden spare drawbar.

The 75mm cannon model 1897 was designed in France at the end of the 19th century. It had a maximum range of 11,200 m and the rate of fire up to 12 shots per minute. It was used on a mass scale during the First World War, and it became popular due to its fast rate of fire and effectiveness. The first cannons appeared in Poland with General Haller’s Army. In subsequent years, the 75mm cannons model 1897/16 were bought and acquired by way of exchange, including on the basis of agreements with France and Romania. In the interwar period, the cannon was one of the basic types of weapons used by light artillery regiments of the Polish Army. During the Polish campaign, it was used in military operations on a mass scale.

The limber in the Museum’s collection was used by the 6th Light Artillery Regiment that was part of the 6th Infantry Division, which set up a defensive position nearby Pszczyna and Ćwiklice. It was damaged during the battle on 2 September 1939 and was left on the battlefield. After being included in the Museum’s collection, it underwent conservation and reconstruction.
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